Civic Honourability in Western Asia Minor from the Late Attalid dynasty to the Early Principate, 188 BCE to 98 CE



Marcus Chin

Wadham College

A thesis submitted towards the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Ancient History

Hilary Term 2021

Acknowledgements

The undertaking of this doctoral dissertation has not been an easy task, and it is fitting to record here the help and support received towards it, however mean the words which follow may be. Many thanks go firstly to my supervisor, Christina Kuhn, who was always generous with her time, and offered many incisive comments that constantly challenged me to clarify my arguments. Charles Crowther, Jonathan Prag, Nicholas Purcell and Josephine Quinn posed searching questions at examination stages. Trips to western Asia Minor to visit the archaeological sites there in 2018 and 2019 were facilitated by the guidance and help of Charles, Peter Thonemann, Martin Hallmannsecker, Leah Lazar, Hüseyin Uzunoğlu and Tolga Özhan, and were sponsored by the generosity of the Craven Committee. Many kindly offered advice on matters macroscopic and microscopic, shared bibliography, and sometimes even provided glimpses of new inscriptions, including especially Thomas Corsten, Marc Domingo-Gygax, Aneurin Ellis-Evans, P. Fröhlich, Benjamin Gray, Anna Heller, Bradley Jordan, John Ma, Andrew Meadows, R. R. R. Smith, Jelle Stoop, Gaétan Thériault, Peter Thonemann and Andreas Victor Walser. I would like to thank in particular Hüseyin and Tolga, as well as the staff at the Bodleian and Sackler libraries, for assistance in obtaining books and articles. Aitor Blanco-Pérez, Chris Haddad, Martin Hallmannsecker, Paul Jarvis, Leah Lazar, Joana Perrone, Ellen Ryan and Jules Skotnes-Brown read and offered valuable critique on drafts at various stages. I should also like to thank the History Faculty for its financial assistance. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the constant moral support offered by many friends, too numerous to enumerate here, and especially my family, above all my father and brother.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT 1

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS 2

INTRODUCTION 4

A tale of two Artemises: conceptualising rhetorical change in euergetic epigraphy between the early Hellenistic period and high Roman empire 4

Euergetism and imperialism: honorific systems in transition under early Roman rule in western Asia Minor 11

CHAPTER 1: IN THE SHADOW OF THE SENATE. THE LATE ATTALID EUERGETIC WORLD ORDER, 188-133 BCE 20

Nikephoria: a king made city 22

Eumenes between the Common Benefactors and the cities 26

The Attalid family-unit 30

Civic honourability and the royal official 33

Civic leaders in the south 38

A powerful citizen and compliant king: Eirenias of Miletos and Eumenes II 44

A crisis of Attalid euergetic confidence, 166-133 BCE 49

From king to citizens 58

CHAPTER 2: AN AGE OF INDIFFERENCE. ROMAN POWER AND THE ENTRENCHMENT OF AMBASSADORIAL ETHIC, 133-29 BCE 63

Roma and the Romans as Common Benefactors 64

Goodwill to the Romans, under pressure, 133-85 BCE 68

The power of personal connections: Menippos and Polemaios of Klaros and Chairemon of Nysa 73

Indebting the ἡγούμενοι 80

Challenges to ambassadorial honourability and the emergence of 'super-ambassadors' 87

Ambassadors of the province 98

Epilogue 102

CHAPTER 3: GYMNASIA AND GODS. CIVIC ELITISM IN THE POST-APAMEIAN CENTURY 105

Individualising honorific rhetoric in the late 2nd century BCE 106

The gymnasialisation of post-133 Pergamon 112

Citizens 'on steroids': gymnasia and civic identity in post-Apameian western Anatolia 119

Intellectual *paideia* and competing gymnasialising honours at Klaros and Metropolis 125

Civic honour and divine service at late Hellenistic Priene: Moschion's *stephanephoria* 131

Wealthier citizens, debased *paroikoi* 135

Honours for gods, honours for men: divine manifestness and euergetic inflation 141

Elitist politics and the demise of peer-polity representation 153

CHAPTER 4: THE EMPEROR AND ELITE HONOURABILITY BETWEEN CITY, PROVINCE AND EMPIRE 29 BCE-98 CE 159

Imperial cult as meta-honour 161

The *princeps* as 'euergetic space' I: embassies to the emperor 170

Provincialising the ambassador: Menogenes of Sardeis 179

The *princeps* as 'euergetic space' II: the power of a name 185

Imperialising civic honorific titles 193

Emperor-loving titles and the honours of the Roman world 201

Roman returns to the *patris* 206

CHAPTER 5: BEYOND THE GYMNASIUM: ROMANS, WEALTH AND FAMILY IN EARLY IMPERIAL CIVIC GENEROSITY AND HONOURABILITY 214

The rise of bathing-oil 215

Resident Romans and civic euergetism 218

Potens of Iasos 222

Roman commerce and the monetarisation of civic honourability 224

Wealth and images of Roman euergetic families 229

Apollonis and Antonia Tryphaina: Family, women, and Romans at Kyzikos 235

Familial trends 242

Familial office-holding and benefactions 243

The reification of ancestral virtue 246

Double exemplarities before city and family 251

From exemplarity to memorability: a new ethos for civic euergetism 256

Continuities of familial honour and benefaction at early imperial Aphrodisias 264

Epilogue: remembering the benefactor at Kibyra 270

CONCLUSION 274

BIBLIOGRAPHY 278

Abstract

This is a study of the impact of Roman imperialism on the public honorific culture of the Greek cities of western Asia Minor, 188 BCE to 98 CE. It is concerned with the way that local civic languages of power, framed in the terms of reciprocal benefaction and gift-exchange, adapted to changing political structures, as Rome succeeded the earlier Seleukid and Attalid regimes. This entails relating a mass of archaeological *realia* for public civic discourse, as embodied in several hundred inscribed honorific decrees, statue-base inscriptions, and public dedicatory inscriptions, to known historical and political contexts, thereby composing a diachronic history of discursive and ideological change and continuity tied to specific chronological and regional boundaries. Of the five chapters, Chapters 1, 2, and 4 chart the influence of high political change. The post-Seleukid era, 188-29 BCE, witnesses an overarching Roman dominance conceived in terms of universal euergetism that affects both late Attalid euergetic self-presentation and the honorific status of local citizens, who become plenipotentiary intermediaries with Roman power. Under the principate the autocratic power of the emperor channels the ambitions of local citizens into the imperial cult, which becomes an arena for elite giving at the provincial and local levels, and encourages honorific hierarchisation and titularisation. Chapters 3 and 5 examine developments in internal political culture across these two periods. Euergetic activity in relation to gymnasia and local cults in the decades after 188 is traceable to anxieties over local identity and growing socio-economic imbalance between citizens and non-citizens; this is exacerbated in the 1st century by the presence of resident Romans, and deepening wealth inequalities, thereby giving prominence to wealth and familial descent as arguments for civic honourability. The result is a subtle change in ethos, as honorific monuments by the early empire emphasise the honorand's memorability rather than exemplarity.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations of ancient authors and works follow the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*[4] in the first instance, and then Liddel and Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon*[9]; those for journals follow *L'année philologique*, and then the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*[4] in the second instance, while inscriptions are cited according to the conventions of the *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, except for the following:

Canali de Rossi, *Filius*	F. Canali de Rossi, *Filius publicus: υἱὸς τῆς πόλεως e titoli affini in iscrizioni greche di età imperiale*, Rome, 2007.
Chankowski.DiodPasp	A. S. Chankowski, 'La procédure législative à Pergame au Ier siècle au J.-C.: à propos de la chronologie relative des décrets en l'honneur de Diodoros Pasparos', *BCH* 122.1 (1998) 159-199, at 162-165 (system of reference for the inscriptions relating to Diodoros Pasparos).
I.Aphrodisias2007	J. Reynolds, Ch. Roueché, and G. Bodard eds. *Inscriptions of Aphrodisias*, 2007, http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/iaph2007
I.Nordkarien	W. Blümel, *Inschriften von Nordkarien*, Bonn, 2018.

I.Nysa	W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Tralleis und Nysa, II. Die Inschriften von Nysa*, Bonn, 2019.
I.Priene2014	W. Blümel and R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Priene*, 2 vols, Bonn, 2014.
I.Sardis II	G. Petzl, *Sardis. Greek and Latin Inscriptions, Part II: Finds from 1958 to 2017*, Cambridge, 2019.
I.Tralleis	F. B. Poljakov, *Die Inschriften von Tralleis und Nysa, I. Die Inschriften von Tralleis*, Bonn 1989.
Mathys, *Architekturstiftungen*	M. Mathys, *Architekturstiftungen und Ehrenstatuen: Untersuchungen zur visuellen Repräsentation der Oberschicht im späthellenistischen und kaiserzeitlichen Pergamon*, Darmstadt, 2014.
McCabe Chios	D. F. McCabe, *Chios Inscriptions: Texts and List*, Princeton, 1986.
McCabe Halikarnassos	D. F. McCabe, *Halikarnassos Inscriptions: Texts and List*, Princeton, 1991.

Introduction

This is a study of the impact of Roman imperialism on the public honorific culture of the Greek cities of western Asia Minor, 188 BCE to 98 CE. It is concerned with the way that local civic languages of power, framed in the terms of reciprocal benefaction and gift-exchange, adapted to changing political structures, as Rome succeeded the Seleukid and Attalid monarchies that had held sway in the region. The main aim is to relate a mass of archaeological *realia* for public civic discourse, as embodied in several hundred inscribed honorific decrees, statue-base inscriptions, and dedications of public benefaction, to known historical and political contexts, and therefore to compose a diachronic history of discursive and ideological change and continuity tied to specific chronological and regional boundaries. This introductory chapter outlines the main scope and historiographical context of the study, as well as its methodological framework and constraints.

A tale of two Artemises: conceptualising rhetorical change in euergetic epigraphy between the early Hellenistic period and high Roman empire

Giving and receiving formed just as much a part of ancient Mediterranean life as it has for any other human society. In the context of the Greek *polis*, giving could be also very public, in gifts and services to the community, for which an individual stood to earn recognition in the form of honour, often manifesting in legal and political privileges (e.g. tax-immunity, the status of *proxenos*, seating privileges), but also sometimes assuming 'symbolic' forms, like crowns, decrees, statues, and in some cases even cultic honour. This public interplay of

gift and reward, benefaction and honour, has come to be characterised as euergetism,[1] and is attested by hundreds of inscriptions across the Mediterranean, principally from the late 5th century BCE to the 3rd century CE.

Euergetic exchange structured relations not only between cities and citizen benefactors, but also between cities and rulers, and cities themselves: what is remarkable about it, and which concerns this study, is the potential for change in the rhetorical representation of this exchange. One might briefly contrast the tone of two well-known dossiers recording honorific exchanges, from both ends of our period, from western Asia Minor. The first is the body of roughly 60 decrees inscribed on the wall of Magnesia-on-the-Maeander's agora, dating to 208 BCE, recording the responses of numerous communities whom the city had invited to approve the inviolate status of the city's territory and its new festival to Artemis Leukophryene.[2] Although wording inevitably varies depending on the recipient community, all the decrees describe the Magnesians' benefactions in maintaining and renewing ancestral friendship with the community addressed, and in the services of Artemis Leuokophryene to the Greeks through her manifestations. In return, the recipient communities each granted recognition of the Magnesians' new festival and their territorial inviolability as the 'honour' they offered in return for the Magnesians' good deeds, sometimes further sealed by granting the Magnesian ambassadors *proxenia* or other honours, although the individuality of these ambassadors is never placed at the forefront. In their overall tone and formulaic character, the decrees of the Magnesians' dossier present a world of 'peer-polity' interactions,[3] where euergetic dynamics are primarily visible in the exchanges between whole civic communities serving as benefactors and honouring bodies. Less visibility is accorded to individual actors. Three

[1] First known as 'évergétisme' in Boulanger (1923) 25; for a succinct definition and overview, Domingo-Gygax (2016) 1-5.
[2] Rigsby (1996) 179-279 and now Ceccarelli (2018).
[3] For 'peer-polity' interaction, Ma (2003), with 12-13, 17 on Magnesia.

centuries later, however, the dossier of inscriptions concerning the foundation of money bequeathed in 104 CE by the Roman G. Vibius Salutaris to Ephesos, west of Magnesia, in honour of Artemis Ephesia, presents a quite different picture of honorific visibility.[4] The dominance of Salutaris as benefactor is overwhelming: across multiple decrees we read civic decisions outlining his donations of multiple honorific statues of the emperors, the Roman Senate, equestrian order, people, and Ephesian tribal heroes (some of whose bases still survive), money towards distributions at regular processions, and even letters of governors and legates approving his generosity. His main honorific decree outlines his accomplishments in great detail, and perpetuates his visibility as benefactor through multiple honorific statues set up across the city and Artemision.[5] The individuality of his personality forms the honorific focus of the many documents inscribed in the theatre. Both dossiers therefore document reciprocal exchange framed in the language of honour, but suggest quite different conceptions of what was honourable, and hence worthy of commemoration on stone. In the Magnesian case, beneficence is bound up in long established, notionally pre-existing reciprocal ties between communities, and individual Magnesian benefactors, apart occasionally from the ambassadors, are not specified. Emphasis is placed on the authoritativeness of *polis* communities as partners in the exchanges recorded. In Salutaris' dossier, however, rhetorical weight is given to his achievements and their uniqueness; the city is still authoritative, but stands very much as a complement to, rather than firmly above, the honoured benefactor. Moreover, these two examples are not anomalous, but reflect broader trends, as we shall see shortly.

What happened in the period in between to cause this difference in ideas around the honourable, and the shift in rhetorical emphasis from the community to the individual benefactor from the 2nd century BCE to 1st century CE, is the subject of this study. The theme

[4] *I.Ephesos* 27-37, Rogers (1991a).
[5] *I.Ephesos* 27a ll. 85-88.

of change in euergetic ideology has not often concerned historians, who have tended to study it as a synchronic phenomenon. P. Veyne's seminal 1976 study of euergetism in the Greek east conceived of its Hellenistic and Roman phases (late 4th century BCE to 3rd century CE) as a monolithic bloc, while the most recent major monograph of A. Zuiderhoek focuses largely on the Roman imperial period as a single unit.[6] The only work to seriously consider euergetism diachronically has been P. Gauthier's *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*,[7] which argues for the emergence of a powerful ruling elite in Hellenistic cities from the mid-2nd century BCE onwards. Tracing the use of the title εὐεργέτης in honorific decrees, Gauthier finds that, where in the early Hellenistic period (late 4th to early 2nd centuries) it is confined mainly to foreign benefactors, and local citizens were honoured in modest terms as members of still strongly democratic civic societies, from the mid-2nd century onwards it comes to be applied even to local citizens, whose accomplishments are described as the quasi-aristocratic expression of an innate, ancestral virtue.[8] Personal generosity was now more prevalent in the operation of politics, leading to an inflation of honours. For Gauthier, affirming earlier observations of L. Robert,[9] this reflects a sort of depoliticisation, by which political power came into the hands of a minority. While his late Hellenistic dating of this process forms a direct response to Veyne's lack of interest in chronological change, it still fundamentally shares Veyne's conception of euergetism as a phenomenon exclusively linked to the existence of a class of powerful notables (the Weberian 'Honoratioren'), for whom benefactions were not a matter of obligation, but simply an assertion of social superiority:[10] Gauthier's main difference rests in the date of the emergence of this class of notables. A broader context for this mid-2nd-century change is not detailed – his fine-grained

[6] Veyne (1976), also (1969), Zuiderhoek (2009).
[7] Gauthier (1985).
[8] Gauthier (1985) 30-39, 53-75.
[9] E.g. Robert (1969-1990) 2.841-842, 5.351; cf. Gauthier (2005a) 1-2.
[10] Gauthier (1985) 8-9 explicitly accepts Veyne's model.

readings of honorific decrees imply a connection with Rome, but this is never made explicit. Gauthier' conception of euergetism is still one based on a notion of elite superiority and dominance over the civic community, and its historical significance lies in being an endpoint for the egalitarian, non-elitist early Hellenistic *polis*.

This thesis of a substantive change in political culture in the late Hellenistic period, by which a minority of notables came to dominate civic politics, has since been rightly critiqued. F. Quaß has downplayed the dichotomy between the early and late Hellenistic periods, although problematically re-instating a Weberian class of 'honourables' across the Hellenistic and Roman eras in doing so.[11] C. Habicht, however, has justly argued that political culture in *poleis* was always shaped by the need of an elite minority to legitimate their dominant position in their community.[12] Certainly, important arguments in favour of discerning change have since been raised, with a collective volume edited by P. Fröhlich and C. Müller in 2005 and an essay of P. Hamon in 2007 emphasising the way in which elite notables were re-shaping civic institutions in their favour,[13] while interest has centred on the continuing vitality and relevance of Hellenistic democratic mechanisms across the 3rd to 1st centuries.[14] Significantly, attention has also turned to the persistence of civic politics in the Roman imperial period, with a number of studies focussed on the continuing vigour of collective decision-making,[15] while also noting changes, like the rise of the council,[16] or the *plebs media* becoming a more vocal element in assemblies.[17] Developments across the late

[11] Quaß (1993), with Gauthier in *BE* 1994 194 and Forster (2018) 21.
[12] Habicht (1995).
[13] Fröhlich and Müller (2005), Hamon (2007); see also Migeotte (1997), Fröhlich (2002) now also Ma (2014) 154-160 and Curty (2015).
[14] E.g. Fröhlich (2004), Dmitriev (2005), Grieb (2008), Hamon (2009), Carlsson (2010), Van der Vliet (2011), Mann and Scholz (2012).
[15] Rogers (1991b), (1992), Lewin (1995) 24-35, Ma (2000), Salmeri (2000) 69-75, Zuiderhoek (2007), Fernoux (2011), Brélaz (2013), Oppeneer (2018).
[16] Hamon (2005), Heller (2009), (2013).
[17] E.g. Meyer-Zwiffelhoffer (2003), Harland (2006), Zuiderhoek (2008) 436-445, (2018).

Hellenistic and Roman periods thus cannot be neatly defined in terms of 'oligarchisation' or elite capture,[18] but were rather part of evolving political dynamism.

The study of euergetism is inevitably bound up in, and offers a viewing-lens for, this ongoing discussion about the relative continuity or discontinuity of political institutions, and hence the communitarian or elitist texture of Hellenistic and imperial civic politics; Gauthier's study has been catalytic in this regard. What has emerged from this debate, nonetheless, is a sense of the continuing creative tension between elite and non-elite citizens across the post-classical *polis*, for whose articulation euergetism formed a crucial symbolic space.[19] That is, as well as reading honorific rhetoric as a mask for the true locus of political power (whether in the elites or the people), one may also read it as an entity in itself, forming a history of honorific representation, within the continual dynamic interactions between elites and non-elite communities. Here, it is useful to note that more recent anthropological and philosophical definitions of 'honour', as a quality of self-recognition simultaneously before oneself and one's society,[20] have increasingly emphasised its place on a spectrum of respect-driven behaviour: 'honour' is not a trait specific to 'primitive' or 'Mediterranean' societies, or to elite classes alone, but part of an universal desire for social recognition.[21] Its study should thus centre not only on those who act towards acquiring honour, but also on the determinative, ideological frameworks shaping such behaviour.

In terms of euergetism, this means thinking less about the actions and motivations of benefactors, and more about the honours they received, and the meanings these conveyed. Such thinking has directed more recent scholarly activity. For one, attention has focussed

[18] See for instance Müller (2018).
[19] In this vein, Brélaz (2009).
[20] E.g. Pitt-Rivers (1966) 21-22.
[21] Honour as not uniquely Mediterranean or elitist: Stewart (1994), Horden and Purcell (2000) 485-522, Brennan and Pettit (2004) 1-10, against earlier synopses of 'Mediterranean' honour in Campbell (1964), Peristiany (1966); honour as respect: Welsh (2008); honour as a means of normalising a notion of justice: Appiah (2010); also, Cairns (2011) 23-29.

on the reciprocity inherent in euergetism, an aspect that Veyne's analysis notably neglected.[22] A. Zuiderhoek showed in 2009 that acquiring legitimacy, as a form of counter-gift, was also crucial to the mentality of public generosity in the Roman period.[23] Moreover, euergetism has been set alongside other forms of public gift-exchange behaviour in the ancient Mediterranean, from the Bronze Age to late antiquity,[24] in which vein M. Domingo-Gygax has analysed benefactions and honours in terms of gifts and counter-gifts, and hence the potential interchangeability of these roles: thus, honours could sometimes even function as 'gifts' in themselves, and constitute 'proleptic' honours encouraging future benefaction.[25] Euergetism's roots may thereby be traced in the self-commemoration of athletic victors in the archaic period, or the 5th-century Athenian democracy's system of encouraging rewards and competition, even if these were not formally acts of 'euergetism'.[26] Much attention has also been devoted in the last two decades to understanding honorific language on its own terms, in the rhetoric and spatiality of decrees and statues: J. Ma, G. Biard, and O. van Nijf have emphasised the role of statues in shaping and enforcing the ideas, norms, and conceptual boundaries around civic behaviour in the Hellenistic and Roman periods;[27] more recently still B. Gray and F. Forster have studied the ethical and ideological content of Hellenistic honorific decrees,[28] while A. Heller has produced the first systematic analysis of honorific titles in the imperial period, as an index of relations between elites and non-elites, and cities and the Roman power.[29]

One might therefore analyse the change in rhetorical tone between the Magnesians' and Salutaris' dossiers highlighted above, over the 'long' late Hellenistic period (2nd century

[22] E.g. Andreau, Schmitt and Schnapp (1978) 317-319.
[23] Zuiderhoek (2009) 113-153.
[24] E.g. Rogers (1993) 190-191, and Domingo-Gygax (2013) and Colpaert (2014) as part of the broader volumes of Satlow (2013) and Carlà and Gori (2014); also, Domingo-Gygax and Zuiderhoek (2020).
[25] Domingo-Gygax (2003), (2009); note also Beck (2015).
[26] Domingo-Gygax (2006), (2016).
[27] Hellenistic: Ma (2013), Biard (2017); Roman-era statues as 'civic mirrors': Van Nijf (2000), (2015).
[28] Forster (2018), Gray (2012, (2013), (2018a), (2018b), (2018c); note also Ma (2002).
[29] Heller (2020).

BCE to 1st century CE), less in terms of a changing balance in political power between elite and non-elite citizenries than as changing representations of such relationships. The operative term is 'honourability' – ideas of the honourable, forming a discourse in itself, as expressed in the epigraphy and archaeology of civic euergetism. The view adopted here, however, is that such representational change only has value for historical analysis when set against the backdrop of civic interactions with imperial powers. In this study, the focus is on the western Anatolian world of the Magnesian and Salutaris dossiers, from which many of Gauthier's examples for late Hellenistic euergetism derive. This was a world shaped indelibly by empires, and which, across the Hellenistic and Roman periods, but especially in the 'long' late Hellenistic period, forms an important case-study for the relationship between euergetic ideology and empire-building.

Euergetism and imperialism: honorific systems in transition under early Roman rule in western Asia Minor

If seen as a specific manifestation of the gift-exchange dynamics of political culture in the *polis* over the *longue durée*, monumentalised euergetism writ large – in decrees and monuments pertaining to honorific exchanges between cities, between cities and benefactors, cities and rulers, and official correspondence employing the language of beneficence – is closely associated with the willingness of imperial states to engage with the ideologies of the *polis*. In western Asia Minor, the relative non-occurrence of this before the Athenian *arche* of the 5th century may explain the absence of euergetic epigraphy in the Lydian and Achaemenid periods. It is Athenian imperial rule, demonstrating the possibility of large-scale hegemony by a *polis*, that notably instigates the first inscription of public

honours outside Athens at cities like Samos, Erythrai, and Lindos.[30] While such inscriptions do appear more frequently in the 4th century, it is primarily in the early Hellenistic and Roman epochs, of the late 4th to early 2nd centuries BCE and late 1st to mid-3rd centuries CE, that one finds the greatest mass of euergetic epigraphy; it is understanding the transition between these periods that is the main concern of this study.

The wealth of material in these two periods is arguably due to the complexity of honorific exchanges under Hellenistic (chiefly Seleukid) rulers and Roman emperors. Cities not only honoured their imperial rulers and their elite citizens, both local and foreign, but also had to contend with the reciprocal relationships between rulers and such citizens, which potentially threatened the integrity of civic honours, especially when citizens might increasingly have found honours from rulers more appealing than those from cities. Honorific 'systems' are therefore determinable in these periods, whereby the honorific evaluation of individual reciprocal relationships was shaped by the pressures and expectations created by other such relationships.[31] In the early Hellenistic period, the predominance of honorific transactions between cities, in grants of *asylia* status, *proxenia* to foreign benefactors and honours for foreign judges,[32] may broadly be regarded as an effect of the establishment of powerful Hellenistic monarchies (Seleukid primarily, but also Ptolemaic, Antigonid, and Attalid), which emplaced vast power differentials, thereby reducing inequality between cities and encouraging euergetic ideologies founded on inter-city parity.[33] It was therefore more honourable to present the primacy of the community over the individual, and indeed this language of inter-city parity came to shape the way that Seleukid kings discoursed with cities.[34] The benefactions of kings to cities, in granting civic

[30] Liddel (2010) 100-105, 124-127.
[31] For the notion of an honorific system, see Heller and Van Nijf (2017b) 5-15.
[32] *Proxenia*: Marek (1984), Mack (2015); *asylia*: Rigsby (1996); kinship language: Curty (1995); foreign judges: Crowther (2007), Cassayre (2010) 131-161.
[33] Ma (2018) 279-287.
[34] Ma (2002) 179-242; note also Ma (2009) for precedents in the Athenian empire.

privileges or gifting buildings and grain, also created new standards, so that they received major honours like cults and statues, while local notables received fairly humble honours (crowns mainly; statues are rare).[35] At the same time, a certain disjunction existed between the honour-worlds of the royal courts and the Anatolian cities, at least before the 2nd century BCE: few civic elites sought and gained honour at Seleukid courts as royal friends, while royal friends are only rarely attested as civic benefactors.[36] The novel existence of large power differentials between cities and rulers, and the sheer vastness of the Seleukid empire in the early Hellenistic period, meant that interactions between kings and the western Anatolian civic elite lacked density: this created circumstances where kings were regarded in superior honorific terms, and likewise exchange between cities was honourable and worthy of public display, but where conversely individual honour was prioritised less.

A different situation subsists for the imperial period. Hundreds of honorific and dedicatory inscriptions of local notables survive, suggesting greater levels of euergetism in these centuries than at any other epoch of Greco-Roman antiquity.[37] Rich dossiers like that of Salutaris illuminate the careers of figures like G. Julius Demosthenes of Oinoanda, Opramoas of Rhodiapolis, or the Vedii Antonini of Ephesos.[38] In lieu of honorific interchange between cities in either grants of *proxenia* or campaigns for *asylia*, it is increasingly honours for elite athletes that primarily reflect contacts between cities.[39] Roman emperors received major honours like cults, like their Seleukid antecedents, but these were more complex and layered, encompassing provincial and civic levels.[40] The emperor could

[35] Royal benefactions and honours: Habicht (1970), Bringmann and Steuben (1995-2000), Kotsidu (2000). Decrees for 3rd-century local citizens modest: Forster (2018) 97-187; statues are rare: Biard (2017) 417-432 (only ten of 253 attested bronze and marble statues from Hellenistic western Anatolia and Aegean).
[36] Savalli-Lestrade (1998) 3-41, 215-236, and (1996) 177-178 n. 117.
[37] Zuiderhoek (2009) 17-22; see also Strubbe (1999) and now Heller and Van Nijf (2017a); for honorific titles, Heller (2020).
[38] Wörrle (1988), Kokkinia (2000), Kalinowski (2002), and also Smith (1998), Barresi (2007), Pont (2008a), (2012a) for other cases; generally, Fernoux (2007), Rizakis and Camia (2008), Schuler (2014).
[39] Athletes: Van Nijf (2001), (2012).
[40] Imperial building: Mitchell (1987), Winter (1996), also Pont (2007); imperial cult: Price (1984), Campanile (1994), Frija (2012a).

actually form the focus of inter-city rivalry in ways unknown in the Hellenistic period, with cities competing for imperial approval of honorific titles and rights as temple-warden or *metropolis*.[41] Moreover, the relationship between civic elites and the emperor, and the Roman imperial system he represented, is more complex than in the early Hellenistic era, with local notables competing fiercely through benefactions honouring the emperor, in buildings and festivals, while the very honorific status of these elites could depend on the approval of emperors and governors, as indeed the dossier of Salutaris shows.[42] Local elites in the 2nd and 3rd centuries also seek office in the imperial administration (as senators and knights) on a scale unprecedented under Hellenistic kings.[43] Crudely put, then, it may be said that the differences between these two honorific systems are due to the changed dynamics in the honorific reciprocities between rulers, local citizens, and cities: whereas the relative lack of such reciprocity between rulers and citizens in the early Hellenistic period meant rhetorical emphasis on the ideology of the community over the individual citizen, by the imperial period the greater integration of citizens within the honour-worlds of the Roman imperial administration, shaped by the emperor, resulted in a heightened honorific emphasis on the elite notable.

The picture presented above is undoubtedly reductive in parts, and obscures much complexity and detail which would be worthwhile exploring elsewhere. It is nonetheless useful for highlighting the relationship between civic honorific representation and supra-local political structures which forms our focus: imperial power affected the honours rulers received, as well as the honours citizens could receive, because it could even give out honours to such citizens too, complicating the dynamic further. In western Asia Minor from

[41] Burrell (2004), Heller (2006), Guerber (2009).
[42] *I.Ephesos* 27c-d. Buildings and festivals: Mitchell (1990), (1993) 1.206-225, Barresi (2000), (2003), Halfmann (2001), Pont (2010), Kokkinia (2011), Longfellow (2011), Ng (2015); imperial approval: Kokkinia (2017).
[43] Demougin (1999), Halfmann (1979).

the 2nd century BCE to 1st century CE, the most significant factor was undoubtedly the rise of Roman power. The changes examined therefore represent the impact of early Roman rule on euergetic ideology and civic honourability, a subject that is absent in Gauthier's analysis. It is also largely absent in other studies of Roman imperialism, both in regard to western Anatolia, but the Greek east generally too, which have mainly centred on Rome's political and administrative priorities and ideological politics (e.g. the use of 'freedom' in dealing with the Greek cities),[44] and less on the ideological viewpoints of the local communities that had to adapt to Rome. While a number of studies have examined Roman civic patronage,[45] these generally have not contextualised the phenomenon as part of an honorific system. The major exception in this regard is the recent edited volume of A. Heller and O. van Nijf, which presents a global view of Roman impact on civic honorific systems in the Greek east;[46] its primary approach, however, is to study the high imperial period as a synchronic unit. There is thus still room for considering how the *onset* of Roman rule impacted such systems.

An analysis of the surviving euergetic epigraphy from western Anatolia of the late Attalid, Roman Republican, and Roman imperial periods stands to offer one such narrative of early Roman impact, as a body of material providing a broad view of the three-century transition between the early Hellenistic and high imperial eras.[47] This is represented by honorific decrees, statue-bases, public dedications, and even some royal and Roman letters, which can be set against other relevant literary, numismatic and archaeological evidence, and analysed in terms of concrete historical moments specific to the region: the peace of

[44] E.g. Magie (1950), Bernhardt (1971), (1998), Gruen (1984), Sherwin-White (1984), Kallet-Marx (1995), Ferrary (2001b); Sartre (1995) 137-164, 209-270 offers overviews of local circumstances; ideological politics: Ferrary (1988) (although mainly focussed on Roman ruling and intellectual elite perspectives), Dmitriev (2011).
[45] Ferrary (1997a) 208-212, 219-224, (1997b) 105-113, Canali de Rossi (2001), Eilers (2002), Nicols (2014) 70-74.
[46] Heller and Van Nijf (2017a).
[47] Evidence has been assembled from major epigraphic corpora and publications, and I have largely followed the technical conclusions around issues like dating, readings, or provenance in these.

Apameia in 188 BCE, the provincialisation of Asia in 129, the Mithridatic wars of the early 1st century, and the establishment of the principate. Fewer distinct moments of change are discernible in the 1st century CE; my end-point of 98 CE with the reign of Nerva is meant only as a rough chronological marker indicating the period before the 2nd century *floruit* of civic euergetism. There are naturally serious caveats to such a chronological approach, inasmuch as some of these documents can only be assigned approximate dates, sometimes only to a two-century span (e.g. 1st century BCE/CE). It is also highly dependent on patterns of epigraphic survival, so that future discoveries may change the picture presented here. These are potentially major failings, but they do not in my view invalidate the overall aims of the study in attempting a synthesis of the material that is currently at hand. Sufficient numbers of qualitatively significant texts (i.e. that survive in good length) or bodies of material (e.g. decrees for gymnasiarchs, honours for Roman magistrates) do survive, assignable to the definable chronological contexts outlined above, to make such an endeavour fruitful – an endeavour that would at least provide one possible regionally specific framework in which to consider the place of any future findings resulting from the re-dating of existing texts, or the discovery of new ones. In the presentation of the analysis word-count limits have prevented lengthy quotations of Greek text or inclusion of texts in appendices, although the vast majority of these, except for a (largely negligible) handful, is available on the Packard Humanities Institute online database.[48]

The structure of the five chapters thus reflects a chronological focus, while integrating different thematic aspects. Two sections cover the pre-imperial and early imperial periods respectively (chapters 1-3, 188-29 BCE, and 4-5, 29 BCE to 98 CE), with chapters on civic honourability in high politics preceding chapters on civic honourability in internal political culture. Chapters 1 and 2 argue that the overarching character of Roman

[48] All translations of texts are my own.

dominance in the post-Seleukid era engendered a closer interaction between ruling powers and local citizens, resulting in the magnified honorific status of the latter. In the period 188-133 this meant both a new notion of Roman universal euergetism, which on the one hand compelled the Attalids to adopt an ideology of benefaction that increasingly intruded on local standards of civic honourability, and on the other elevated the honorific status of local citizens, especially in free cities. This trend continues in the post-Attalid period, as citizens become the plenipotentiary intermediaries with Roman power itself; in the troubled 1st century BCE, this powerful standing of local citizens was challenged as Roman magistrates increasingly joined them as civic benefactors and, as with powerful *imperatores*, even established relationships of patronage with citizens that interfered with pre-existing relationships between elites and their cities. The formalisation of the *koinon* of Asia thus afforded, in this reading, an alternative avenue for honour that integrated elite reciprocities with cities with those maintained with the Roman power. Chapter 4 then examines how this heightened standing of local citizens was further shaped by the imperial cult, instituted in 29 BCE, that simultaneously created provincial and local arenas for elite giving, and thereby encouraged honorific hierarchisation, and a corresponding interest in deploying honorific titles. Chapters 3 and 5 examine developments in internal political culture across these two periods. The former argues, with particular reference to Pergamon and Priene, that the rising honorific status of citizens was a result of heightened inter-city competition and socio-economic developments over the post-188 decades, as anxieties over local identity manifested in increased euergetism in relation to gymnasia and local cults. Chapter 5 proposes that the central role of the gymnasium in defining civic honourability in the late Hellenistic period was increasingly challenged from the mid-1st century BCE onwards: the pressure of resident Roman populations and increasing wealth inequalities allowed more rhetorical space for justifying benefactions and honorific status on the grounds of personal

wealth and familial connections, rather than the gymnasium or *polis*-citizenship alone: this also changed the ethos of civic honouring, as greater emphasis was increasingly placed on memorability over exemplarity.

Important qualifications to these conclusions must be mentioned. For one, while I am focussed on western Asia Minor, this study is not a regional history.[49] Rather, regionality is employed primarily as a heuristic tool to draw attention to the interaction of honorific culture with definable socio-political frameworks.[50] This means that different accounts of the period 2nd century BCE to 1st century CE, and even different periodisations altogether, for instance in Achaea, Boeotia, the Black Sea or Kyrenaica, are possible and desirable,[51] even if some of the points made here may hold true elsewhere. Secondly, 'honourability' is throughout 'civic honourability', and represents official public discourse in civic contexts; this is therefore not a study of honour comparable, for example, to L. Mitchell's study of the dynamics of gift-exchange in 5th- and 4th-century Greece, or J. E. Lendon's account of the role of honour in Roman imperial government,[52] where abundant literary evidence provides complementary perspectives. This study is by contrast overwhelmingly epigraphic, although this is not only because inscriptions constitute, for the most part, our only sources. A further aim is also to suggest that overall ideological trends can be gleaned by examining epigraphic sources *en masse*, and therefore that such evidence can form history of its own, as a history of discourse and mentalities, even if these are still primarily those of the citizen elite: these were the local figures, after all, who formed the 'human hinges' of Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic history.[53] Ultimately, through these sources we stand to learn how the inhabitants of western Asia Minor conceived of the considerable upheaval in their worlds, between

[49] Such as e.g. Thonemann (2011a), Russell (2017), or Ellis-Evans (2019).
[50] Compare Lafond (2006) for the Peloponnese, or Lomas and Cornell (2003) for Italy; for Anatolia see also Tekin, Roosevelt and Akyürek (2020) 3-132.
[51] Cf. Gauthier (2005a) 4-5.
[52] Mitchell (1997), Lendon (2001).
[53] Davies (2002) 10-11.

Hellenistic kings and Roman emperors, in terms of the expectations of honourable behaviour they placed on such rulers, and, more ubiquitously, their leading citizens.

Chapter 1: In the Shadow of the Senate. The late Attalid euergetic world order, 188-133 BCE

In December 184 the people of Telmessos in Lykia celebrated the victory of their new king, Eumenes II. He had fought and won an important battle at Lypredon in Bithynia just months before against two of his major rivals, the Galatian ruler Ortagion and his ally Prusias II of Bithynia.[54] It does not seem to have mattered that Lypredon was more than 500 kilometres north of Telmessos, and that the city would hardly have faced an immediate existential threat from its outcome; for its civic authorities, prompt and exuberant acknowledgement of Eumenes' accomplishment was clearly the priority. A decree was passed conferring grandiose honours, including prayers for the king and queen-mother Apollonis, a procession of ritually crowned citizens, and commemorative annual sacrifices to Zeus and Athena Nikephoros.[55] Eumenes is moreover described as one who fought not only on behalf of his subjects (l. 8 [ὑπ]ὲρ τῶν ὑφ' αὐτὸν τασσομένων), but also of the inhabitants of Asia (ll. 8-9: ἀλλὰ καὶ | [τῶν ἄ]λλων τῶν κατοικούντων τὴν Ἀσίαν). Why were the Telmessians so quick to honour Eumenes? One reason is that they were a geopolitical hotspot: Rome had explicitly given their city to Eumenes as a gift at the peace of Apameia in 188, and not Rhodes;[56] both Telmessos and Eumenes would have been keen to advertise the firmness of their relationship. In any case, the Telmessians' response illustrates the tight-knit reciprocity between ruler and city that prevailed in the late Attalid state, as the shadow of Pergamon loomed over the communities of post-Seleukid western Asia Minor. Over the following years, in fact, Eumenes would take advantage of this boundedness to propagate the ideology expressed by the Telmessians – of him and his family as a saviour and benefactor of the

[54] *OGIS* 298 comprises the victory dedication; for the events, Mitchell (1993) 1.24-25.
[55] Segre (1932) 446-447 ll. 15-28.
[56] Polyb. 21.45.8, 10.

Greeks (and not just those of the Attalid realm) – through the expansion of Pergamon's Nikephoria into a panhellenic festival, which would first be celebrated in 182.[57]

The Telmessians' decree and Eumenes' subsequent promotion of the Nikephoria exemplifies the subject of this opening chapter – namely, the way in which the changed political landscape of western Anatolia in the decades after the peace of Apameia in 188 shaped discourses around power-relationships between rulers and cities, as most visibly expressed in the language of euergetic reciprocity. The major source of change was the power of Rome, which exercised an indirect hegemony in the region before its formal provincialisation of Asia in 129, and whose overarching influence placed post-Seleukid rulers like Eumenes in an awkward bind, caught between obligations to Rome and the need to assert his authority regionally among cities both subject (like Telmessos) and free. The material result of this bind at the discursive level are a number of Attalid royal letters and civic honorific decrees from the period 188-133 for kings, royal friends and relatives, and local citizens, illustrating the extent to which joint efforts by both kings and cities to re-equilibrate euergetic authority pervaded and shaped local honorific systems, in a world bereft of the singular charismatic authority of the Seleukid king. Eumenes' initiative in expanding the Nikephoria and projecting an image of the Attalid monarchy as 'city-like' in its behaviour reveals one aspect of this, and forms our first focal point. The chapter then considers the way that Attalid royal authority co-mingled with local honourability through the involvement of members of the ruling family as local benefactors, and the co-optation of local elites as Attalid representatives, before examining euergetic relations with powerful cities south of the Maeander, who only briefly experienced hegemony under Rhodes: some, like Miletos, seem even to have sought a position of ideological parity with the king. The overall picture is of a late Attalid state whose ideological penetrativeness represents a source

[57] The Nikephoria had first been established by Attalos I, most likely as a local Pergamene event, in the 220s: Polyb. 4.49.3.

both of strength and weakness, as a form of euergetic interactivity distinct from that of its Seleukid predecessor, and ultimately due to the pressure exerted by Rome.

Nikephoria: a king made city

Eumenes' expansion of the festival to Athena Nikephoros made it a panhellenic, and hence penteteric, event, replete with musical, gymnastic, and equestrian contests.[58] Missions were sent to communities outside the Attalid realm to obtain international recognition: evidence for such missions is known from Kos, Iasos, Olbasa, and Delphi.[59] From the letter to Kos we learn that earlier celebrations of the Nikephoria commemorating this victory, while still only an annual festival, had already been held in 183 and 182.[60] Only in 182 did Eumenes decide to convert it into a panhellenic isolympic event. From the letters and decrees at Kos, Iasos and Delphi it is clear that the ideological expansion of Athena Nikephoros was due to the king's initiative; he, and not the city of Pergamon, is described as the primary actor in honouring the goddess, fixing the boundaries of her shrine, and sending out sacred ambassadors.[61] In the Aetolians' decree, Eumenes' brothers and Pergamon join Eumenes, although the latter clearly has precedence.[62] Some of the envoys sent out to announce the festival were Pergamenians elected by the city, but not without first receiving the approval of the king.[63]

The panhellenic Nikephoria must therefore be seen primarily as a royal initiative. It is intriguing to consider the way in which the expansion of the festival was justified. At Kos

[58] As part of this, Eumenes beautified the Nikephorion with a grove: Strabo 13.4.2.
[59] *IG* XII.4 251 (Kos), *I.Iasos* 6, *F.Delphes* III.3 240 (Aitolian League), *F.Delphes* III.3 261 (Delphic Amphiktyony), with Rigsby (1996) 363-377. The Olbasa letter is unpublished; I thank Professor Thomas Corsten for sharing a preliminary text.
[60] *IG* XII.4 251 ll. 9-12; Rigsby (1996) 364-365.
[61] *IG* XII.4 251 ll. 2, 19, 24, *I.Iasos* 6 ll. 13-20, *F.Delphes* III.3 261 ll. 10-15.
[62] *F.Delphes* III.3 240 ll. 6-8.
[63] *IG* XII.4 251 ll. 28-32, *I.Iasos* 6 ll. 1-5.

and Iasos, Eumenes speaks of the achievements he had accomplished through the goddess at many critical moments.[64] The Aetolians' decree further adds that Eumenes had been a benefactor to their *ethnos* and the Greeks at large, before stating that he had enlarged his kingdom through victories over his enemies.[65] That this should be a reference not only to the recent war against Bithynia and Galatia (which is unlikely in itself to have resulted in major territorial gains for Eumenes), but to the broader situation dating back to the peace of Apameia, is borne out by the strikingly idiosyncratic presentation of recent history in the decree of the Delphic Amphiktyony. Here, too, Eumenes' goodwill towards the Amphiktyony and the Greeks is also described, but is then joined by an important emphasis on the fact that this was dependent on Eumenes' own goodwill and favourable standing with Rome.[66] It is precisely in granting gifts to the Greek cities, and maintaining their autonomy (δι' ἣν αἰτίαν) that Eumenes demonstrated his goodwill to the Romans, who thereby expanded his kingdom (l. 7: Ῥω[μαῖ]οι θεωροῦντες αὐτοῦ τὴν προαίρεσιν ἐπευξ[ήκασιν τ]ὴμ βασιλείαν). The Attalid king is placed among the 'good' kings, those who have been the cause of no ill to the Greeks and are deserving of trust, as opposed to the 'bad' kings who have plotted against the Greeks and received fitting punishment (ll. 8-10: νομίζοντες [δεῖ]ν καὶ τῶμ βασιλέων ὅσοι μὲν ἐπιβουλεύουσιν [τοῖς Ἕλλ]ησιν τυγχάν[ειν] | τῆς καθηκού[σης] ἐπιπλήξεως, ὅσοι δὲ μηθενὸς γίνονται κακοῦ [παραίτιο]ι τούτους τ[ῆς] | μεγ[ί]στης [ἀξιο]ῦσθαι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς πίστεως). The vocabulary of πίστις here is remarkable, in conceptually placing Eumenes as subject to Roman power in the same way that magistrates were accorded πίστις from cities, and indeed as Attalid royal officials were entrusted with authority by their kings.[67] This overtly Roman colouring to Eumenes'

[64] *IG* XII.4 251 ll. 3-5, *I.Iasos* 6 ll. 16-17.
[65] *F.Delphes* III.3 240 ll. 1-6.
[66] *F.Delphes* III.3 261 ll. 1-10.
[67] For πίστις as a civic virtue, see Robert (1969-1990) 2.1059-1060 and Fröhlich (2002) 90-91 and (2020) 19-22 for the broader semantic range around 'trustworthiness'; for Attalid administrative loyalty, *I.Sardis* 4 ll. 3-4, *I.Adramytteion* 17 ll. 3-5, *I.Pergamon* 248 ll. 56-57, *I.Sestos* 1 l. 14.

motivations was possibly a specific formulation of the Amphiktyony, with its own direct experience of good and bad kings (Philip V above all), and an elaboration of the letter Eumenes had sent it, which had mainly recounted his benefactions to the Greeks and their cities.[68] It is clear from the Aitolians' decree, however, in its emphasis on Eumenes' expansion of his kingdom,[69] that the justification for the Nikephoria lay precisely in the dual claim that his achievements had both showered beneficence on the Greek cities *and* maintained his loyalty to Rome, for which he had been rewarded.

All this comprised a centralised aggrandisement of the idea articulated by Telmessos in 184, that Eumenes was benefactor of Asia's inhabitants. The Nikephoria would now reinforce this claim every four years. It is notable that the direct catalyst for the celebrations, the victory over Prusias and Ortagion, did not form the major ideological focus: unlike the Aetolians' Soteria of 246/245, cast as a battle of civilisation against barbarism, Eumenes' Nikephoria was centred on his position as a royal benefactor in a world where kings were no longer the supreme force. This is ultimately the tension underpinning the Amphiktyonic decree's very character as an honorific decree for Eumenes, by which Delphi would be shown to honour kings who act similarly favourably towards Rome.[70] The festival's expansion cannot therefore be analysed outside the affective framework established in 188, in which Eumenes stood as an awkward intermediary between Rome and the cities of western Anatolia. At the peace of Apameia he had received grants of territory (Thracian Chersonese, Lydia, Mysia, Phrygia, Lykaonia, the Milyas, portions of Pisidia and Pamphylia), δωρεαί, as Polybios calls them,[71] that effectively enlarged his realm tenfold. The other major beneficiary, Rhodes, received Karia and Lykia.[72] Both states therefore faced

[68] *F.Delphes* III.3 240 ll. 14-15; Holleaux (1938-1968) 2.70-72.
[69] *F.Delphes* III.3 240 ll. 5-6.
[70] *F.Delphes* III.3 261 ll. 16-18.
[71] Polyb. 21.45.9-11. For Eumenes as a friend of Rome, Burton (2011) 197-199, 217-219.
[72] Polyb. 21.22.14-15, and 45.8-10.

the problem of balancing obligations to Rome with managing stable relationships with their subjects, composed for the largest part of *polis* communities. The Attalid Nikephoria was one answer to the ideological challenge, in the form of euergetic dialogue between king and cities, posed by the post-Apameian geopolitical situation: it promoted the notion of Eumenes as a benefactor to the Greeks, which would be re-packaged by the cities through their recognition of its panhellenic status, as seen most clearly in the Amphiktyonic decree. The festival was also a recognition of the subtle balancing-act required to effectively govern the new Attalid empire, which was now dominated by a mosaic of civic communities, many of which had actually been declared free,[73] and in relation to whom the fluidity and indeterminacies of the settlement of 188 are most likely to have played out. Some sense of the potential fragility inherent in this can be gleaned from the Rhodians' long war with Lykia, instigated precisely because of mutual miscomprehension of the latter's political status, when the Senate first declared Lykia a subject of Rhodes, and then subsequently an independent, and thus autonomous, ally of Rome.[74] Rhodes would ultimately be dispossessed of Lykia and Karia by Rome in 167.[75]

In the Attalid sphere, the Nikephoria of Eumenes II can be seen as a concession to the primacy of the *polis* in negotiating a predominantly Anatolian empire. It should be noted that only one earlier king is known to have instituted a panhellenic festival – Ptolemy II's Ptolemaia in 280 or 262. Even this, however, was in honour of his father, and not based at a civic shrine like the Nikephorion at Pergamon.[76] By contrast, Eumenes' Nikephoria was patterned on the great civic festivals of the mid- to late 3rd century BCE at Kos, Magnesia,

[73] Polyb. 21.45.2-10 and Livy 38.39.7-17; cities which had been tribute-paying to Attalos I, or joined Antiochos, were subject to Attalid taxation. Explicitly named as free are Kolophon, Klazomenai, Chios, Smyrna, Erythrai, Phokaia, and as subject Tralleis, Ephesos and Telmessos; Bikerman (1937) is still the most comprehensive on post-188 civic statuses, suggesting that most were freed; see also Savalli-Lestrade (2001) 80.
[74] The Ilians had argued for the Lykians' autonomy: Polyb. 22.5, with Gruen (1975) 64; for the wars overall, Wiemer (2002) 265-268.
[75] Polyb. 30.5.12, Livy 44.15.1-2.
[76] *F.Delphes* III.4 357, *IG* XII.7 506.

Miletos, or Teos.[77] Tellingly, the missions despatched in quest of its international recognition included the appeal that the inviolability of Athena's shrine, *asylia*, be affirmed, thereby rooting Eumenes' self-presentation as benefactor of the Greeks in epichoric cult:[78] that is, as a king whose power was centred on a city and civic traditions.

Eumenes between the Common Benefactors and the cities

The Nikephoria thus embodies a further facet to the late Attalid state's project of fashioning kingly power on the basis of civic norms, visible also in the prominence of the Telephos frieze on the Great Altar at Pergamon, and the quasi-Athenian pretensions of the dynasty in these decades.[79] This tendency to model itself on the *polis* must be set within a conceptual framework where Roman power itself was increasingly incorporated into local honorific systems. The earliest and most ubiquitous form of this was cult to Rome as personified in the goddess Roma, first attested at Smyrna in 195 BCE, and increasingly common across Ionia, Karia, and the Aegean islands from 189 to 133.[80] The cult of Roma was not simply a continuation of Hellenistic royal cults,[81] let alone calqued on them, but was the product of the recognition by the Greek cities of the novel character of Roman power. The growing tensions between Rome and Antiochos in the 190s were crucial in concretising this notion of Roman dominance. In 196/195, just a year before Smyrna established the first cult to Roma, the Lampsakenes could still talk to Rome as a 'Hellenistic' *polis* through the language of inter-city kinship (*syggeneia*), via the Massiliotes, within a notionally bilateral, peer-

[77] Parker (2004) 15-17. Attalos I and Prusias I had organised local festivals at Pergamon and Nikomedeia, but these were not panhellenic in scale: Polyb. 4.49.3.
[78] *IG* XII.4 251 ll. 17-19, *I.Iasos* 6 ll. 6-7, *F.Delphes* III.3 240 ll. 18-19, 261 ll. 11-12.
[79] Gruen (2000).
[80] Tac. *Ann*. 4.56, and Mellor (1975) 51-52, and 35-79, 212-226 for other cities.
[81] Price (1984) 45, *contra* Mellor (1975) 21-26.

polity relationship.[82] By the year 189/188, however, a Chian notable would honour Rome with a Romaia festival, at which he dedicated a monument depicting the birth of Romulus and Remus, and victory-shields inscribed with myths attesting to Roman courage:[83] the point was undoubtedly to reinforce the sense that Rome was not simply a successor to the Seleukids, but something more akin to a special super-*polis* worthy of divine honour, with its own founders and venerable deeds.[84]

Arguably concomitant to cults of Roma was the emergence of the notion that the Romans were 'common', that is 'universal', benefactors, κοινοὶ εὐεργέται. The first attestation, indeed, is in the Amphiktyonic decree ratifying Eumenes II's Nikephoria festival.[85] Examples are then scattered throughout the 2nd century, and extend even to the early 1st century.[86] The notion of universal benefaction must be seen primarily as a conception of the *poleis*, with ethical value for euergetic behaviour within *poleis*, as we see in the next chapter. It is largely unprecedented by any designation given to Seleukid or Ptolemaic kings; the closest is a description of Antiochos III as 'common benefactor' at Teos.[87] Eumenes II would himself be given the title of 'common benefactor of the Greeks' by the Ionian *koinon* in 166,[88] but this was highly exceptional, coming at a time when his relations with Rome had suffered a grave setback, and served to re-deploy a notion reserved for the Romans.[89] Nevertheless, it is possible that its emergence was closely tied to the

[82] *I.Lampsakos* 4 ll. 21-22, 25, 31, 56, 61; note that the Phokaians also evoked kinship with Rome through the Massiliotes when it sought clemency after 129 for supporting Aristonikos, but then in quite obviously different circumstances: Just. *Epit.* 37.1.1.
[83] *SEG* 30.1073 ll. 25-31; for the date, Derow and Forrest (1982) 87-88.
[84] While other city-states received cults in the 2nd century, like Rhodes, Lesbos, Kos, Kyme, and Massilia, none ever came close to matching the near-universality of Roma cults: Robert in Des Gagniers (1969) 321 and n. 7, and (1966) 426 n. 1.
[85] *F.Delphes* III.3 261 ll. 16-18.
[86] Erskine (1994) 70 n. 3 for references; add *I.Metropolis* 1a l. 18. Of the thus seventeen instances known, ten come from western Asia Minor. See also Robert (1969) 57-60, Wehrli (1978), Ferrary (1988) 124-132, and Heller (2020) 26-27.
[87] *SEG* 41.1003ii ll. 6-7; Antiochos III was also called benefactor of the Greeks at Iasos (*I.Iasos* 4 ll. 41-48), as was Ptolemy III at Samos (*IG* XII.6 156 l. 17); see Erskine (1994) 73-74.
[88] *OGIS* 763 ll. 7-8: κοινὸν ἀναδείξας ἐμαυτὸν εὐεργέτην τῶν Ἑλλήνων.
[89] Thus Erskine (1994) 74; see below. Thonemann (2013a) 37-38 is overzealous in defining a late Attalid 'common' euergetism through this one case alone.

specific dynamic that had subsisted in western Asia Minor and the Aegean, where cities had had to deal more regularly than elsewhere with powerful, albeit largely distant, kings: the title is notably rare in mainland Greece.[90]

The conception of the Romans as overarching, common benefactors, beneath whom kings like Eumenes had to operate, was not only a construct of *polis* ideology; it was also readily accepted by these kings. In his letter to the Toriaians soon after 189 he grants them the marks of *polis*-hood, in a civic constitution, laws, and a gymnasium.[91] This replayed a broader Hellenistic pattern, with longstanding Diadochic and Seleukid precedent, of the creation of *polis*-status. Eumenes is granted eternal honours (χάριτας… διὰ παντός) probably in the form of cult, just like earlier Seleukid monarchs, which were intended to bind the supremacy of royal power to the city through euergetic reciprocity. The late Attalids continued to receive this sort of homage across their realm in the period 188-133, and the new reverence to the Romans as common benefactors did not diminish continuities at the level of Hellenistic ruler-cult; Eumenes, Attalos II and Attalos III were still ultimately kings.[92] Yet they were rulers under obligation, and the Toriaion grant also reflects the influence of the idea of the Romans as universal benefactors on the behaviour of post-Seleukid Anatolian states, even soon after the battle of Magnesia. Eumenes actually emphasises that he made his grant through the authority vested in him by the Romans (ll. 20-22: ἐκτημένου κυρ[ί]|ως διὰ τὸ παρὰ τῶν κρατησάντων καὶ πολέμωι καὶ σ[υν]|θήκαις εἰληφέναι Ῥωμαίων). By contrast, the favours granted by those who had not received such validation (τῶν μὴ κυριευόντων) would be vain and deceitful.[93] This forms a veiled

[90] Erskine (1994) 70 n. 3 ns. 1, 4-6, 8, only at Chalkis, Athens, and Delphi. The same holds true for cults of Roma, only attested at Euboia, Athens, Delphi, and Elis, and once in Macedonia: Mellor (1975) 99-108, 207-212. The only statue of the *demos* of the Romans is Athenian: *IG* II^2 3447 (albeit of Augustan date). The panhellenic centres Athens and Delphi apart, these are meagre pickings.
[91] *SEG* 47.1745 ll. 9-11, 31-34.
[92] For Attalid ruler-cult both within and without the kingdom, Schwarzer (1999) 256-262 and Kotsidu (2000) 633 for references.
[93] *SEG* 47.1745 ll. 22-24.

reference to an earlier promise of Antiochos III,[94] and hence an implicit denunciation of the earlier Hellenistic royal tradition of affirming *polis*-status which the grant would at first seem to perpetuate. The implication is therefore that Rome held overriding power over even the gift-giving authority of kings. Eumenes is here instead positioning himself within an overarching euergetic framework embodied by Rome, affirming his goodwill to it precisely by acting as a benefactor to Greeks, promoting the values of *polis*-hood, and encouraging communities to see themselves as part of a world of cities.

Post-Seleukid Anatolian kings therefore had to comport themselves with circumspection. One extreme was abasement, as Prusias II of Bithynia's greeting of the Senate in 167/166 as θεοὶ σωτῆρες shows.[95] By and large, the more prevalent tendency may have been that such kings re-conceptualised themselves as equals of cities, as indeed is reflected in the increasingly prevalent practice of accompanying embassies to Rome with gold crowns (notionally for the crowning of Roma the goddess), reminiscent of civic honorific crowns.[96] In the late Attalid realm, where royal power mingled most with civic power, Roman universal euergetism seems to have had the effect of creating a more intrusive form of royal euergetism than had obtained under the preceding Seleukids. In short, Eumenes and his successors were compelled to conceptualise their position not primarily as pre-eminent kings, but also as leaders of Asia's *poleis*, so that their acts could actually exert ideological force on civic norms and expectations. The Nikephoria festival, for example, may have set precedents for Attalid subject cities and generated local imitations, as with the Sardians in 166, who established crowned games called the Panathenaia and Eumeneia

[94] Jonnes and Ricl (1997) 18-19.
[95] Polyb. 30.18, Livy 45.44.4-20.
[96] Polyb. 30.5.4 (Rhodes), 31.32.3 (Ariarathes V), 31.33.5, 32.2.1 (Demetrios I of Syria), 32.10.4 (Orophernes of Cappadokia); the earliest case is of Philip V in 191, Livy 36.35.12; see Walbank (1957-1979) 3.421-422. See also Erskine (1994) 86: 'Ρωμαῖοι οἱ κοινοὶ εὐεργέται marked out the Romans as rulers and put the Greek state on a par with an Egyptian peasant'.

dedicated to both Athena Nikephoros and Eumenes.[97] An examination of the evidence of honorific decrees across the late Attalid realm, however, reveals two features worthy of note: the tendency to promote the ruling family-unit and its intimates, almost as a special 'elite' family, and the prevalence of honours for civic notables where local honourability was increasingly intertwined with royal euergetism.

The Attalid family-unit

A dedication from Thracian Panion to Eumenes calls him its saviour, benefactor, and founder; a notable feature of this text is that the dedication was also made to his brothers and wife Stratonike.[98] This inclusivity of royal family members is paralleled in both the decrees of Telmessos and the Aetolian League, where honour is paid not only to Eumenes, but also to his brothers and his mother Apollonis.[99] The upward recognition of Apollonis in particular marks a departure from the way the family of Antiochos III and his predecessors had been honoured in western Anatolia, where the focus had been on the nuclear royal family: Antiochos, wife Laodike, and their children.[100] Apollonis received kingdom-wide recognition, and it is striking that the leitmotif of the surviving evidence is her maternal virtues, and not a specifically 'political' role. A temple was dedicated to her at her birthplace of Kyzikos whose mythological reliefs were almost entirely dedicated to the theme of filial piety and maternal love.[101] At her death, the Hierapolitans even honoured her with a decree that placed emphasis almost exclusively on her role as an exemplary mother and mother-in-

[97] *F.Delphes* III.3 241 ll. 7-9 (only musical and gymnastic contests) and 242 ll. 13-19 (including equestrian contests as well).
[98] *OGIS* 301.
[99] Segre (1932) 446-447 ll. 18-22, *F.Delphes* III.3 240 ll. 11-13; the new Nikephoria letter from Olbasa also shows a similar promulgation of the royal family-unit (ll. 8-10: Eumenes, queen Apollonis, and brothers).
[100] Coloru (2012) 86-87; for example, Iasos honoured Antiochos, Laodike and their children: *I.Iasos* 4 ll. 60-62; Sardeis prayed for the same group: *SEG* 39.1284 ll. 13-14.
[101] *Anth. Pal.* 3.

law.[102] This fixation on domesticity must have derived to an extent from the need for dynastic legitimacy stretching back to the pre-Apameian days of Attalos I. It also added, however, a new dimension, subtly refashioning what Attalid monarchy would be about. Such domesticity, with a focus in particular on the maternal role in promoting familial descendance, does not seem to have featured in the public presentation of Seleukid queens: while Antiochos III's wife Laodike, for example, was honoured as a wife and complementary partner to her husband, little ideological weight seems to have been placed on her role as a *mother*.[103] A notable anecdote in this regard is the triumphal entry of Apollonis and Eumenes and Attalos (II) into Kyzikos, precisely after the victory at Lypredon in 184/3 that would later inspire the elevation of the Nikephoria festival, in emulation of the legendary filial piety of Kleobis and Biton. The fact that the theme of euergetism directed at the Greeks converges here with an aspiration to present the royal family as a sort of special elite family argues for the prime place it held in the Attalids' conception of their role as benefactors.[104] When a *somatophylax* of Eumenes sought to honour his king at Pergamon, he did so by erecting statues of all his family members, and not just Eumenes himself.[105]

As well as upward familial links, we also find an interest in promoting horizontal familial links, in the civic euergetic activity of royal brothers and foster-friends, *syntrophoi*, some of whom certainly married into the royal family.[106] Again, this is largely unparalleled in the Seleukid period.[107] Eumenes' brothers Athenaios and Philetairos were honoured at

[102] *OGIS* 308 ll. 13-21. Apollonis was also posthumously honoured at Teos, although the motivation section of the decree is lost: *OGIS* 309.
[103] At Teos a fountain was dedicated to Laodike, whose water would supply the marital ablutions for brides: *SEG* 41.1003ii ll. 70-83; at Iasos, Laodike distributed grain towards dowries for daughters of poor women, while newly-weds were to sacrifice to Laodike: *I.Iasos* 4 ll. 15-25, 85-87; for all this, Caneva (2012) 90-91 and (2014) 43-46.
[104] Polyb 22.20.4-8, with Thonemann (2013a) 41-42.
[105] *I.Pergamon* 171-176.
[106] For example, Sosandros the *syntrophos* of Attalos II married the daughter of Attalos' cousin Athenaios: *I.Pergamon* 248 ll. 29-31.
[107] An exception may be the use of the title of 'sister' in relation to Seleukid wives, although this may have served more to convey the impression of parity between husband and wife, than any further sense of an enlarged royal family; cf. Holleaux (1938-1968) 3.180.

Kolophon sometime in the years 180-160, for instance, although the fragmentary state of their decrees precludes any conclusions about the benefactions conferred.[108] Athenaios' decree, slightly better preserved, shows how a royal brother could be honoured together with the royal family, with his statue placed alongside that of his brothers and mother.[109] Moreover, he was accorded the sort of cultic honours which would have been granted to Eumenes himself, in sacrifices and games for the *neoi* and ephebes on his birthday (ll. 11-15).[110] Even more striking, however, is the fact that a foster-friend of Attalos II could receive similar cultic honours. Hailing probably from Apollonia-on-the-Maeander is a decree for an Asklepides son of Theophilos, who had died between 170 and 159 BCE, and was honoured grandly, possibly with a public funeral, and a form of anniversary sacrifices.[111] While much of the text is lost, the opening lines are noteworthy for their near-exclusive focus on the identity of the honorand as a royal foster-friend (ll. 1-8):

> 'Since Asklepides son of Theophilos, a childhood friend of Attalos the brother of the king, has passed away, having provided a great many services, and been worthy of this shared upbringing in comporting himself in a manner that left no cause for reproach, acting at all times with good-order and discipline, and through his goodwill rendering himself visible at all moments, speaking and acting on account of the king…'

Asklepides had clearly done some good for Apollonia deserving of local posthumous honours (l. 4); whether or not these were outlined in detail in the later lost section of the decree, the decision to prioritise his royal connections, in effect presenting his foster-friendship with Attalos II as synonymous with civic honourability, is nevertheless significant. The deployment of *syntrophoi* and royal relatives seems to have been a specific

[108] *SEG* 57.1227, 1228.
[109] *SEG* 56.1227 ll. 1-5, with Gauthier (2006) 480 for lines 3-5.
[110] For cult honours on royal birthdays, Habicht (1970) 148.
[111] *SEG* 49.1540 ll. 27-30, with Thonemann (2003) 99; Kaye and Souza (2013) 99 rightly doubt that Asklepides was also granted intramural burial as later benefactors were.

and necessary feature of the Attalid regime, in its need for trustworthy administrators over a sprawling imperial state drawn from the ruling Pergamene elite. This larger pool of close royal associates may have generated a sense that royal power was more pervasive and omnipresent, and hence contributed to concretising a notion of dual honourability at the local level, framed around service to the city but also king. Thus, at Apollonis an unknown brother of Eumenes, possibly Attalos II, was honoured as the city's founder, thereby carrying out the will of his brother,[112] while the Akrasians praised Menogenes, a relative and *somatophylax* of Eumenes II, for his goodwill 'towards the king and themselves'.[113]

Civic honourability and the royal official

This dual honourability is further traceable when we look beyond royal family-members and foster-friends to honours for Attalid officials more generally: royal beneficence increasingly shaped the honourability of local citizens across the late Attalid realm. A long decree from Apollonia on the Rhyndakos for a Korrhagos son of Aristomachos, of the 160s, illustrates this well.[114] Korrhagos was not a member of the royal court, but a descendant of a local Macedonian family,[115] and had been appointed general of the Hellespontine territories (ll. 3-4). He thus exemplifies an important approach in Attalid governance – namely, the co-optation of local notables as administrators.[116] Korrhagos' achievements were highly consequential for the city, in restoring its laws and political rights (ll. 9-11), furnishing sacrificial bulls, obtaining grain, maintaining property rights, providing for those who lacked property, and obtaining a further two-year extension to an existing three-year tax exemption

[112] *TAM* V.2 1187 ll. 4-6.
[113] *OGIS* 290 ll. 5-6, with restorations of Savalli-Lestrade (1998) 135-137.
[114] *I.Prusa* 1001; for identification of city as Apollonia, Holleaux (1938-1968) 2.114-116.
[115] He is called Macedonian (l. 3: Μακεδών); cf. Thonemann (2013a) 15.
[116] Thonemann (2013a) 5-17.

(ll. 11-20). Notably, however, these were due almost entirely to his ambassadorial intercession with the king (ll. 9: ἠξίωσεν τὸν βασιλέα, 22: ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως); even the provision of grain, and of land to the needy, was done through royal money (ll. 16-17: καὶ τῶι βασιλε[ῖ] μνησθείς, 20: ἐκ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ). The only benefaction which seems to have derived from his own pocket is the provision of bulls and sacrificial rites. While some of these achievements obviously required royal approval, like the grant of the city's constitution, laws and gymnasial oil (recalling Eumenes' letter to Toriaion), others, like grain-provision and property rights, reflect more specifically local concerns. Moreover, the civic exemplary value of Korrhagos' virtues, in his desire to increase the people's interest and usefulness to all citizens, and the decree's claim to display the honour for those who do it good (ll. 4-8, 26-28), are essentially due to his mediation with the king. As the grammar of lines 24-26 implies, Korrhagos' desire to set the people on a prosperous path was in conformity with the king's own euergetic conviction (βουλόμενος εἰς εὐδαιμονίαν καὶ ἐπίδο|σιν καταστῆσαι τοὺς πολίτας, ἀκόλουθα πράσσων τ[ῆι] | τοῦ βασιλέως προαιρέσει·).

All this would suggest the deep reach of the Attalid state, and a highly intrusive mode of euergetic personality. A comparandum here is the Olbasan decree for Sotas from around 138, a local notable who had been appointed governor of the city after his services in the Pisidian war of the 140s.[117] The considerations are mostly lost, although we find a similar entanglement of local services with royal beneficence. Sotas' services during the war, in receiving refugees from the enemy, and providing distributions to the exiled, are similarly described as an expression of goodwill to the king's affairs (ll. 4-11, 10-11: τοῖς τε τοῦ βασι|λέως πράγμασιν εὔνους γενόμενος). Most importantly, however, the Olbasans felt it necessary to ask the king's permission for the honours they proposed for Sotas: '…ambassadors to the king are to be chosen who will deliver the decree to him when they

[117] *SEG* 44.1108, Kearsley (1994a) with Gauthier, *BE* 1997 563 and Savalli-Lestrade (2001) 87-88 for the date (138/137, not 159/158).

arrive, and invite him to approve it' (ll. 18-21). While this procedure is certainly due to Sotas' position as an Attalid city-governor (ll. 26-28),[118] and the fact he was honoured alongside Aristarchos, the regional governor (στρατηγός), it is nonetheless highly unusual: this sort of civic request for royal permission in the granting of *civic* honours is practically unattested in the pre-Apameian era, and indicative of the intrusiveness of Eumenes and his successors in overseeing local honouring processes, or at least of local perceptions that such oversight was necessary. The only other parallels are also Attalid. An Aiginetan decree for its city-governor Kleon records the despatch of the decree to the king,[119] while a fragmentary letter of Eumenes II to Tabai very likely outlines royal approval of the local honours passed for a Koteies who had fought valiantly in the second Galatian war.[120] When earlier Seleukid or Ptolemaic officials were honoured by cities, the decree is typically sent only to the honorand, who is exhorted to maintain future goodwill; royal approval for the honours is never sought.[121] The involvement of the Attalid king, however, is explicable as a function of the much tighter-knit political system of his empire: it is nevertheless remarkable, given that Olbasa and Aigina lay at the edges of Attalid rule.

Closer to Pergamon, royal attention must have been almost inescapable. Even when Kyme, in the reign of Attalos II, sought to adopt the earlier prevailing procedure, and report to the royal courtier Epigonos of Tarentum the honour of *proxenia* they had given him, the ambassadors chosen were those who were sent 'to the king'.[122] For Pamphilos of Adramytteion and Timarchos of Sardeis (dating to 188-168 and c. 155 BCE respectively), two citizens who established careers at the Pergamene court, the king was effectively the

[118] For the office of στρατηγός here as a provincial governorship of the Milyas, Kearsley (1994a) 53-54.
[119] *IG* IV 1 ll. 51-53 (158-144 BCE).
[120] *SEG* 57.1109.
[121] E.g. *IG* XII.6 120 ll. 29-30 (Aristolaos, Ptolemaic offical at Samos, 280-246 BCE), *Amyzon* 16 ll. 4-7 and 17 ll. 1-6 (Nikomedes and an unknown other Seleukid official, c. 200 BCE).
[122] *SEG* 29.1216 ll. 16-18. For the date, see Petzl and Pleket (1979) 76-80.

primary source of the honourability they gained at their own cities.[123] Pamphilos is praised for the high esteem he earned from Eumenes II, Stratonike, and Attalos (II) for his πίστις and μετριότης, while his services to his native city are barely detailed.[124] Timarchos had been royal treasurer (ῥισκοφύλαξ) to Eumenes II, and likewise was well regarded for his loyalty to the king, in his καθαρειότης and μετριότης. He was later appointed the temple-warden of Artemis at his own Sardis by Attalos II.[125] Local honour was thereby in effect the concrete result of a royal administrative act (κατέστησεν), even if the city ultimately re-cast Timarchos' temple-wardenship as an act of patriotism, conforming to his αἵρεσις towards the city (ll. 20-21), and set up the stele in the temple of Artemis as an exhortation to other Sardians (ll. 24-30).

Similarly, we find Attalid notables initiating benefactions after the example of a royal gift. At Apameia, Kephisodoros the gymnasiarch set up statues to Eumenes and Attalos (II) soon after the second Galatian war, possibly for an earlier royal donation.[126] Sometime later, the king again donated 3000 drachmas, comprising a further gift that further stimulated the generosity of Kephisodoros, who then dedicated another unknown amount of money himself towards the Hermaia and Herakleia.[127] Nothing justifies the assumption that Kephidoros was a 'courtisan zelé';[128] he was likely just a local citizen. What is significant here is that royal euergetism had catalysed generosity by local notables, and to this extent Apameia represents a success-story: as the setting for the momentous negotiations that had won Eumenes his empire, the city and its citizens are still found two decades later responding readily to his euergetism by imitating it. There were others like Kephisodoros,

[123] *I.Adramytteion* 17 and *I.Sardis* 4.
[124] *I.Adramytteion* 17 ll. 2-18.
[125] *I.Sardis* 4 ll. 2-17. A dedication made by him to an unnamed hero must be associated with this service: *I.Sardis* 89: ἥρωι ἐπιφανεῖ Τίμαρχος νε[ω]κόρος.
[126] *MAMA* VI 173 ll. 9-11.
[127] *MAMA* VI 173 ll. 11-16, with Robert, *BE* 1993 400 p. 509.
[128] Robert, *BE* 1993 400 p. 509.

like the Andrian gymnasiarch who erected statues and made sacrifices to the Attalid royal family in reciprocation for an Attalid donation to that institution.[129] In contrast, while earlier Seleukid and Ptolemaic kings had also received cultic honour in gymnasia, and even had gymnasia named after them,[130] we rarely hear about the gymnasiarchs who took active steps to nurture their cults. The Attalids' widespread and longstanding interest in sponsoring local gymnasia across their realm (dating to the early 3rd century at Kyzikos),[131] but also beyond it, was therefore a further component to their ideological posturing as benefactors to all Greeks: this was especially so at panhellenic sites like Delphi, to whose gymnasium Attalos II donated a large sum.[132] The zealousness of a Kephisodoros represents the acknowledgement and enactment of their concern to promote the *polis*. Yet this enthusiasm could also be a double-edged sword: when Eumenes fell out of favour with the Romans after Perseus' defeat, it was at Sardeis' gymnasium that Gaius Sulpicius Gallus invited accusations against the king be made.[133] Overall, the intrusive euergetic personality cultivated by the late Attalids as surveyed in the preceding sections thus forms another response, like the Nikephoria, to the volatile geopolitical environment of 188-133, where civic independence, and the need to deal with their increasingly demanding and influential leading citizens, was a major feature of political interaction.

[129] *IG* XII Suppl. 250.
[130] Ptolemaion at Athens: *IG* II^2 1006 l. 19; at Eresos: *IG* XII Suppl. 122 l. 6; Antiocheion at Iasos: *I.Iasos* 93 ll. 22-23, 98 l. 36; cf. Delorme (1960) 121, 123, 146-147.
[131] *OGIS* 748 ll. 15-17 (Philetairos); for later Attalid interventions, Bringmann and Steuben (1995-2000) 2.2 52-61, D'Amore (2006) 170-178, 189, 191, and Wörrle (2007) 504-508 (Pergamon).
[132] *Syll.*^{3} 672.
[133] Polyb. 31.6.1-5. For the Attalids' attitudes to gymnasia as sites of political interaction, Kaye (2012) 40-74.

Civic leaders in the south

Around the time Eumenes set in motion his plans to expand the Nikephoria, the people of Apollonia Salbake, a community in Karia, and hence technically subordinate to Rhodes by the terms of Apameia, honoured Pamphilos. He had obtained advantageous terms for his city at the conference at Apameia, in the presence of Manlius Vulso and the ten Roman delegates, and at a later period travelled to Rhodes to argue for Apollonia's rights in a dispute concerning the indigenous inhabitants of the region, which most likely arose out of the complexities involved in the post-Seleukid transfer of authority over the region to Rhodes; Pamphilos signally confirmed the Apollonians' alliance with the island-state.[134] Yet further embassies, however, were required in subsequent years concerning the public affairs of the city, about which no details are provided (ll. 14-18). Pamphilos' services were not only ambassadorial. At Apollonia he also proposed a law that regulated the administration of public finances after a period of mismanagement and deficit (ll. 18-24).[135] Whether this last activity was related to the political situation addressed by his embassies is not made explicit, although it is unlikely to be coincidence that territorial disputes with neighbouring indigenous peoples, caused by the recent incorporation into the Rhodian sphere, were attended by financial problems within the city.[136]

We are looking at a different world to the late Attalid state. The political landscape south of the Maeander was less clearly structured over much of 188-133. For the first two decades Rhodes ruled Karia and Lykia, but what this meant in administrative practice and, for our purposes, euergetic ideology, is unclear. As Pamphilos' decree makes clear, nominally subject cities could claim to operate outside formal hegemonic subjection, and

[134] *La Carie* 167 ll. 9-14.
[135] Schuler (2005) 396-397.
[136] Wiemer (2002) 253-254.

form ‘alliances’ with the Rhodians.[137] We know that Rhodian rule was perceived by some as harsh – not least by the Lykians, who had to wage two wars over these two decades, and the Kaunians, who revolted in 167.[138] When the liberation of Karia and Lykia was finally proclaimed in 167, it was greeted with joy by the Amyzonians, who dated *stephanephoroi* ‘from the time when the Karians were freed’.[139] The brevity of Rhodian rule means that we know less about how the hegemonic city-state dealt with its subjects at the level of euergetic dialogue. We do not possess, for instance, official correspondence. An interesting sign, however, is evidence for cults of Rhodian gods, like Helios, and even more strikingly, cults of Rhodes and its *demos*, at Hyllarima, Lagina, and Physkos in the Rhodian *peraia*.[140] It would seem that Rhodian power was thus conceptualised in a manner analogous to Rome, as a powerful hegemonic city-state. We find honours for Rhodian officials sent out from Rhodes, like Damokrines, commander of the Karian territories of Karia, at Aphrodisias,[141] and Polykratidas the *epistates*, at Panamara.[142] The examples are few and fragmentarily preserved, but overall seem to indicate that representatives of Rhodian power were honoured primarily in the traditional socialising way as powerful outsiders: so Damokrines was praised for ensuring concord among the Karian communities (ll. 2-8), as well as doing good for Aphrodisias specifically (ll. 9-12); Polykratidas oversaw his garrison in fine fashion, but also resolved judicial suits between citizens, and was pious towards the gods (ll. 7-14).[143] We do not find the same degree of centralising interest in controlling honorific activity or

[137] See also *Amyzon* 23, a fragmentary decree for two ambassadors who travelled also to Rhodes after Apameia, although the outcome is lost (ll. 21-22).
[138] Polyb. 30.5.11-15.
[139] *Amyzon* 51 ll. 1-2: ἀφ’ οὗ | [K]ᾶρες ἠλευθερώθησαν.
[140] Helios at Knidos, Alabanda, Panamara: *I.Knidos* 91 l. 6, *I.Nordkarien* 351 l. 6, *I.Stratonikeia* 48 (all of imperial period); for cults of the people of Rhodes, *I.Nordkarien* 458 l. 11, and possibly at Physkos in the Rhodian *peraia*, *I.Rhod.Per.* 505 l. 3, and Priene, *I.Priene2014* 77 l. 4 (both of the 1st century BCE); at Lagina there was a joint priesthood of Helios and Rhodes, *I.Stratonikeia* 504 l. 5; see Wiemer (2002) 258.
[141] *SEG* 60.1075.
[142] *I.Stratonikeia* 9.
[143] See also *I.Peraia* 357, partly preserving a decree for Xenomenes, a Physkian with pre-existing close ties to Amos, elected by the *sympas demos* as commander of the Coast, Physkos, and Chersonese.

presence of the ruling power in honorific rhetoric as in the Attalid state, so far as can be observed. A measure of the 'normality' of honorific exchange with Rhodes is the existence of honours for Rhodians, some probably powerful landowners, simply as foreign benefactors with *proxenia* and citizenship.[144]

Arguably the main difference in the outlay of euergetic ideology between the Attalid and Rhodian spheres, however, was the predominance of independent political action by civic communities and their leading citizens in the latter, particularly in Karia. Local wars and disputes, which had largely been overshadowed by the larger movements of kings in the 3rd century,[145] become the focus of political activity in the region. In the 180s such a war broke out between Magnesia, allied to Priene, and Miletos, joined with Herakleia under the Latmos, over the territory of Myous in the Maeander Valley, which had been conferred on Miletos at the peace of Apameia.[146] Priene itself would be embroiled in territorial disputes with Miletos, Magnesia, and Samos for much of the 2nd century.[147] Further east the Karian heartland was increasingly dominated by the forces of Mylasa and Alabanda, which actually posed a threat to Rhodian hegemony, so much so that in 167 they attacked Euromos when the Kaunians had revolted with the aid of Kibyra; the Rhodians managed, however, to defend Euromos and repel them.[148] The most summary account of the sort of violence and political disruption that could subsist between local communities in the half-century after Apameia, however, is the decree for Orthagoras of Araxa in Lykia, variously dated from the

[144] *I.Stratonikeia* 5 and 6.
[145] There are exceptions, like Mylasa's expansion after 246, Reger (2010), or the war between Rhodes and Byzantion in the 220s, although this involved greater powers: Polyb. 4.47-53.
[146] Polyb. 21.45.5 with Herrmann (2001) 111; this was the territory between the river Hybandos and Miletos: *Milet* I.3 148, with lines 28-32. For the date of the treaty in the 180s, Errington (1989).
[147] Arbitration by Smyrna between Priene and Miletos in the 180s: *I.Priene2014* 141; Mylasan judgement on a dispute with Magnesia around the mid-century: *I.Magnesia* 93; Rhodian decision on dispute between Samos and Priene: *I.Priene2014* 132, overturned by Rome in 135 and soon after: *I.Priene2014* 134-135.
[148] Polyb. 30.5.11-15.

early to later decades of the 2nd century.[149] Over the nearly 80 lines of the text some eight different conflicts are recounted in which Orthagoras served variously as military officer and ambassador: wars against the ruler Moagetes of Boubon (ll. 8-29), the Kibyrans (ll. 29-36), the tyrants Lysanias and Eudemos (ll. 36-46), the Termessians (ll. 46-49), a dispute with unnamed neighbours of Araxa about the territory called Soasa (ll. 49-54), and a mission to accept the Orloandans into *sympoliteia* with the Lykian League (ll. 54-62).[150] Nor was such inter-city conflict confined only to the freer south and south-west. North of the Maeander, the Klazomenians and Temnians were involved in a bitter conflict concerning shrines and tombs that required the arbitration of Knidos.[151] Other such arguments about territory are attested across the period 188-133 between Erythrai and Hypata, Lampsakos and Parion, and Mytilene and Pitane.[152]

Such endemic conflict called for firm civic leadership and increasingly specialist skills in diplomacy and arbitration. Praise for resolving disputes or assuring positive relations with neighbouring states therefore becomes an ever more prominent feature of Karian honorific decrees, as with Pamphilos of Apollonia Salbake. A fragmentary decree for an honorand from Keramos records that he sealed an alliance with the Rhodians, but further also that he defended his city from false accusations made by the Herakleians.[153] An interesting case is the Mylasan Moschion, who in the decades after 167 settled several cases spanning both public and private legal disputes. He dealt with Herakleia on the Latmos for not only taking unlawful possession of sacred property belonging to Euromos (joined to Mylasa in *sympoliteia*), but also for appropriating the property of a certain Leonteus. He

[149] *SEG* 18.570; for the dating, Kokkinia (2008a) 20 n. 123; Behrwald (2000) 94-99 has argued cogently that the events described likely took place before 167, although this does not exclude that Orthagoras was only honoured after this date.
[150] For all these, see Kokkinia (2008a) 15-23, and especially 20-23.
[151] *SEG* 29.1130bis for the Knidian arbitration; this conflict is likely evoked in the Klazomenians' mid-2nd-century presentation of Zeus with the epithet σωτὴρ ἐπιφανής: Meadows (2018) 304 and (2009) 252-254.
[152] Ager, *Arbitrations* 125 (167-146?), 90 (after 190), 146 (150-133).
[153] *I.Keramos* 6 ll. 13-22.

further travelled to Myndos to deal with the theft of a slave belonging to a Philippos.[154] Negotiating authority was increasingly devolving onto elite experts, who could thereby obtain a regional profile. Also from the period after 167, the dossier of decrees concerning the activities of the priest Leon of Stratonikeia in promoting Zeus Panamaros – through re-copying decrees of *asylia*, advertising the Panamara festival, and resolving disputes about oaths – reveal a network spanning at least three communities: the *koina* of the Panamarians and Laodikeis, Kallipolis, and probably more.[155] As studied by Van Bremen, the activities of Leon reflect aggressive expansionism on the part of Stratonikeia *vis à vis* the Mylasans to the west, and Rhodes to the south.[156] The resolution of disputes relating to oaths would relate to aspects of sacred law around the community that Stratonikeia sought to nurture around the cult of Zeus Panamaros – a community based in part on Karian kinship and solidarity, as the Kallipolitans' decree makes explicit.[157] The identity of the other communities approached by Leon are unknown, but some of these may have impinged on Rhodian territory. We do at least hear that Leon had exposed himself to danger.[158] In any case, Leon's efforts served to create a sub-hegemonic network, based notionally on the horizontal equivalence characteristic of Hellenistic peer-polity interaction, beneath that of the political dominance that had been represented by Rhodes before 167 (and remained the case for its subject mainland territories thereafter).

The interactions described in the paragraphs above concerned those between city-states. Equally, however, civic leaders after 188 had to engage with a hierarchy of hegemonic states, in the Attalids or late Seleukids (even if their communities were not directly subordinate to them) and, of course, Rome. Honours for civic leaders for engaging

[154] *I.Mylasa* 102 ll. 14-27. For the dating of Moschion to roughly 167-133, Van Bremen (2018) 25-26.
[155] *I.Stratonikeia* 7, 1401, 1042. For the other communities, Van Bremen (2004) 235-237.
[156] Van Bremen (2004) 227-235.
[157] Oath-dispute resolution: *I.Stratonikeia* 1401 ll. 12-13 (Kallipolis), 1402 ll. 7-8 (Laodikeis); kinship: *I.Stratonikeia* 1401 l. 28.
[158] *I.Stratonikeia* 7 ll. 10-11, 1401 ll. 15-16, 1402 ll. 9-10.

in such encounters present an index of the way that civic communities argued for their significance on the world stage. In this regard, honours for ambassadors to Rome form a minority before 133, despite the clear enthusiasm for making contact already from 188.[159] Only those who sought to make clear political statements may have felt the need to do so. Kaunos, for instance, honoured Stratios for obtaining the territory of the Telandroi before the Senate, in the years immediately following 167;[160] the city had endured a particularly tense relationship with Rhodes under its hegemony, which continued to play out thereafter in a war over Kalynda, and it was here arguably attempting to validate its radical shift in loyalty.[161] Contact between elite citizens and Rome may have been conceptually problematic and ambiguous in the period 188-133, with the latter not directly ruling territories in the east (at least before 146) but still exercising an overarching hegemony as 'universal' benefactors. This ambiguity seems to underpin the unusual mid-2nd-century Abderite decree for the Teian ambassadors Amymon and Megathumos.[162] While their embassy concerned a dispute over territory between Abdera and the Thracian king Kotys (ll. 5-9), the decree never actually reports the outcome of the dispute (even if the decree's existence strongly suggests the Abderites won). Rather, the bulk of the text is dedicated to describing the Teians' sheer act of having travelled to Rome at all, in confronting their opponents, and attending daily audiences with their senatorial patrons at their atria (ll. 19-27). The point of the decree may well have been simply to express this foreignness, and the bewilderment it generated back home.

[159] E.g. Polyb. 21.18.3; cf. 23.1 (Greece).
[160] *I.Kaunos* 90.
[161] Polyb. 31.4-5. It is notable that two of the three examples of honours for the *demos* of Rome are at Kaunos and Rhodes: *I.Kaunos* 89 and Polyb. 31.4.4. Such honours specifically for the Roman people are unusual (see chapter 2), and may be the result of the uniquely hostile relationship between the two; the third case is from Samos, of the first half of the 2nd century: *IG* XII.6 350.
[162] *Syll.*[3] 656.

A powerful citizen and compliant king: Eirenias of Miletos and Eumenes II

Some civic notables of post-Apameian Karia were honoured, however, for interactions with kings, and in particular the Attalids. One such notable stands out, whose decree reflects the way that civic power could even pose a conceptual and political challenge to royal power: Eirenias of Miletos, who met Eumenes II on several occasions in the 160s BCE.[163] As a leading figure already from the late 3rd century,[164] he had risen to prominence at a period when Miletos was attaining a position of regional supremacy in the Maeander Valley. As the recipient of the territory of Myous at Apameia, the city had concluded treaties of *sympoliteia* with Pidasa in 188/187 and *isopoliteia* with Herakleia under the Latmos in 185/184,[165] and engaged in a war with Magnesia and Priene over land around Myous.[166] Eirenias appears as one of the commissioners in the treaty with Herakleia.[167] Shortly before 167, he met with Eumenes and persuaded him to provide a gift of 160,000 *medimnoi* of grain and timber towards the construction of a gymnasium in the city.[168] While the honorific decree for Eirenias relating this transaction predictably presents him as the main driving force, in 'encouraging the king' (l. 6: προτρεψάμενος αὐτὸν δοῦναι), we should not doubt that Eumenes, too, was quite willing. The beginnings of a decree honouring Eumenes for this benefaction certainly present it as a manifestation both of his desire to enhance the benefactions of his ancestors, and his status as benefactor of the Greeks – this was, of course, consonant with the ideology promulgated through the Nikephoria.[169] A contribution to a gymnasium in a free city would have had important symbolic resonance. There were also

[163] For Eirenias and his career, Herrmann (1965) offers the most detailed summary of the relevant inscriptions.
[164] He is first attested in a late 3rd-century list of contributors: *Milet* I.3 147 l. 88.
[165] *Milet* I.3 149-150.
[166] *Milet* I.3 148.
[167] *Milet* I.3 150 ll. 6, 10.
[168] *Milet* VI.3 1039i ll. 4-8; the grain would be sold to obtain funds: Migeotte (2015) 346.
[169] *Milet* I.9 307 ll. 11-15, 4-5. For the identity of this decree with Eumenes' first benefaction, Herrmann (1965) 111-112, on the basis that lines 17-18 (τά τε ὑπὸ Εἰρ[η]νίου ἐμφανισθέντα αὐτῶι) relate to Eirenias' spoken encouragement at the first embassy.

probably legitimate fiscal reasons, in the need to off-load large quantities of grain to avert the lowering of tax-rates.[170]

It is likely, therefore, that the interests of Eumenes and Miletos converged in this instance. The size of the gift, 160,000 *medimnoi*, approximates to the 280,000 *medimnoi* that Eumenes would send to Rhodes for the salaries of its gymnasium-instructors in 161/160,[171] and thus implicitly recognised the political status of the city as a regional power. The aftermath to this initial promise of grain, however, reveals the bargaining power that the Milesians clearly felt they could impose. In response to this first promise of grain, they decreed honours (probably those outlined in the lost section of *Milet* I.9 307), and sent out Eirenias again, this time to encourage Eumenes to enlarge his promised grain, and even to cover the costs of his honours.[172] It is clear that this manoeuvre relied on Eirenias' personal standing as an elite citizen, and arguably represents a new stage in king-city relations in Hellenistic Asia Minor. One should note the remarkable status implied by the way Eirenias had in the first instance 'met' the king in accordance with the permission granted him (ἐντυχὼν δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖ Εὐμένει κατὰ τὴν δο|θεῖσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους αὐτῶι συγχώρησιν): the fact he was granted 'permission' (συγχώρησις) suggests that the whole encounter from the get-go may have been in large part orchestrated by Eirenias alone.[173] The level of influence implied here may account for the remarkable request to Eumenes to pay for his own honours, revealing the 'proleptic' character of these honours, by which the future benefaction of more grain would be assured.[174] The resulting imbalance in the euergetic dynamics may be sensed in the odd situation that resulted, that in paying for his honours Eumenes 'made clear the gratitude of the people towards its benefactors' (ll. 12-13).

[170] Thonemann (2013a) 26-27.
[171] Polyb. 31.31.1-2.
[172] *Milet* VI.3 1039i ll. 8-15.
[173] *Milet* VI.3 1039i ll. 4-5. Hermann (1965) 78 interprets it as a writ of plenipotentiary power, 'Ermächtigung'.
[174] Domingo-Gygax (2009) 176.

Through a slightly perverse logic, Eirenias had prevailed on Eumenes to make a benefactor of himself. Significantly, Seleukid kings are never invited to pay for their own honours.[175]

Nor was this the end of the Milesians' demands. The gymnasium works extended up to a decade after the initial grant, and even after Eumenes' death in 159. Around that moment the city decreed further honours for him, in a priesthood of the divine Eumenes, and grain-distribution on his birthday.[176] On both occasions, the then-king Attalos II was to be met by embassies inviting him to cover costs for these honours and continue in the beneficent attitude of his brother. Eirenias played leading roles in both decrees.[177] It is further striking that the Milesians re-deployed core aspects of the Attalids' own euergetic ideology to generate pressure. In their first decree honouring Eumenes he is socialised as a 'kinsman and friend', in a collocation that simultaneously adopts the language of inter-city kinship and royal *philia*; the kinship alludes to Miletos' *syggeneia* with Kyzikos, the home city of Apollonis, Eumenes' mother. The specificity of this relationship undoubtedly drew on the core role of the royal family in late Attalid euergetic ideology. Similarly, the later resolution of Eumenes' birthday honours is communicated not only to the then-king Attalos II, but also to his brother Athenaios and son Attalos III.[178] This argument of kinship seems to have been exploited to an even greater extent, as a letter of Eumenes to the *koinon* of the Ionians from the year 167/166 shows.[179] The *koinon* had decreed honours (an *aristeios* crown and a statue) for the king, in which it reproduced his claim to be a benefactor to the Greeks in defending them from the barbarians and looking after their cities (ll. 7-13). The context is the eve of his war against the Galatians.[180] While there is no mention in the *koinon*'s decree of the

[175] In fact, the only king attested doing so is Eumenes II: here, for the honours of the Ionian *koinon* (see below), and at Delphi in 159: *F.Delphes* III.3 239 ll. 11-12; cf. Gauthier (2000) 61-62.
[176] *Milet* VI.3 1040, *I.Didyma* 488.
[177] He was ambassador to Attalos in the priesthood decree (*Milet* VI.3 1040 ll. 10-17), and one of the two men charged with creating a foundation for grain-supply out of the interest gained from loans to merchants from the donation of Eumenes (*I.Didyma* 488 ll. 15-36); for the latter procedure, Migeotte (2015) 349-351.
[178] *I.Didyma* 488 ll. 38-41.
[179] *OGIS* 763.
[180] Holleaux (1938-1968) 2.153-159.

transactions between Eumenes and Miletos conducted only a short time before, it is unlikely that this did not play some role in adding to the pressure placed on the king, as we find, yet again, Eirenias as the ambassador here (ll. 3-4). It is this pressure that arguably compelled him, in a replay of Eirenias' second embassy to Eumenes, to assume the costs for the statue decreed, and even to provide money for a day consecrated to him during the Panionia (ll. 48-60). Moreover, he instructs that the statue be set up in his cult-temple at Miletos, precisely on the basis of the shared kinship through Kyzikos (ll. 59-68).[181]

This apparent interweaving of the interests of Miletos and the Ionian *koinon* may mask, for all we know, tensions within the *koinon*. Ionia's cities may have been in competition over the right to serve as the locale for Eumenes' statue, and Eirenias' already proven influence with the king may have provided the trump card in earning Miletos this particular privilege. At any rate, the involvement of the *koinon* at all is striking, and reflective of Eirenias' regional influence, parallel to Leon of Stratonikeia's creation of a Karian network around Panamara. The pressure of a decree passed by the *koinon*, itself formed on the basis of shared Ionian kinship, would only have magnified the claims to kinship relations with the king, whatever the reality of tensions within the *koinon*. The point, then, is that Eirenias' activities reflect the increasingly large influence that civic leaders, especially of powerful states like Miletos, could have on even royal hegemons – the exchange of honours by Eumenes with further benefactions, and his multiple offers to cover the costs of these honours, form ritualised but still potent exchanges between a city seeking to exert itself, and a monarch who could not afford to back down. These interactions were also embedded in the cellular administrative mechanisms of Attalid governance, where local power depended heavily on royal command. The very form of Eumenes' initial gift of grain represents a magnified version of the sort of dynamics seen earlier at Apollonia on the

[181] Note that the Ionians further addressed the Attalid family-unit as a whole, greeting Eumenes but also his relatives (ll. 30-31).

Rhyndakos with the governor Korrhagos, roughly contemporary to Eirenias' manoeuvres. While there the king had provided resources from royal territory to sponsor a subject city, in this case he was doing the same to a non-subject city, most likely by conveying grain and timber from royal storehouses close to Milesian territory. In both cases local notables appealed to royal authority. Whereas Korrhagos belonged to a subject city, however, there was obviously less control with a free city like Miletos, and the obligation to provide benefactions can only have increased as such cities, and their notables, increased in political clout, and their pressure-creating power, in the post-Apameian period. The result in the Milesian symbolic sphere was a conceptual parity: it is a striking feature of the archaeology of Eirenias' own honours, a statue, that this monument was closely comparable in physical stature to the columnal statue of Eumenes himself.[182] The most remarkable aspect of Eirenias' career, however, is that this sort of influence over kings was not limited to the Attalids. He was also close to the sister or wife of Antiochos IV, and even obtained the significant privilege of tax-immunity for Milesian goods from the Seleukid king.[183] Yet Eirenias' Seleukid connections form in themselves only part of a broader story of Milesian attachment to Antioch in the 2nd century, traceable through the prosopographical study of a number of other leading Milesians who pursued careers as Seleukid courtiers, like Apollonios son of Menestheus, courtier of Seleukos IV and even *strategos* of Koile Syria and Phoenicia, or Antigonos the navarch of Alexandros Balas.[184] Some returned to Miletos to engage in local games of honour, empowered by their connections with powerful kings. When the brothers Timarchos and Herakleides – who attained extremely prominent positions at the Seleukid court – dedicated their *bouleuterion* as a gift to Apollo and the city,

[182] Hermann (1965) 72: the diameter of the base on which Eirenias' decree (*Milet* VI.3 1039) was inscribed measures almost a metre longer than the monument for Eumenes II featuring the decree of the Ionian *koinon* (2.65m to 1.74m).
[183] *Milet* VI.3 1039ii ll. 1-7; for the king as Antiochos IV, Hermann (1965) 83.
[184] Herrmann (1987) for Milesians at the 2nd-century Seleukid court, and 175-189 for Apollonios and Antigonos in particular.

they were keen also to emphasise that it was made ὑπὲρ βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου Ἐπιφανοῦς – in much the same way that the gymnasium will have embodied the continuing goodwill between Miletos and Eumenes.[185]

A crisis of Attalid euergetic confidence, 166-133 BCE

The year 167 must have been an *annus horribilis* for Eumenes II. Faced with a growing Galatian threat to the east (instigated in part by Rome), he had travelled to Italy to ask the Senate for help, only to be rejected at Brundisium: a large part of this was due to the Senate's suspicion of him after learning of his collusion with Perseus. Now triumphant over the last Antigonid ruler, Rome was no more a friend of Eumenes, who was forced to return to Asia, dejected, where the Galatian threat was still to be faced.[186] Part of this anxiety must account for the unusually compliant tone of his letter to the Ionians in response to the ambassadors he met at Delos in 167/166.[187] It reads essentially as a reproduction, in the first person, of the Ionians' decree;[188] lines 23-29 even recount the hortatory and honouring clauses of the decree. After accepting his honours and promising to do good for the future, Eumenes continues – 'may affairs pass as I wish; for so you will gain an impression of my attitude towards you from deeds themselves' (ll. 47-50). It may be in sympathy with this new position of weakness that the Ionians proclaimed Eumenes the 'common benefactor of the Greeks' (ll. 7-8), thereby harnessing the Attalid self-presentation as benefactors to the Greeks to the universality implied by the Romans' title of 'common benefactors'.[189] This is

[185] *Milet* I.2 1-2; for Timarchos and Herakleides, Herrmann (1987) 171-173.
[186] For the breakdown in friendship, Burton (2011) 292-299.
[187] For the rebuff at Brundisium, and the dating of the letter to his return journey to Pergamon, Polyb. 29.6.4, 30.19.1-15 with Holleaux (1938-1968) 2.161-169.
[188] *OGIS* 763 ll. 5-37.
[189] Robert (1969) 59 and Ferrary (1988) 129 n. 290. Polyb. 31.6.6 records that the Greek grew more sympathetic to Eumenes after his humiliation by Rome.

far from the confident tone in his letter to the Toriaians in 188, where Eumenes could openly justify his concession as a rightful reciprocation of their previous goodwill to him.[190] At Delos in 167, Eumenes could not be so sure of living up to expectations.

He nevertheless did defeat the Galatians,[191] and the Attalid dynasty soldiered on for another two and a half decades after his decease in 159. The period from 166 to 133 may nonetheless be said to mark a further stage in the balance of euergetic power, so to speak, between the kings and cities, both subject and free. In brief, cities became more confident, and their elite citizens bolder. Where Eirenias and Eumenes had pursued fairly peaceful relations, the small neighbour of Miletos, Priene, actually entered into a dispute with Attalos II, although the details thereof are unknown. It endured a war against both him and the Kappadokian king Ariarathes V in the 150s after pledging to safeguard the money entrusted to it by Orophernes, Ariarathes' brother and rival.[192] It is probably Orophernes who felt sufficiently compelled to court the Prienians that he gifted them a statue of the people, as a fragmentary letter records.[193] Moreover, Priene recovered soon after, precisely through its elite citizens: its leading figure Moschion son of Kydimos, like Eirenias of Miletos, represented the city before rulers across the eastern Mediterranean, travelling to both Demetrios I and II, the Ptolemaic court, and even Nabataean Petra.[194] His contemporary Heroides maintained Priene's links with the Ariarathid court, which by 112 BCE could be described as a relationship characterised by 'ancestral goodwill'.[195]

The wide range of these contacts is evidence of the growing versatility of such elite diplomats, but also of confidence, as cities increasingly chose who they wanted their

[190] *SEG* 47.1745 ll. 24-26.
[191] For the campaign, Mitchell (1993) 1.25-26.
[192] Polyb. 33.6.1-9.
[193] *I.Priene2014* 10 ll. 9-10; this was possibly in connection with the war of the 150s, after mention of those who had fought with the unknown ruler (l. 7: τῶν συγκεκινδυνευκότων).
[194] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 152-159, 163-174.
[195] *I.Priene2014* 65 ll. 103-107, 171-175.

benefactors to be. A notable aspect of the diplomatic activities of Apollonios of Metropolis in the 150s and 140s is the relatively minor role of the Attalid king in the civic self-presentation recorded in his early decree dating to 145/144.[196] This is significant, because Metropolis was a subject city.[197] He was involved in major issues concerning the city's autonomy, in disputes with neighbouring communities over land (ll. 14-18), and over the unjust impositions of additional taxes by tax-farmers (ll. 18-23), but on both occasions the precise details, let alone the identity of the adjudicators and disputants before and with whom Apollonios had to negotiate, are unmentioned. Instead, we only read of the self-sacrificing ambassador, who never placed his own interests before that of the community (ll. 15-17, 21-22), and, seemingly single-handedly, 'guarded the affairs of the people without incurring any loss', and 'preserved the pre-existing tax concession' (ll. 18, 23). This obscurity of the identity of those he met was a conscious rhetorical choice, because the decree does actually mention in passing that Apollonios went as ambassador to 'the kings and others' (ll. 12-13): nevertheless, none of the kings or officials (presumably referred to by the 'others') are named, and there is no phrase hinting at royal beneficence.[198] This may simply reflect the reality that Apollonios was a mere citizen, and not an Attalid official like Korrhagos or Sotas, whose honours did make specific mention of the role of royal goodwill. Yet compared even to Kephisodoros of Apameia in the 160s, also a citizen of a subject city, Apollonios appears as a grudgingly free-willed freedom-fighter. In the one instance where a royal gift is involved, of an annual donation of 500 drachmas each for oil-provision and the lessons of the free boys (ll. 23-26), this is described as having been obtained 'from the king through his (Apollonios') own persistence' (ll. 23-24). That is, we are looking at a leading citizen of

[196] *I.Metropolis* 1b.
[197] The decree is dated by the reign of Attalos II: *I.Metropolis* 1b ll. 1-2.
[198] Jones (2004) 372 emphasises that Apollonios can only have had recourse to royal authority in these instances.

an Attalid subject city behaving with airs similar to those of Eirenias of Miletos several decades earlier.

If this does indeed suggest the growing confidence of civic communities *vis à vis* the Attalid kings, and the crucial role that civic honours played in encouraging this, we cannot tell how widespread this was in the specific period 166 to 133. It is noteworthy that several military *katoikiai* in Lydia and Mysia start to present themselves publicly through honours for local worthies around these years, and into the 150s.[199] Yet we should be wary of equating honorific activity with greater civic independence or even anti-royal feeling, because it is precisely from these Lydian and Mysian settlements, many occupied by Macedonian settlers,[200] that the royal pretender Aristonikos would receive the most support in 133-129.[201] Indeed, the presence of intimates of the Attalid court among the honorands may suggest that honorific activity here was meant to bolster loyalism to the ruling house.[202] This cluster of honours is nonetheless part of a broader phenomenon of heightening civic and elite identity. The most remarkable text from this Lydian context is a decree for Apollonios, Attalid *epistates* of Akrasa or Stratonikeia-on-the-Kaikos, who had been *agonothetes* of the Basileia, and contributed to the civic life of that community in receiving *theoroi* and foreign visitors, and donating sacrificial vessels.[203] Other powerful notables continued to gain influence and status within the royal framework in the period 166-133.

[199] *TAM* V.2 1307 (Macedonians at Agatheira, Seleukos, sometime in 188-158), *OGIS* 290 with Savalli-Lestrade (1998) 135-137 (Macedonians at Akrasos, Menogenes, reign of Eumenes II), *TAM* V.3 1423 (Macedonians of Kobdyle, Philo[---] son of Polemaios, 163/162), *TAM* V.2 1188 (Macedonians of Doidye, unknown, 161/160), 1189 (settlement near Apollonis, Herodes, 159/158), 1190 (Macedonians at [---]espoura, Derdas the general, 153/152), *SEG* 40.1062 (Mysians at Emoddi, son of Hegesias, 171/170 or 163-161); see also *SEG* 43.879 (Mysian village Daphnous near Apollonia on Rhyndakos, for Polemaios and Zenon, (royal?) bodyguards, 2nd century BCE).
[200] Mitchell (2018) 18-21.
[201] Daubner (2006) 162-170.
[202] See above for the unknown brother of Eumenes who founded Apollonis and Menogenes the *somatophylax* of Eumenes II (*TAM* V.2 1187 ll. 4-6, *OGIS* 290 ll. 5); note that the Akrasians' honour for Menogenes was actually found at Pergamon: *I.Pergamon* 176a p. 504. The honorific monument for Derdas the general by the Macedonians at [---]espoura praises him for his virtue and courage demonstrated towards the king and themselves: *TAM* V.2 1190 ll. 6-9.
[203] *OGIS* 268, either of 160 or 139 BCE: see Savalli-Lestrade (1996) 154-155 n. 19.

The late Attalid patronage of the Dionysiac *technitai*, for instance, reveals royal authority over an association of wealthy and highly skilled elites: the most notable figure in the post-Apameian period is Kraton of Chalkedon, whose career comprised a gradual ascent from leader of the Ionian *technitai* to leading member, and possibly founder, of the *Attalistai*, a sub-association of the *technitai* specifically trained to honour the Attalid house (named after Attalos I or II), over the period c. 180 to the 140.[204] The remarkable feature of his career is his wealth and influence. Kraton even served as ambassador to L. Mummius in 146 on behalf of the *technitai* overall, and at his death bequeathed the large sum of 10,500 drachmas to the *Attalistai*, alongside his house and other equipment, for its activities.[205] Yet his career-trajectory also shows a steady gravitation towards the Pergamene centre, so that the patronage of Attalos II made it necessary for him to settle there and obtain Pergamene citizenship and property.[206]

The archetypal case for considering the way in which elite power may have cohered with royal euergetic ideology must, however, be Pergamon itself. An important feature of its public epigraphy throughout the post-Apameian period is that it largely follows the trend of pre-Apameian Pergamon: elite citizens barely receive public recognition in the form of civic honours, or only did so where they had clear connections to the king.[207] The main category is thus composed of honours for royal *philoi* and *syntrophoi*, for whom a few statue-bases survive.[208] Yet even here, one may discern a subtle development in honorific profile in the post-166 period. A key document here is the fragment of a decree for a

[204] For Kraton, see now Le Guen (2007).
[205] Ambassador to L. Mummius: *SEG* 32.491; Kraton's will: *CIG* 3069.
[206] In an earlier decree of 180-170, Kraton is still Chalkedonian; by the mid-century, he is Pergamene: *CIG* 3068b ll. 1-12, c l. 2; Le Guen (2007) 253-260 argues cogently that the property described in *CIG* 3069 ll. 20-28 was located at Pergamon.
[207] The only case in the 3rd century is *I.Pergamon* 18 for *strategoi* appointed by Eumenes I, their appointment likely being an unusual departure from the norm: Müller (2003) 426-431.
[208] *I.Pergamon* 179 (Apollonides son of Theophilos, *syntrophos* of Eumenes II), probably related to 166 (fragmentary honours for a Theoph[---] in the first Galatian war) and *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 316 n. 41 (son of Apollonides, mid-2nd BCE); *MDAI(A)* 29 (1904) 173 n. 16 (*syntrophos*(?) of Attalos II); *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 242 n. 2 is a possible case (fragmentary honours for a [---]os son of Athe[---], although note καταστα θείς l. 3).

syntrophos of the king,[209] most plausibly identified with Andronikos, known from Polybios as ambassador on behalf of the king to the Senate in 156 and 151/150; the decree would date soon after this second embassy.[210] While the second half of the considerations are lost, the remarkable feature of its surviving beginning portion is the close interweaving of royal and civic exemplarity, and indeed the implied primacy of the latter, in the presentation of Andronikos' career. While we learn that he had attained a privileged place (προεδρία) and honour within the royal circle (ll. 7-8), and was irreproachable in his courtly conduct (ἀμεμψιμοίρητος),[211] emphasis is placed on his παιδεία, which brought him repute among other citizens (ll. 6-7), and the way that he had made Pergamon superior to other cities for the quality of its administration through his παρρησία, frankness of speech (ll. 9-12). Noteworthy here are two ideas: that Pergamon regarded itself not as a special 'royal' city, but rather merely as one among a concert of other peer-polities, and that this was due to an exemplary citizen who strove 'as far as he was capable', ὅσον ἐφ' ἑαυτῶι,[212] and not because of any special royal authority or writ. It is striking that while παρρησία is mentioned, a quality particularly prized in the post-Attalid democracy,[213] other more predictably 'courtly' qualities, like the μετριότης or πίστις for which Pamphilos of Adramyttion or Timarchos of Sardeis were praised, are absent. It is Andronikos' civic persona that arguably serves as the conceptual backdrop to his embassy to Rome denouncing the impiety of Attalos II's enemies (i.e. Prusias II) and renewing the friendship of the Romans, which perhaps formed the main event for which the honours were actually passed (ll. 17-22). While this embassy did therefore form a service to royal goodwill, it is remarkable how it is qualified as having been

[209] *OGIS* 323.
[210] Polyb. 32.16.1 (on Prusias II's attacks on Pergamon), App. *Mith.* 9 (to obtain war reparations from Prusias II); for Andronikos and *OGIS* 323, Savalli-Lestrade (1996) 158-166.
[211] Compare *SEG* 49.1540 l. 5 for Asklepides of Apollonia.
[212] *Pace* Bielfeldt (2010) 148, this phrase should refer to the limits of Andronikos' exertions, as Savalli-Lestrade (1996) 159 reads it, and not the political limits implied by royal control, i.e. 'as much as was possible'; this meaning is implied by the comparison to the other cities in the following clause.
[213] E.g. *SEG* 50.1211 ll. 18-21.

performed 'on behalf of our common interests' (l. 18: ὑπὲρ τῶ[ν] κοι[νῆ συ]νφερ[όν]τωϲ); that is, the interests of the city and king were regarded virtually as interchangeable. The major reason for this, of course, is that Rome stood above both: this made Andronikos' ambassadorial role as intermediary between king and city alike all the more praiseworthy.

The story of Pergamene political culture under Attalos II and III is thus traceable through an increasingly confident rhetoric highlighting the authoritativeness of the civic community as a whole, but also and more importantly of its leading citizens, who served as conduits between both, and to Rome. A striking indication of the shifting balance is the existence of two statue-bases set up by Attalos II himself for two courtiers – Philopoimen, indeed the son of Andronikos the ambassador, as his general and seal-bearer, and a certain Euakes, at Samos and Tenos respectively, reflecting the importance placed on such intermediary figures not only by cities, but the king as well.[214] After Andronikos, we start to find more honours for citizens who were not necessarily royal courtiers – Metris, the priestess of Athena who held the ninth Nikephoria,[215] and under Attalos III even honours for two gymnasiarchs, Agias and Me[---], who were praised for setting up statues of the king. Remarkably, Me[---]'s statue was intended as a gift for the *people*, and not the king *per se*, indicating that the public circulation of honour now well and truly transcended the control of the king.[216] The most notable aspect of Attalos III's reign, however, is that we find for the first time civic honours for the king himself, in a decree outlining the grant of statues, a commemorative procession and sacrifices, and a procession of welcome led by the city's population, on the occasion of an unknown military victory.[217] The location of the two

[214] *IG* XII.6 469 and *IG* XII.2 639. For Philopoimen, see Savalli-Lestrade (1996) 166-168.
[215] *I.Pergamon* 167 (149/148 BCE).
[216] *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 379 n. 2 ll. 27-30, *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 375 n. 1 ll. 18-23. The following are possible citizen honours, although whether in the royal or post-royal period is uncertain: *MDAI(A)* 27 (1902) 103 n. 104 (Apollodoros son of Metrodoros), *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 340 n. 74 (Demarchos, late 2nd BCE); *I.Pergamon* 162 (fragmentary decree for Herakleides).
[217] *OGIS* 332.

statues conferred on Attalos in the Asklepieion and agora, and the route of the former procession from the *prytaneion* to the Asklepieion (ll. 7-10, 14-17) reveal strong civic control of the ideology of military victory – traditionally a royal prerogative. Moreover, the king is presented almost in the terms of a normal 'civic' benefactor, and met by a series of ritualised gestures that self-consciously projected the capacity of the city to impose honorific pressure on its ruler: at the end of the welcome procession, Attalos is invited to the *prytaneion* to share in the sacrificial meat that had been offered precisely on his own behalf (!), and is even granted a copy of the decree and invited to remain a benefactor to the city. Significantly, this is all towards the betterment of 'the common affairs of the polity' (l. 56: τὰ κοινὰ τοῦ πολ̣[ι]τεύματος), thereby highlighting the extent to which the king's power was now regarded as being integral to the broader civic community, and not only existing outside of it.[218]

Whether this change in honorific dynamics replicated itself in substantive political action, and even served as a source of hostility between king and city, is difficult to tell. Anecdotes about the cruelty of Attalos III to his courtiers, nevertheless, hint in this direction.[219] It is further instructive to consider the tone of some inscribed correspondence of Attalos II and III. In the letter of Attalos II to Olbasa approving Aristarchos and Sotas' honours (of 138 BCE), for instance, we find little concession to the reciprocal character of the exchange in any indication that, for example, Attalos' response was a requital for the 'good deed' of the city in proposing the honours. Instead, we only read a curt reply: '…you ask me to grant you permission (to honour Aristarchos and Sotas); as we deem them worthy, put into action the decrees which you have related to me'.[220] This contrasts somewhat with

[218] For these points, Chin (2018) 125-130, and now Caneva (2018) on the concern to demonstrate civic administrative procedure.
[219] Diod. Sic. 34.3.
[220] *SEG* 44.1108 ll. 28-30. For the cold tone, Virgilio (2013) 206-207, and 205-206 for a comparandum in Attalos II's correspondence with Amlada (*OGIS* 751, Swoboda-Keil-Knoll, *Denkmäler aus Lycaonien* etc. 75), where Attalos speaks in commanding tones in granting them relief from their payment obligations, without

the layered politesse of Eumenes' letter to Tabai concerning the honours for Koteies, where he says that he would not need (γράφειμ…οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον ἡγούμην) to recount how Koteies 'had demonstrated goodwill and eagerness in all his public offices, comporting himself in an unhesitating and diligent way, and how he had always made many speeches in relation to his fatherland with zeal'.[221]

The difference in tone may not simply be a matter of differing circumstances (in both situations, after all, the king approved honours for services in a recent war). Some corroboration for a genuine slant towards the adoption of a more commanding, and less concessive, tone in the 130s can be found in Attalos III's letters to Kyzikos and Pergamon concerning the honours he conferred on his relative Athenaios, dating to 135 BCE.[222] In the Kyzikene missive we read a slightly haughty and paternalistic account of Athenaios' qualities and suitability for his role as priest of Dionysios Kathegemon, based primarily on his familial connection to Attalos III (as the grandson of a cousin of Attalos II), his dutifulness to the royal family, and the fact that his appointment was approved by both him and Attalos II (ll. 26-40) – this last fact is mentioned twice (ll. 32-33, 38-39). There is no indication of civic agency, or that this was a response to a Kyzikene proposal to honour Athenaios, for example, even though Kyzikos was technically a free city.[223] In fact, the point of the exchange was not even about honouring Athenaios, but simply to convey to Kyzikos the knowledge of his appointment and royal favour, as reflected in the royal edicts (προστάγματα) which were attached (ll. 40-43). This oddly uneuergetic character is matched by a slightly earlier letter to Pergamon, in which Attalos similarly instructs the city to inscribe (κρίνομεν…ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς νόμοις φέρεσθαι παρ' ὑμῖν) the edicts (προστάγματα)

concession to euergetic politesse (*OGIS* 751 ll. 12-13, 15 [ἐπι]τέταχα ἀφελεῖν, ἀπέλυσα); there are however mitigating circumstances (Amlada had fought against the Attalids in the second Galatian war, ll. 5-6), while the second letter is incompletely preserved.

[221] *SEG* 57.1109 ll. 4-11.

[222] *I.Pergamon* 248.

[223] Since 188: Bikerman (1937) 236, Polyb. 25.2.13.

outlining his appointment of Athenaios as priest of Zeus Sabazios (ll. 57-60) – again, this is the only purpose of his message, after a disquisition on the importance of Sabazios, a not especially Pergamene god, to the royal family (ll. 45-53). The aim of these letters, then, seems to have been to display, in its raw fulness, the authority of the king: the overt mention of edicts is highly unusual in Attalid correspondence.[224] Euergetic convention is practically absent here, or only focussed on the narrow reciprocity between Attalos and Athenaios. This arguably reflects a conscious response to the challenge of honorific pressure increasingly posed by the Attalids' interactions with cities and their elites, both free and subject – an attempt to reset the language of power on terms favourable only to the king.[225] That this was only a tone adopted in the reign of the last Attalid king must reflect growing weakness and anxiety, and not strength or self-assuredness.

From king to citizens

This chapter has examined how the recession of Seleukid power after the peace of Apameia affected dynamics of public honourability, as manifested primarily in the interactions between the Attalids and civic communities. Two main features should be noted in conclusion. The first is that the way in which Eumenes and his successors engaged euergetically with cities must be subtly distinguished from the approach taken by their Seleukid predecessors. Labouring under the obligation to reciprocate Rome's gift of territory in 188, they had to maintain the image of being benefactors of the Greeks and their freedoms. The result can be seen in the ideology of the Nikephoria, but also in the way that royal beneficence came to suffuse local honourability, as civic decrees for royal relatives,

[224] As noted by Virgilio (2013) 211-215, and especially 215.
[225] I have argued elsewhere that these letters bear some relation to the Pergamenes' honorific decree for Attalos III (*OGIS* 332): Chin (2018) 133-134.

governors (Korrhagos, Sotas) or courtiers (Timarchos, Pamphilos) increasingly emphasised the honorand's service to royal goodwill, on top of, and sometimes in lieu of, that to the local community. The inclusion of the king as a sort of third party in civic honorific transactions was of course already a longstanding component of Hellenistic royal euergetism and its tendency to integrate royal and civic discourse.[226] It may be said, however, that the Attalid state was particularly good at doing so, and further intensified this practice, as seen especially in the phenomenon of royal approval for local honours at Olbasa, Tabai, and Aigina. The extent to which royal officials, for instance, were socialised into local honorific systems, and presented as 'normal' foreign benefactors, such as had been the case with Seleukid governors,[227] was arguably lessened by the penetrative character of Attalid ideology: where Seleukid city-governors like Menestratos of Phokaia or Chionis of Alinda could be presented simply as foreign benefactors whose actions primarily served the people,[228] for a Korrhagos or Sotas there was greater pressure to mention that such actions also demonstrated goodwill to the king. On the one hand, this was simply a result of the geopolitics of the Attalid state, different in scale to the sprawling Seleukid empire, and therefore requiring less administrative stratification; Menestratos and Chionis' embassies were not to Antiochos III, but only to Zeuxis the governor-general.[229] On the other hand, however, administrative hierarchy did not completely disappear, as the continued existence of regional governorships, and some other Seleukid-era posts, show.[230] The pattern of our evidence for Attalid royal correspondence, heavily skewed towards direct royal communication with cities – as opposed to the Seleukid period, where there is more evidence of hierarchical relaying through governors – may therefore reflect a conscious choice on the

[226] Ma (2002) 230-232, and especially 231 n. 151 for examples.
[227] Ma (2002) 206-211.
[228] *Amyzon* 15, 14.
[229] *Amyzon* 15 l. 10, *Amyzon* 14 l. 7.
[230] Most prominently, the *archiereus*, attested in the petition of a priest of Apollo Pleurenos (c. 188): *SEG* 46.1519, with Ma (2002) 248 and Thonemann (2013a) 8-9.

part of the kings, as a way to fulfil their role as benefactors to the cities, as much as an administrative reality.[231]

A second issue surrounding Attalid euergetism, then, is the extent to which this avowed concern with cities served to abet the confidence of the cities, many of which already enjoyed an unprecedented degree of autonomy in the post-Apameian period. Some answer to this can be discerned in the finely crafted and deeply localising Attic-standard silver coinage minted by numerous cities on the western coast in the period 170-140, whose iconography reveals a quite new attachment to local cultic identity, and whose suddenness and distribution should be explained, in many cases, as the result of Attalid military expenditure, or special fiscal contributions.[232] Here, local pride, as manifested in the iconography of these types, was generated by Attalid power. Can a similar scenario be envisaged for the rise of civic leaders, in figures like Eirenias and Apollonios? The search for Attalid influence here may be misleading, since the phenomenon should be seen, as has been emphasised here, against a backdrop of rising civic confidence across the region, and especially in non-Attalid Karia and Lykia (cf. Pamphilos of Apollonia, Leon of Stratonikeia, Orthagoras of Araxa). The question has equal validity when posed in the reverse, as to whether Attalid euergetic ideology owed anything to civic models: it certainly did, and, as the form of the Nikephoria, or the promotion of the royal family and intimates (*syntrophoi* and relatives) as civic benefactors reveal, seems to have resulted in a 'horizontal' integration of royal power largely unprecedented by the more hierarchical, stratified ideological structure of the Seleukids. Direct contact between kings and citizens, a far more realistic possibility in the post- than pre-Apameian world, must have nevertheless served to reshape

[231] Virgilio (2013) 210-211 and Thonemann (2013a) 12-13; the only letter to an Attalid official is Eumenes II to Artemidoros concerning the Kardakoi: Segre (1938a).
[232] For this coinage, Le Rider (2001) and Thonemann (2015) 56-65; for the iconography, Meadows (2018). The military explanation for its emergence (primarily Attalid support for Seleukid pretenders in the 150s) is argued for by De Callataÿ (2013) 233-236, Psoma (2013) 275-294, Kinns (1987) 106-107; the fiscal argument, Lorber and Hoover (2003) 62-63.

the balance of euergetic authority. It gave courtiers like Timarchos, but also politicians like Eirenias or Kephisodoros, greater political stature at home, while minimising the conceptual distance between kings and citizens, as the honorific presentation of Eirenias as the cajoler of Eumenes II and recipient of a statue comparable in monumental scale to the king's, or the Pergamene honours for Attalos III, suggest. This movement towards status-equalisation was new. In the Seleukid 3rd century civic leaders had certainly abounded, like Boulagoras of Samos (c. 242) or Polykritos of Erythrai.[233] Yet while they may have sponsored embassies to kings,[234] we never find the same level of intimacy implied by the activities of Eirenias: even Boulagoras, whose decree records his meeting Antiochos II/Hierax at Ephesos and Sardeis, had to compete with other influential *philoi* of the king and regional landowners for Samos' land rights – clearly, these were the local bigwigs who could exert real influence on the king.[235] In the 160s and 150s, however, Korrhagos, Eirenias, Timarchos, and Apollonios of Metropolis assumed the place of such local bigwigs themselves, while remaining zealous citizens. More broadly speaking, then, the post-Apameian period changed political and honorific dynamics not by elevating citizens to the level of kings, so that one reading of the later Hellenistic period, 150 BCE onwards, is as the epoch when 'citizens took the place of weakening kings'.[236] Rather, we might be more specific, and claim that the period 188-133 witnessed the elevation of the *intermediary* role of citizens, and that those they replaced were men like the royal *philoi* of Boulagoras' opposition, and not kings like Antiochos II himself, or indeed Eumenes. A factor that diminished in importance was the local dynast, regional big men whose authority positioned them between civic and royal states for much

[233] *IG* XII.6 11 (after 243 BCE), *I.Erythrai* 28 (275-265 BCE).
[234] Polykritos gives money for an embassy to Antiochos I: *I.Erythrai* 28 ll. 41-48; Malousios of Gargara gave money for an embassy to Antigonos Monophthalmos: *I.Ilion* 1 ll. 8-9, 24-27, 37-40; in both cases it is not stated if the honorand actually travelled as ambassador as well.
[235] *IG* XII.6 11 ll. 5-20, especially ll. 12-13: 'he opposed himself during the embassy to the most illustrious friends of Antiochos who were in possession of the contested estates' (ἀντικαταστὰς ἐν τῆι πρεσβείαι τοῖς ἐνδοξοτάτοις τῶν Ἀν[τι]|όχου φίλων οἳ ἐτύγχανον ἔχοντες τὰ αἰτήσιμα).
[236] Gauthier (1985) 55-56.

of the 3rd century (a phenomenon deriving ultimately from the Achaemenid period) – figures like Olympichos in Karia or Achaios in Lydia.[237] This process must have been accelerated by the Attalids' tendency to co-opt local notables into their governance, and engage with cities. As a result, leading citizens now exerted more direct influence on the ruling power, making such interaction a part of honorific discourse and late Hellenistic expectations around civic service. The end of Attalid rule and provincialisation of Asia only enhanced this dynamic, as we shall now see.

[237] For such early Hellenistic dynasts, Billows (1995) 81-110 and Mitchell (2018) 13-16.

Chapter 2: An Age of Indifference. Roman power and the entrenchment of ambassadorial ethic, 133-29 BCE

The death of Attalos III in 133 marked the end of Attalid hegemony in western Anatolia. It would only be in 129, however, that the Roman province of Asia would be established, after a bitter four-year war between Rome, the cities of Asia, and the royal pretender Aristonikos – a war that affirmed the identities of the cities as autonomous entities, and established Roman rule in Asia Minor for the first time.[238] This had important consequences for the continued viability of the ideology of benefaction and honour that had shaped their relations with the Attalid kings, as cities sought to relate to their new overlord. The Elaians, a small community living in the shadow of Pergamon, sensed the moment. Obtaining a *senatus consultum* affirming their alliance with Rome, they had this set up on bronze tablets in the temple of Demeter and in the *bouleuterion*, next to a statue of Demokratia, and even paid special honour to it by declaring holy the day of the tablets' dedication, and making sacrifices to Demeter, Persephone, and Roma.[239] The Elaian view of its place within the balance of imperial power in the eastern Mediterranean, from the year 129, would henceforth be framed in terms of its goodwill no longer towards a king, but instead towards a council of elders based some 1200 kilometres away, as enshrined in the goddess Roma.

The province of Asia, however, was not simply a re-instatement of the late Attalid kingdom, and this fact changed the way that power relations were expressed when articulated in the terms of euergetism. The structure of Roman administration in the period 129-31 BCE, based on annually rotating governorships fixed by the Senate, offered no clear monarchical figure of political authority, and hence no obvious focal point for euergetic

[238] For a full account of the war, Daubner (2006) 53-136; for the early history of the province of Asia, Dmitriev (2005a), Marek and Frei (2016) 251-263.
[239] *IGR* IV 1692; Elaian provenance: Robert (1984) 489-496.

ideology, as under the Attalids. The result was that Rome never nurtured a centralised euergetic persona, and ruler-cult for individual Romans was never an established practice. This had important consequences for the honorific standing of local citizens, which had become increasingly prominent in post-Apameian Karia (as seen in chapter 1), and continued to elevate after 133. The first section in this chapter outlines the change enacted by Roman provincialisation, suggesting that the ideology of the Romans as common benefactors, dating to 188, established reciprocal goodwill towards Rome, while allowing cities to act as autonomous entities. The following sections, studying the century after the onset of direct Roman rule in 129, show how this ethic was embodied in honours for local representatives, even to the extent of encouraging some to form patronal relationships with leading Romans; the upheavals of the decades from 85-31 meant that some of these relationships threatened to override local obligations. The concretisation of the *koinon* of Asia in the later 1st century BCE can thus be regarded as an attempt to assuage this threat by inscribing euergetic obligations within a provincial framework.

Roma and the Romans as Common Benefactors

As we saw in the last chapter, the Romans were already increasingly characterised as 'common benefactors' by the cities of Asia Minor in the decades after Apameia. As well as shaping the euergetic profile of the late Attalid kings, this conception of the Romans as overarching, universal benefactors also allowed the cities to articulate an ethics for political action in the post-Seleukid world – how communities, but also citizens, should behave. The logic of reciprocity implied in the title, as attested in public epigraphy from 188 BCE to the 1st century BCE, requires unpacking.

The notion of universal benefaction implied benefaction to a collective body of the 'Greeks'. While this served to level distinctions of state identity in the Greek world, so that royal or civic polities could increasingly be seen in similar terms, this rhetoric was not simply about defining a hierarchy of power, placing Rome as the *de facto* ruler of the Mediterranean, above post-Seleukid Hellenistic rulers. It implied, for one, reciprocity, in that Roman power would continue to be a benevolent, universal benefactor, as long as the cities maintained their role as grateful recipients of such benevolence.[240] It was also, however, a way of characterising a new sort of euergetism. Crucially, the title is not found in honorific monuments for Romans themselves, but only ever in honorific transactions between *poleis* and civic benefactors.[241] This is not simply an accident of survival, but arguably reflects the fact that in conceptualising the Romans as 'universal benefactors', and therefore not as specifically honoured entities, *poleis* conceived a sphere for political agency within a hegemonic framework. Thus, in a treaty between an unknown city and Antioch-on-the-Maeander made soon after 167, the Antiochenes are praised not only as friends and allies, but also for being gratefully disposed towards the Romans the common benefactors (εὐχαρίστως δὲ διακειμένους καὶ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, τ[οὺς κοινοὺς] | εὐεργέτας πάντων):[242] this implies that political self-identity was now tied to a favourable attitude towards Rome, but also that everything else involved in that transaction – here, the traditional mechanisms for securing inter-city friendship and alliance – were compatible with and indeed constitutive of it.

Defining the Romans as common benefactors was therefore not so much about responding to specific benefactions as about conceptualising a state of being-in-hegemony, by qualifying the very operation of civic institutions as the 'benefaction' granted by Rome.

[240] Thus Ferrary (1988) 131-132.
[241] Erskine (1994) 76.
[242] *IG* XII.6 6 ll. 21-22.

As a result, we find almost no trace of honours for specific institutions of Roman power, like the Senate, whose collective power might well have been equated with the personal charismatic euergetism of a Hellenistic king.[243] A few examples of honours for the *demos* of the Romans are known, but these are exceptional, and possibly represent efforts by some cities to re-imagine Rome in ways which were consciously different from the more prevalent conception of universal benefaction.[244] By contrast, it is this conception of universal benefaction, constituting a means of empowering the *poleis*, which seems to have received the most honorific attention. The joint emergence of cults of Roma alongside designations of Romans as οἱ κοινοὶ εὐεργέται in the early 2nd century BCE is therefore not coincidental, but reflects two modes of defining a new form of hegemonic reciprocity. On occasion, the two could merge, as we see in the few attestations of honours for Roma as εὐεργέτις,[245] or cultic honours for Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ κοινοὶ εὐεργέται.[246]

In these early honours for Rome, then, we observe a gradual shift, before the actual onset of Roman power in the region after 133, in civic conceptions of hegemonic power. Before 189, and to a different extent in the late Attalid empire, as we have seen, this was focussed on the charismatic persona of individual rulers, manifesting primarily in euergetic exchange between cities and rulers, mediated through politely worded official correspondence, and finalised in ruler-cults. After the peace of Apameia, however, it was necessary to conceptualise Rome's particular brand of hegemony differently, in which

[243] Price (1984) 42. Crowns to the *demos* and senate of Rome: *I.Delos* 465 only; for the cult of the Senate in the early imperial period, in much changed circumstances, Erskine (1997) and Schörner (2014).
[244] Samos (*IG* XII.6 350), Kaunos (*I.Kaunos* 89), and Rhodes (Polyb. 31.4.4), around 167; two other bases from Termessos and Side may be of late Hellenistic date: *SEG* 57.1433 and *I.Side* 25. Some of the dedications on the Capitoline were statues of the Roman people, but this may be due to the specific context of honouring Rome *at* Rome: *IGUR* 9 (by Mithridates V), 6 (Laodikeia), two others, *IGUR* 17 and 19, may be later; overall, Mellor (1978).
[245] Delos: *I.Delos* 1778 (late 2nd century BCE); Stratonikeia: *I.Stratonikeia* 507 ll. 6-7 (early 1st century BCE); Xanthos: *F.Xanthos* VII 18-19 (Augustan); Assos: *I.Assos* 20 (early imperial); see Ferrary (1988) 131 n. 297.
[246] One attestation (*F.Delphes* III.2 70 ll. 45-46) implies sacrifice made τοῖς κοινοῖς εὐεργέταις Ῥωμαίοις; *F.Delphes* III.3 124 honours Aristotheos the historian for reciting encomia εἰς Ῥωμαίους τοὺς κοινοὺς τῶν Ἑλλάνων εὐεργέτας (ll. 6-7), but this need not suggest cult: Erskine (1994) 79-80, *pace* Price (1984) 41-42. A different, and locally specific, case is the cult of the οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι εὐεργέται at Thessalonike: *IG* X.2.1 4 (95 BCE).

authority over civic communities continued to be exercised by successor-states to the Seleukid empire, like the Attalids and Rhodes, or did not exist at all, for those who were declared free after 189. The result was a conception of Rome as a goddess or 'universal benefactor' that served to reconcile local governance and the primacy of civic norms with Rome's hegemonic, even supra-hegemonic, power, and therefore persisted well into the period of Roman provincialisation after 129; cults of Roma and the designation of Romans as common benefactors endure into the 1st century BCE.[247] That is, the imposition of direct Roman rule did not bring about a radical re-orientation of euergetic attitudes to Rome, in the same way that one can perceive changes between the Seleukid and Attalid eras. In stark contrast to the preceding late Attalid state, the Romans seem to have made no effort to nurture a hegemonic euergetic personality beyond that proposed by the cities. Notably, honorific responses to Roman power after 129 did not immediately consist of cults to individual Romans. Powerful conquerors had certainly been sporadically honoured with cult in mainland Greece already, in the manner of Hellenistic kings, like Flamininus in 196, and Mummius after 146;[248] in Asia a cult of Manius Aquillius from 129 is known, but only at Pergamon.[249] After this, however, there seems to have been relative lack of interest in honouring Roman governors with cult, or even honorific statues, until the 90s BCE.[250]

At the same time, provincialisation made the foreignness of Roman power visibly real for the first time. Cities readily co-opted the statements of Roman power by choosing, soon after 129, to publicly inscribe the authoritative decisions of the Senate. The fact that

[247] Romans as universal benefactors in the 1st century BCE: *I.Ephesos* 8 l. 1 (common saviours), *SEG* 62.493 l. 3 (Mytilene), Joseph. *AJ* 14.247, 256 for decrees of Pergamon and Halikarnassos; probably also of 1st-century date is *SGDI* 4854 ll. 4-5 (Kyrene).
[248] Flamininus honoured at Argos, Gytheion, and Chalkis with cult: Daux (1964), *SEG* 11.923 ll. 11-12, Plut. *Flam*. 16.3-4; for L. Mummius, *BE* 1979 350; cf. Thériault (2001) 87.
[249] *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 5 ll. 38-40 and 6γ ll. 24-25 for a priesthood and sacrifices to Manius. It is perhaps noteworthy that Flamininus does not seem to have received cult in Asia Minor, despite the fact his proclamation of Greek freedom also included it: Polyb. 18.46-47.
[250] Next honoured with cult was Q. Mucius Scaevola: Ferriès and Delrieux (2011) 210-224; the earliest dateable statue-base for a Roman official is *SEG* 49.1506 (G. Valerius Flaccus, 95 BCE).

multiple copies of documents like the *senatus consulta* on Pergamene land and the annexation of Phrygia (129, 119/116), or the *lex de praetoriis provinciis* of 99,[251] were set up – in the case of the first by communities not even directly concerned with the decision – should be seen primarily as part of local willingness to incorporate the foreignness of Roman power, rather than the result of top-down gubernatorial stipulation.[252] The presentation of authoritative senatorial writs, characterised by idiosyncratic Latinising prose, and distinctly un-euergetic in their affirmative, even imperious, tone, may well have contributed, ironically, to consolidating the sense that the Romans formed a special class of 'universal' benefactors. It is precisely this foreignness that the Elaians incorporated in 129 by inscribing their treaty with Rome, thereby making clear that 'the Roman people acknowledged and accepted the conviction and goodwill of our people'.[253]

Goodwill to the Romans, under pressure, 133-85 BCE

The longstanding conception of the Romans as universal benefactors therefore allowed cities to maintain reciprocal relations with Rome, the supreme guarantor of civic freedoms. While this was continually founded on maintaining goodwill towards Rome, the onset of direct Roman presence from the war of Aristonikos onwards redefined what such goodwill meant. Rome did not replace the Attalids as a new Hellenistic monarch and individual benefactor-ruler, but rather encouraged cities to negotiate with it through their elite citizens. From the decades after 129 onwards, goodwill to Rome also increasingly demanded that such elites bind themselves to leading Romans, forming relationships that extended beyond the reciprocity between Rome and their communities alone.

[251] *RDGE* 12, 13, Crawford, *Roman Statutes* 12.
[252] Jordan (2019) 309-323.
[253] *IGR* IV 1692 ll. 19-21.

The war against Aristonikos offered the first major chance for Asia's cities to demonstrate their goodwill 'to the Romans'. The starkest example of this is the honorific decree for Apollonios of Metropolis, who died in battle at an early stage of the war, at Thyateira in 132, shortly after the Senate had declared the freedom of the cities of Asia.[254] Here, the war against Aristonikos was not framed primarily as a local war for freedom, but rather as a conflict that vindicated its goodwill towards Rome. In the decree's account, Apollonios opposed Aristonikos not only because of the people's attachment to freedom, but also because Aristonikos had disobeyed the judgement of the common benefactor Romans (ll. 17-19). Likewise, the main motivation underpinning the city's despatch of Apollonios to Thyateira was to demonstrate its gratitude to Rome for its freedom, and its goodwill towards its affairs (ll. 20-23). Quite remarkably, Apollonios' statue-base inscription commemorated his goodwill first to the affairs of the Romans, and only secondarily to the people (ll. 38-40). This incorporation of Roman power into local honourability evokes the infiltration of civic discourse by royal power in earlier periods, and especially under the Attalids, as we have seen. It is likely this was due to the excitement of the moment, as the Metropolitans sought to pattern their relationship to Rome on the terms they had known under the kings: such incorporation is otherwise anomalous among our extant decrees for individual citizens.

The long war, and subsequent provincialisation of Asia, tested assumptions that Rome would act like a Hellenistic king. Goodwill would be challenged, as it became clear such goodwill entailed sacrifice and suffering, sometimes at the hands of the Romans themselves. When Manius Aquillius asked Bargasa to billet some of his troops as he mopped up the last corners of resistance in the 129-126, the community refused, having been overwhelmed by the expenses it had already made on the Romans' behalf: in the decree

[254] *I.Metropolis* 1a, with ll. 13-15 for the Senate's declaration. For the dating to 132, Jones (2004) 478-482, *contra* Dreyer in *I.Metropolis* pp. 66-79, who argues for 130.

honouring the Apollonios who succeeded in exempting the city before Aquillius himself, it is this generalised goodwill to Rome which is emphasised (τοῦ δήμου θλιβομένου…διὰ τὸ ἐγδεδαπανῆσθαι εἰς τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους εὔνοιαν), and not the reality that this had involved personal interactions between Apollonios and Aquillius.[255] This insistence on εὔνοια was important, because it maintained the notion that the Romans were universal benefactors, within which framework civic agency could be exercised, in a world (especially after 129) where Rome was increasingly the undisputed dominant power. An important feature of the Metropolitans' decree for Apollonios is the emphasis on the fact that freedom had been *returned* (ἀποδεδομένη),[256] and not *given*, to the city, thereby generating the sense that Roman universal benefaction and the city's ancestral self-identification were synonymous.[257] For this reason, εὔνοια towards the Romans emerges throughout the public rhetoric of the period, both shortly after the war against Aristonikos, and well into the 1st century BCE, as a virtue that cities were keen to advertise.[258]

Even if never fully incorporated into the realm of honorific exemplarity in the way, for instance, that royal officials or citizens could be praised directly for their goodwill to the Attalid king, goodwill towards the universal benefactor Romans could also colour the form and focalisation of civic honorific discourse. In the case of the Metropolitans and their hero Apollonios, it is worth asking, for all their efforts to present Apollonios as essentially an incarnation of the Metropolitan *demos*, and the prominence of the *demos* as an individual actor in his decree,[259] why the city decided to erect an honorific monument to Apollonios at

[255] *I.Nordkarien* 551 ll. 13-15, 18-20.
[256] Three of the five mentions of ἐλευθερία qualify it as ἀποδεδομένη: *I.Metropolis* 1a ll. 14-15, 16, 33, alongside 19, 21; for the significance, Snowdon (2008). The Pergamene decree of 133 says Attalos III's will freed the city (*OGIS* 338 ll. 3-6), while at Ephesos a new era of 134/133 may commemorate an earlier grant: Adams (1980) 311-314 and Rigsby (1979). Alongside Livy, *Per.* 59.3 (according to whom all Asia was liberated, *libera esse debet*), it seems likely the Senate confirmed the Attalid will: Jones (2004) 480-481.
[257] This cyclicality is also embedded in the idea that Metropolis had been loyal to Rome from the beginning (ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς): *I.Metropolis* 1a l. 20.
[258] Shortly after 129 BCE: *IG* XII Suppl. 116 ll. 9-11, 16, *IGR* IV 134 ll. 16-18, *SEG* 34.1198 ll. 8-13. 1st century BCE: *I.Ephesos* 8 ll. 1-2, *I.Nordkarien* 211 ll. 11-13.
[259] *I.Metropolis* 1a ll. 20-24, with the *demos* in the nominative.

all, rather than, for instance, compose a decree presenting the city as the sole actor, as the Elaians would do. The problem is legitimate, because Apollonios had died (and thus offered no hope of future benefactions by himself), and because his statue-base also simultaneously served as a public war memorial that preserved the names of the other Metropolitans who had died alongside him below the decree.[260] In short, the civic authorities clearly intended to present Apollonios as a *representative* of its goodwill to Rome, and not only to present this goodwill altogether. There is, moreover, some wider epigraphic context to substantiate this supposition, for the decades after 129 were marked by a veritable outburst of interest in honouring elite citizens with lengthy decrees outlining their career achievements, inscribed not only on stelai, but also on statue-bases and building facades. Such were the honours for Menas the gymnasiarch of Sestos, Machaon the ambassador of Kyzikos, Menodoros the Pergamene politician, and other local worthies: an unknown son of Anaximbrotos of Gordos, Poseidonios of Bargylia, Apollonios of Bargasa, Menippos and Polemaios of Kolophon, and Moschion, Heroides and Krates of Priene.[261] The war against Aristonikos, and the establishment of Roman rule which followed, marked an ideological watershed moment for the communities of western Asia Minor. This epigraphic concentration reflects Rome's co-optation of local elite authority in its establishment of provincial rule: where the elites of Macedonia and Greece had been deported, obliterated, or cowed into submission after 169 and 146,[262] there was no purge of local power in Asia, but instead continuity, and the careers of many of the individuals above spanned both the late Attalid and Roman eras. Some were honoured in part for their ambassadorial representations before Roman authorities, sometimes at length and over revealing cases affecting civic freedom, as we shall

[260] *I.Metropolis* 1a ll. 47-56.
[261] Menas: *I.Sestos* 1; Machaon: *IGR* IV 134; Menodoros: *SEG* 50.1211; son of Anaximbrotos: *SEG* 34.1198; Poseidonios: *SEG* 44.867; Apollonios of Bargasa: *SEG* 51.1495; Klaros benefactors: *SEG* 39.1243, 39.1244; Moschion, Heroides and Krates: *I.Priene2014* 64, 65, 67.
[262] Sève (2005) 271-273.

see, and their decrees should therefore be seen in part as documents recording the way that cities related to Roman power through euergetic ideology. Analysed in these terms, they mark a development from, and indeed intensification of, the notion of Rome as a universal benefactor, whereby local citizens embodied civic virtues by interacting directly with Roman authorities, while at the same time foreshadowing the emergence of new patterns of reciprocity arising from the increasing prevalence of personal relationships between citizens and leading Romans (as adumbrated by the achievements of Apollonios of Bargasa mentioned above).

Some of these decrees show that Roman rule changed local notions of what hegemonic power was about. Several present the ambassadorial acts of their honorands, in negotiating with Rome, as the crowning achievement of their careers, thereby creating the impression that some cities in the 120s BCE conceived of the histories of their rulers as histories of *interactions*.[263] In the posthumous account of Apollonios of Metropolis' career, it is his embassies to the 'kings and other officials' in dealing with earlier disputes that foreground the support he rendered Rome against Aristonikos;[264] this earlier history of ambassadorial interactivity arguably accounts for the inscription of his earlier Attalid-era decree on the same base. A similar retrospective evocation of earlier ambassadorial contacts with Attalid kings can be found in the decrees for Menippos of Klaros, Menas of Sestos, and the son of Anaximbrotos of Gordos, serving in part to foreshadow their embassies to Rome in the present-day of the 120s.[265] The relative prominence of these accounts of earlier Attalid-era embassies in these decrees thereby integrated the Attalid past into a Roman

[263] Notably, the first surviving portion of Machaon of Kyzikos' decree is occupied only by ambassadorial service – to M. Cosconius, governor of Macedonia, the Senate, and thirdly the Roman generals in Asia in 133-129: *IGR* IV 134 ll. 7-23.
[264] *I.Metropolis* 1a ll. 6-8.
[265] *SEG* 39.1244i ll. 14-17, *I.Sestos* 1 ll. 10-25, *SEG* 34.1198 ll. 6-13, 22-23; note also that the Prienian decrees for Moschion and Heroides specially mention their embassies to M. Perperna at Pergamon after victory over Aristonikos: *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 227-230, 65 ll. 100-103.

present, in effect presenting the honorand as the conduit between these periods of hegemonic rule, and suggesting that the ambassadorial interactions with Rome that had been a core part of the creation of Roman Asia belonged to a longer continuum of *polis*-history. At Pergamon, where this continuity was especially fraught, the politician Menodoros, who had held a prominent place during the war against Aristonikos, was even praised for speaking with frankness (παρρησία) before Manius Aquillius and the ten commissioners charged with establishing Asia.[266] Like the earlier late Attalid notable Andronikos, as we saw in chapter 1,[267] such frankness marked out Pergamon's civic identity before its rulers – an identity that perhaps more than any other city was tied to its recent acquisition of official status as a democracy – δημοκρατία, as the decree makes clear –[268] and was therefore especially worthy of mention in the now Roman context.

The power of personal connections: Menippos and Polemaios of Klaros and Chairemon of Nysa

This rhetorical conception of the 'citizen-ambassador' also reflects a heightened sense of the personal power of such citizens to influence the political destinies of their communities. Menodoros' frankness not only represented Pergamon's interests, but could also be relied upon to persuade Manius Aquillius and the ten commissioners of their importance. Other notables were also described as persuading Romans: thus, Apollonios of Bargasa swayed (ἔπεισεν) Aquillius into releasing his city from billeting burdens.[269] The same verb, πείθειν, is found in the decrees for the Polemaios of Klaros and Krates of Priene.[270] Obviously, the

[266] *SEG* 50.1211 ll. 18-21; Menodoros had been a member of a federal council 'according to Roman principle', κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν νομοθεσίαν (l. 13), for which see Wörrle (2000) 569-570.
[267] *OGIS* 323 ll. 9-12.
[268] *SEG* 50.1211 ll. 11-12.
[269] *SEG* 51.1495 l. 20.
[270] *SEG* 39.1243ii ll. 61, *I.Priene2014* 67 l. 117.

reality of Roman administration after 129 must have brought into sharper focus the fact that Roman power could no longer simply be conceptualised in terms of universalising, and therefore physically distanced, 'common benefactors'; it now also comprised governors and their entourages, *publicani*, and enterprising *negotiatores*, who were an increasingly permanent presence in Asia's political geography. While the evidence increasingly suggests that the Roman state in Asia was largely rudimentary in character in its early decades, and only assumed a more intrusive form after the Mithridatic Wars,[271] this does not mean that the decades 129-85 were simply a blanket period of *de facto* independence for the cities. While this may have been the case in the years immediately following 129, and is arguably reflected in the triumphalist tone of the decrees from the 120s, a more likely scenario is that the intrusiveness of Roman authority gradually intensified, and was shaped by landmark moments like the *lex Sempronia* in 123 (which abetted the activities of Asia's *publicani*) and the annexation of Phrygia in 119/116.[272] Furthermore, some cities did lose their freedom after 129 for supporting Aristonikos.[273] In these early years, cities and their leaders were already increasingly aware of the need to engage in personal relations with powerful Romans in ways that went beyond earlier pre-133 interactions. Indeed, this was already happening during the war against Aristonikos: a Poseidonios son of Menandros, a leading personage of Bargylia, was praised for having militarily supported the Roman cause, but also, however, for succeeding in releasing Bargylian soldiers from military duty on two occasions, interceding before Aquillius and the later commanding officer in Karia, Gn. Domitius.[274]

[271] This 'minimalist' view of Kallet-Marx (1995) 109-122 is increasingly dominant; see also Jordan (2019) 19-114. The 'maximalist' view emphasises Roman incorporation of pre-existing Attalid institutions (roads and customs-houses), e.g. Mileta (1990) 438-444, Mitchell (1999) 17-20 and (2009) 183-187; military presence before 85 was minimal: Sherwin-White (1984) 91-92 and Brunt (1971) 429, 431, 434-435.
[272] The *lex Sempronia de censoria locatione* of 123: Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.12, *Schol Bob.* 157, Diod. Sic. 34-35.25. A key document is the *senatus consultum de agro Pergameno* (*RDGE* 12), to be dated to 129, rather than 101: Merola (2001a) 27-34; for the *senatus consultum* on Phrygia's annexation (*RDGE* 13), *SEG* 28.1208.
[273] E.g. Phokaia; cf. Bernhardt (1971) 103-107.
[274] *SEG* 44.867a ll. 13-21 (military support for Aquillius in Mysia), b ll. 28-31 (released soldiers from Aquillius' imposition), b ll. 23-27, 33-34 (later demand for troops by Q. Caepio, a subordinate of Gn. Domitius, and Poseidonios' success in releasing troops from obligations).

The second time, we even learn that he had been inscribed as an 'ancestral' friend of the Domitii; in return, the city may have granted *proxenia* to Domitius and his sons.[275]

While Poseidonios seems to have entered into formal relations of *amicitia* with Domitius, the Klarian statesmen Polemaios and Menippos further engaged, within just the following decade, in patronal relations with individual Romans.[276] The latter is praised, in a final summary of his accomplishments, for having been 'of the highest use to the city before the Romans by making them genuine patrons (πάτρωνας) of the city'.[277] Similarly, Polemaios had met leading Romans and established relationships of patronage (πατρωνείας) for the city among their best: acts, importantly, which were seen as worthy of his friendship (ἄξιος τῆς ἐκείνων | φιλίας) with them.[278] The appearance of the terms πάτρων and πατρωνεία here are among the earliest attested in the Hellenistic world: this does not mean that patronal relations with local Greek notables only began now,[279] but rather that such relationships were only now integrated into public honorific rhetoric. The diplomatic accomplishments of Menippos and Polemaios were wide-ranging and complex, but centre on interaction with the Senate. Menippos conducted no fewer than five embassies to Rome regarding Kolophon's political rights, territorial sovereignty over neighbouring land (the Dioshieron, the 'Narrows', and the sanctuary of the Prepelaion),[280] and its judicial authority over its courts and citizens; disputes with Metropolis necessitated further embassies.[281] Polemaios' career demonstrates the ongoing character of these problems, in embassies to

[275] *SEG* 44.867b ll. 37-41 with Holleaux (1938-1968) 2.191-192 for the restoration πατρικὸς φίλος, attested elsewhere, e.g. *OGIS* 227 l. 9 (Seleukos II to Miletos), *IG* XII.4 209 l. 18 (Ziaelas of Bithynia to Kos), Polyb. 33.18.3 (Attalos II regarded as ancestral friend of Rome).
[276] *SEG* 39.1243-1244, with Robert and Robert (1989); there is no definitive proof, but it is more likely, that Polemaios' career slightly post-dates that of Menippos: no mention of earlier embassies to the Attalid kings is made (unlike Menippos), although this in itself is not decisive, cf. Ferrary (1991) 557-558.
[277] *SEG* 39.1244iii ll. 6-7, 10-12.
[278] *SEG* 39.1243ii ll. 24-31, and also iii ll. 2-5.
[279] *Pace* Eilers (2002) 114-119, 124-137; the two earlier cases are *IG* XII.6 351 (Gn. Domitius, Samos), and *Syll.*[3] 656 ll. 22-23, an honorific decree of Abdera for Teos which should be dated to the mid-2nd century BCE: Bloy (2012) 192-200, with 177-179, 186-191 for patronage in the earlier 2nd century.
[280] For these places, Robert and Robert (1989) 71-85.
[281] *SEG* 39.1244i ll. 20-31, 34-54, ii. ll. 1-7.

the Senate and governor concerning raids on territory and the city's judicial authority.[282] In all, then, at least seven embassies to Roman authorities are recorded, suggesting recurring insecurity and instability.

The implications of these missions for civic rights and liberties in the early years of Roman Asia have been well-studied;[283] what requires emphasis here is only that these accomplishments should be seen primarily as the result of Menippos and Polemaios' patronal connections, and were not merely 'ambassadorial' successes, much as the decrees vaunt the primacy of civic interests. The impression we receive from the decrees is that the Klarians' successes were unprecedented because they had obtained direct access to the Senate, and by-passed gubernatorial authority: indeed, on several occasions they even obtained replies from the Senate that overrode the actions of governors, achievements that their decrees praised in high-blown language.[284]

However, the role of strong patronal connections, and not sheer ambassadorial skill, should not be underestimated. These were the relationships that Menippos continued to nurture after his missions, personally hosting the governor Mucius Scaevola at Kolophon at a later occasion, for instance.[285] Moreover, his fifth embassy, clearly the highpoint of his ambassadorial career as the jubilant after-celebrations show, was arguably centred precisely on the problem of patronal connections.[286] Menippos had saved a citizen who had been summoned to Rome, thereby preserving the city's judicial authority over its own citizens.[287]

---

[282] *SEG* 39.1243ii ll. 33-62.
[283] Especially, Ferrary (1991), Lehmann (1998) 146-168/22-44, Fournier (2010) 417-437.
[284] Polemaios received a senatorial decision (ἐπίταγμα) instructing future governors to protect the city from similar misdeeds (*SEG* 39.1243ii ll. 44-51), Menippos obtained senatorial instructions after his fourth embassy that 'delimited the province from autonomy' (*SEG* 39.1244i ll. 39-40: τῆς ἐπαρχείας ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτονομίας χωρισθείσης); at a later date he gained a reply from the Senate 'most in conformity with self-governance' (ἰδιώτατον τῆι δημοκρατίαι καὶ κάλλιστον ἐνέγκας ἀπόκριμα), whereby 'the governor would not be allowed to make judgements or meddle in affairs outside the sphere of the province' (ii ll. 2-7). For the rhetoric of being 'external' to the province, Fournier (2010) 424.
[285] *SEG* 39.1244ii ll. 42-46; for identification with Q. Mucius Scaevola *cos*. 117, Robert and Robert (1989) 98-99, and Ferrary (2000b) 165 n. 20. Menippos also hosted unnamed Romans during the war against Aristonikos (ii ll. 10-12): Ferrary (1991) 561-562.
[286] *SEG* 39.1244i ll. 48-50.
[287] *SEG* 39.1244ii ll. 40-50.

The anonymous citizen had been charged ἐπὶ Ῥωμαϊκῶι θανάτωι, a phrase which has been understood to refer to the murder or condemnation to capital punishment of a Roman ('summoned for the death of a Roman');[288] more recently, however, it has been cogently re-interpreted as a reference rather to the sort of Roman capital punishment reserved for foreigners, *supplicium more maiorum*; that is, this Kolophonian had been 'condemned to death in the Roman style'.[289] The singularity of the case in the fifth embassy – τὸν κατῃτιαμένον πολίτην – contrasts with the more general problem of the fourth embassy, which concerned the city's authority over its courts, affecting the rights of 'citizens', and 'inhabitants of the city';[290] here, we are arguably dealing with a private disagreement between a local notable and a Roman. The most likely scenario is that this Roman was a magistrate, which would explain the publicity around the event.[291] The fifth embassy would therefore have dealt with the sort of conflict found later in the early 1st century, where, in effect, patronal relationships between civic leaders and powerful Romans had soured. At Lampsakos (c. 80), the violent breakdown in guest-friendship between Philodamos and Verres led to the death of the latter's lictor, after which Philodamos should have been summoned to Rome, like the anonymous Kolophonian, instead of being condemned to death by Verres, as Cicero claims;[292] another notable (*homo nobilissimus*) Perikles of Ephesos *was* summoned around 95, after he had forcibly denied the quaestor Aemilius Scaurus entry into the temple of Artemis to retrieve a slave.[293] Remarkably, Menippos not only saved his fellow-citizen, but also, exceptionally, obtained a senatorial decision granting the city the

[288] The murder of a Roman: Robert and Robert (1989) 87, and Laffi (2009) 158-159; condemnation of a Roman to capital punishment: Ferrary (1991) 567-573.
[289] Lehmann (1998) 162-167/38-43; Sánchez (2010) 48-50 has corroborated Lehmann's arguments by demonstrating in particular that the adjectival form Ῥωμαϊκός, as opposed to Ῥωμαῖος, generally qualifies abstract concepts, not individual persons.
[290] *SEG* 39.1244i ll. 23-27, 37-39.
[291] Sánchez (2010) 56-57.
[292] Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.63-85, 84 for Cicero's accusation; cf. Steel (2004) for the episode.
[293] Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.85.

right to judge Romans in all cases, whether as defendants or plaintiffs.[294] This sort of reversal can only have come about through his patronal connections. The outpouring of joy at Menippos' achievement, then, was due also to the recognition that he had, in effect, corrected the error of the anonymous Kolophonian: where the latter had mismanaged the sort of tenuous patronal relationships that were now required of civic notables, Menippos had excelled in his own contacts, even earning privileges for the city. Such success, by the same token, was closely dependent on these personal contacts. It would seem that when he departed the political scene, the same problem re-emerged again, and had to be dealt with, this time, through Polemaios' means of persuasion.[295] This rapport with Roman authorities must account for the honorific stature of Menippos and Polemaios; both received impressive columnal statues, and Menippos was even called εὐεργέτης.[296]

The role of patronal relations in shaping civic honour also emerges in the stele honouring Chairemon of Nysa, dating to the aftermath of the first Mithridatic war, some three decades after the Klarian decrees, and revelatory of the extent to which such patronal relations with Romans had normalised by this point.[297] Three letters are inscribed on the stele: two of Mithridates VI, commanding his satrap Leonippos to seek out and capture Chairemon, and subsequently repeating the instruction at a later point, when Chairemon had fled to Rhodes,[298] and one of G. Cassius, commending Chairemon for providing 60,000 modii of wheat to his besieged army at Apameia in 88 – ultimately, however, to no avail.[299]

---

[294] *SEG* 39.1244ii ll. 42-44: τῆς συγκλήτου δεδογματικείας καὶ τὸν | ἀδικοῦντα καὶ τὸν ἐνκαλοῦντά τινι τῶν ἡμε|τέρων πολιτῶν Ῥωμαῖον κρίνεσθαι παρ' ἡμῖν. For this reading, Robert and Robert (1989) 87, Ferrary (1991) 568. Laffi (2009) 154-155 minimises its significance, applying τὸν ἀδικοῦντα to Kolophonian defendants, so that the regulation does not cover Romans as defendants; this assumes, however a degree of tautology, as the phrase would be redundant if this is what the decree-drafter intended: Fournier (2010) 426-428.

[295] *SEG* 39.1243ii ll. 51-58; he may have presented a copy of the senatorial decree obtained by Menippos: Ferrary (1991) 567.

[296] *SEG* 39.1244iii ll. 19-23, 31-32, *SEG* 39.1243v ll. 43-45, with Robert and Robert (1989) 103-104.

[297] *I.Nysa* 410-413.

[298] *I.Nysa* 412-413.

[299] App. *Mith.* 19, Strabo 12.8.18.

It is clear from this selection of documents that the Nysans sought to demonstrate their pro-Roman sentiments in the aftermath of the war. The fact that they had to do so in this unusual way, however, by including official letters as part of the honorific exchange between the city and Chairemon, arguably points to the alternative and less straightforward reality that the Nysans had surrendered to Mithridates, which would explain their possession of copies of Mithridates' correspondence with Leonippos.[300]

Whatever the role of these letters in presenting a history of pro- or anti-Roman activity, it is nonetheless clear that the honouring of Chairemon served principally to celebrate the close patronal ties he enjoyed with Roman authorities. The letter of G. Cassius to Nysa presents him not as an official ambassador of the city, but almost as a private agent. Chairemon had gained access to Cassius' private council (συμβούλιον), and, tellingly, Cassius does not praise the city for having sent Chairemon, but explains that he would endeavour to inform Chairemon that his deeds had been well-received, and would relay an account of them to the Senate:[301] that is, the main purpose of the letter to Nysa was to affirm the relations of friendship between Chairemon and himself. We may even question Chairemon's allegiance to the city, considering his readiness to flee from Mithridates to Rhodes and Ephesos;[302] there may have been tensions with civic authorities, or other pro-Mithridates political opponents. In any case, it is the strength of his personal relations with a Roman senator that accounts for the unusual form of his honorific stele, in its emphasis on his independence of movement – a diametrical opposite, in many ways, to the deeply community-focussed narrative of the pro-Roman decree for Apollonios of Metropolis in 132, and indicative of the changed world of the 80s BCE.

[300] Otherwise the only surviving examples of Mithridates' public pronouncements; another candidate is *I.Nysa* 403, whose identity has long been disputed; cf. Akdoğu Arca (2017) 188-193.
[301] *I.Nysa* 411 ll. 6-8, 9-11.
[302] *I.Nysa* 413 ll. 2-5; possibly to join Cassius at Rhodes: App. *Mith*. 24.

Indebting the ἡγούμενοι

Part of the Nysans' aims in honouring Chairemon, then, was coming to terms with the disruptive effects of personal friendships between their civic leaders and powerful Romans – namely, that such relationships distinguished between loyalties to the city and Roman authorities, and thus threatened conflicts of interest in a time of war. The honours to Chairemon sought to rectify this by re-indebting him to the city, and seem to have been successful in doing so, as some evidence for Chairemon's later public service would suggest.[303] The possibility of such double loyalties, however, by which civic notables were increasingly exposed to alternative allegiances beyond their home communities, was arguably a result of the vagueness of the Romans' position as a hegemonic authority-figure, which still remained largely within the framework of being 'common benefactors' after 129. From this point on they are increasingly referred to as the ἡγούμενοι, 'our rulers':[304] supreme leaders, but ultimately distant, and accessible only through civic intermediaries. This conceptual distance engendered stability, as local citizens provided the political continuity previously afforded by Attalid and Seleukid kings, but also divisions of interest, as individuals like Menippos of Klaros and Chairemon of Nysa had to maintain interests with both their Roman patrons and their cities. Menippos was even an ambassador on the Romans' behalf (ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν), presumably to assist in distributing senatorial decisions to other cities as a Roman 'representative'.[305] This movement towards double loyalties was

[303] Thonemann (2011a) 206 n. 9 for numismatic evidence for a magistrate named Chai[---] between 84/83 and 61/60.
[304] E.g. Menippos: *SEG* 39.1244i l. 19, ii l. 15, iii ll. 11-12; Polemaios' decree uses ἡγούμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι: *SEG* 39.1243ii ll. 14-15, 25, iii ll. 4-5; *I.Priene2014* 65 ll. 100-103. The term may be first attested in the early 2nd-century Abderite decree for Teos, although this is a restoration: *Syll.*[3] 656 l. 21: τοῖ[ς ἡγουμένοι]ς Ῥωμαίων. For ἡγούμενοι in Polybios, Ferrary (1988) 266 n. 2; in public discourse it seems to have predominated only in the period after 129: Drew-Bear (1972) 453-455 and Robert (1969-1990) 2.842-846, and also *I.Aphrodisias2007* 2.503 ll. 7, 24, and 12.103 l. 6 for other attestations, with Mason (1974) 151. Related is ἡγεμόνες, which may refer to Roman magistrates in the imperial period in particular: Robert (1969-1990) 2.845 n. 5.
[305] *SEG* 39.1244iii ll. 6-8, with Ferrary (2008) 141-142.

exacerbated by the first Mithridatic war, when loyalty to a Roman could even override that to the city, and was a dynamic that did not fundamentally change in the period 85-31 BCE. What we do find is an intensification of it, and the honours that such intermediaries received, culminating in 'super-ambassador' figures who had close personal friendships with leading Romans. An important factor in this phenomenon, however, was arguably a large-scale increase in honours for Roman officials who had acted as civic representatives and patrons, which thereby challenged local ambassadors to do the same.

In the aftermath of the first Mithridatic war euergetism by Roman officials ('individual Roman euergetism') becomes a more widespread phenomenon than ever before. The brevity of Mithridates VI's rule in Asia meant that little trace survives of his euergetic interactions with cities, even if there are tantalising signs that he was attempting to re-establish a euergetic persona based on Seleukid and Attalid precedents, in the establishment of satrapal governors, and the patronage of Athena Nikephoros, for instance.[306] His defeat, however, was followed by the increased visibility of Roman officials in the honorific sphere. Of fifty-six statue-bases commemorating individual Roman officials from c. 129 to the end of the Republican period (not counting those for family relations, or the honours for Pompey and Caesar) – that is, governors, legates, quaestors, military officers – only five certainly date to before the treaty of Dardanos in 85 BCE.[307] The chronological shape of this evidence may be in part due to iconoclasm: for instance, the Ephesians' destruction of statues of Romans in the first Mithridatic war.[308] These early pre-85 cases can

[306] Satrapal governors derived from Pontic kingship: McGing (1986) 98-99; patronage of Athena Nikephoros at Pergamon: Plut. *Sull*. 11, with Kohl (2002) 250-251. Mithridates was also received with *apanteseis* by some cities of Asia in 88, evoking royal euergetism: Diod. Sic. 37.26; he was also hailed as Nysios, as part of his self-presentation as Dionysos: Cic. *Flac.* 60-61. He also donated money towards the re-building of Apameia: Strabo 12.8.1.

[307] The key corpora by which this figure was arrived at are those of Tuchelt (1979) and Erkelenz (2003), to which should be added more recently collected material at Kaunos (*I.Kaunos*), Ferrary (2000a), and now Jordan (2019) 332-335; for patrons see Eilers (2002) 191-267. The five cases before 85 are: *IG* XII.4 857 and *I.Magnesia* 123 (M. Popillius Laenas, c. 100), *SEG* 49.1506, 49.1507 (G. Valerius Flaccus and L. Valerius Flaccus, *coss*. 95 and 92), and *I.Ilion* 71 (L. Julius Caesar, 89-87).

[308] App. *Mith.* 21.

nonetheless be set within a context of heightening tensions with Roman authority, as cities came into conflict with increasingly confident and rapacious *publicani*. Thus, L. Julius Caesar preserved the sacred land of Athena Ilias from *publicani* in 89.[309] The sheer chronological concentration of evidence in the half-century after 85 nonetheless suggests that the majority represent euergetic responses to the dire political and economic circumstances faced by many cities after the first Mithridatic war. Sulla's imposition of an indemnity of 20,000 talents racked up borrowing, mortgaging of public property, and deepened the reach of Italian credit in Asia:[310] although alleviated somewhat by Lucullus' measures of 71/70,[311] the dynamic of civic indebtment to increasingly powerful Italian creditors (like Cluvius of Puteoli, who was creditor to five cities in 51/50), combined with further war-time levies and impositions in the Civil War and triumviral periods, must have furnished a continual source of distress.[312] Moreover, many cities lost their free status after 85, making them more liable to exactions by *publicani*, at least until the reforms of Caesar in 48 transferred fiscal responsibilities to the cities themselves.[313]

Nevertheless, the honorific inscriptions themselves are generally reticent about these specific contexts, and the precise benefactions for which such Roman officials were praised. Only a few, including that of Caesar at Ilion, offer such insight, broadly involving services of a political nature: protection during war, restoration of civic rights and territory, and upright tenure of office.[314] The majority follow the pattern of the statue-base for L. Manlius

[309] *I.Ilion* 71, with Wallace (2014) 56-58.
[310] For an overview, Santangelo (2007) 107-133; 20,000 talent indemnity: App. *Mith*. 62; mortgaging of public property: Plut. *Luc.* 20; *publicani* insurgent in Asia even from the late 80s already: Brunt (1990) 1-8.
[311] Lucullus' measures included capping interest-rates at 1% and placing limits on creditor profits on interest: Plut. *Luc.* 20; the numismatic evidence for overstriking, countermarking, and inflation in type-frequency corroborates this dire picture: Crawford (1985) 196.
[312] Cluvius of Puteoli (creditor to Alabanda, Mylasa, Bargylia, Herakleia, Kaunos, and a certain Philokles of Alabanda): Cic. *Fam.* 13.56, and Delrieux (2010); the exactions of Brutus, Cassius, and Antony demanded at least 230,000 talents over 44-40: Kirbihler (2013) 352-359, Plut. *Ant.* 24.
[313] For a list of civic statuses, Santangelo (2007) 122-123; Caesar's elimination of *publicani*: Le Teuff (2017) 61-69.
[314] *IG* XIV 1121 (G. Salluvius Naso protects Abbaeitians and Epiktetes from Mithridates during the war); *I.Pergamon* 410 and *IGR* IV 401 (L. Antonius administers justice in the province 50-49); *I.Pergamon* 413 (Servilius Isauricus restores political rights to Pergamon, 46-44); *I.Magnesia* 142 (Servilius Isauricus, for a

Torquatus, honoured at Miletos sometime in the 80s to 60s BCE as '*legatus pro praetore* on account of his virtue and goodwill towards it'.[315] This preponderance of vagueness is not simply the result of the tendency of honorific inscriptions to focus on the fact of mutual goodwill at the expense of the specificity of the benefaction, but arguably also reflects the systematisation of conceptions of Roman power. It has even been seen as part of the routinisation of honours for Roman officials, whereby such honours were increasingly passed as a matter of administrative procedure.[316] We certainly know that they could have functions extending beyond the transaction between community and honorand alone, and could function as testimony in *repetundae* trials, for example, or as character testimonials useful for pursuing a political career at Rome.[317] This further dimension to honours for Roman officials means that we cannot be sure that they were invariably granted only after the completion of a term of office or a benefaction, and not, for instance, at the start of the term, as a means of pre-empting wrongdoing during their year of service. In any case, Roman officials should be seen to form a distinct category of honorand, tied to the fact of their Roman office – they were not simply conceived as 'foreign' benefactors. The honours for L. Julius Caesar as censor requited him for preserving the sacred land of Athena Ilias, in the first instance, but also acknowledged that the sources of his authority, as censor, lay in the Roman world beyond.[318] They were therefore arguably meant not only to respond to benefaction, but also served to define what Roman office-holding authority meant in local

benefaction to Artemis Leukophryene 46-44); *I.Stratonikeia* 509 (Marcus Cocceius Nerva regains freedom and political rights, 38/37); *SEG* 49.1512 (M. Titius is benefactor of Apollo Klarios, 34-32); exceptionally, *IGR* IV 420 (L. Cornificius for goodwill towards a certain Neon Boubas, 38/37).

[315] *Milet* VI.3 1121. For ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας τῆς εἰς αὐτόν, see also e.g. *SEG* 60.908 ll. 7-8, *I.Priene2014* 233 ll. 4-6.

[316] Frija (2014) 89-90; it is also notable that such honours are known to us exclusively in the form of statue-bases; no decrees for Roman officials are known from Asia.

[317] E.g. as *laudationes* of governors: Cic. *Flac.* 36 (59 BCE, Akmoneia's praise of Flaccus), *QFr.* 2.10.2 (54 BCE, Magnesians on the Sipylos praise Quintus), *Fam.* 3.8.3, 5 (Midiaion, Laodikeia, Apameia, Synnada, Philomelion, Ikonion praise App. Claudius Pulcher).

[318] *I.Ilion* 71.

terms.[319] The main way this happened was in the granting of civic honorific titles. A striking feature of the fifty-six texts is that a majority (thirty-eight of fifty-six) accord the honorand a civic honorific title (εὐεργέτης most commonly, but also occasionally σωτήρ) or the designation as πάτρων; this is the case regardless of office, whether a governor, quaestor, legate or prefect.[320]

What titles aimed at was the embedding of Roman authority within local reciprocal exchange, and, to this extent, one solution to the problem of double loyalty encountered by local elites outlined above. The role of civic πατρωνεία is instructive here. Such relationships were certainly initiated by cities, and most of all by their elites, as the early cases of Menippos and Polemaios in the 110s show.[321] Their integration into the language of civic euergetism, however, in designations of honoured Roman officials as πάτρων, follows the pattern of epigraphic survival for such honorific statue-bases, with only about three instances before 85 BCE, and over fifty in the half-century after it.[322] Thus, L. Sestius was honoured at Pergamon in 54 as 'the quaestor, its (the Pergamene *demos*') patron and benefactor.'[323] Here, the designation as πάτρων is syntactically associated with his title as benefactor as an 'honour', and distinguished from his quaestorship, his 'benefaction'.

[319] Honours for Roman officials, notably, are almost entirely inscribed in Greek, with only a handful of Latin examples, either by resident Roman communities, or bilingual: *SEG* 52.1174 (Sardeis, L. Munatius Plancus, after 88, bilingual), *CIL* III 7160 (Mytilene, M. Titius, 34-32), *AE* 1990 938 (M. Cocceius Nerva, 38/37); a unique case is *IG* XIV 1121 for Gn. Salluvius Naso (after 88), bilingual and set up at Nemi.

[320] This data for titles derives from Erkelenz (2003) 253-255, 281-282, 289, 305-306, 310 and Jordan (2019) 332-335; of the eighteen that do not exhibit titles, however, ten include some qualification of the honorand in traditional terms, either for accomplishing a εὐεργεσία, or in praise ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας τῆς εἰς αὐτόν; the remaining eight have mitigating factors: three are either bilingual or in Latin (*SEG* 52.1174, *IG* XIV 1121, *AE* 1990 938), three are fragmentary (*I.Magnesia* 123, M. Popillius Laenas, 155, Marcus (?), *TAM* V.2 920, L. Antonius), one honours L. Sestius, also honoured at Pergamon as benefactor (*I.Pergamon* 406-407); only L. Julius Caesar (*I.Ilion* 71), as discussed above, is honoured without an honorific title. Instances where only an honorand's Roman office is praised, unaccompanied by any title or designation as πάτρων, are unknown in the Republican period, although a few such cases are attested in the Augustan period, all belonging to popular governors who received honours elsewhere in Asia: Sextus Appuleius (*I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.301), M. Valerius Messalla (*I.Pergamon* 417), C. Marcius Censorinus (*I.Pergamon* 422), P. Vinicius (*I.Knidos* 87).

[321] Eilers (2002) 23-25; the main source for this is the letter of Q. Oppius to Aphrodisias in 85: *I.Aphrodisias2007* 8.2 ll. 16-24.

[322] Eilers (2002) 137-138, 145-146, Santangelo (2007) 129-132; for civic patronage in general, see also Ferrary (1997a) 208-212, 219-224 and (1997b) 105-113, Nicols (2014) 70-74, Canali de Rossi (2001).

[323] *I.Pergamon* 406: ὁ δῆμος ἐτ[ί]μησεν | Λεύκιον Σήστ[ι]ον τὸν τα|μίαν, τὸν ἑαυτ[οῦ] πάτρωνα | καὶ εὐε[ργέτη]ν.

Indeed, this syntactic distinction between the honorand's magistracy and the honorific title as πάτρων seems to have been the main pattern,[324] and is even more distinct in the few cases where only a magisterial office and πατρωνεία are mentioned: so, L. Valerius Flaccus (92 BCE) was described at Klaros as 'proconsul of the Romans, the patron of the city'.[325] The very use of the term πάτρων, nonetheless, reveals the need to characterise a specifically Roman form of reciprocity, in the same way that Roman magistracies were transliterated into Greek, and to this extent πατρωνεία could also form a 'benefaction'. The letter of Q. Oppius to Aphrodisias (c. 85), our major source for understanding how civic patronage was initiated, indicates that the city had justified their request not on the basis of Oppius' goodwill to the city, but rather on that of the Aphrodisians' goodwill – that is, their invitation of πατρωνεία served to initiate a benefaction on the part of Oppius, but was also a commitment that had to be accepted by him, and not only an honour that generated the expectation of benefaction, like the more traditional *proxenia*.[326] In a few honorific inscriptions this character of patronage as benefaction is made explicit, sometimes even with the specification that the honorand 'was a patron' (πάτρων ὤν).[327] While the epigraphic evidence does tend, then, to suggest that πατρωνεία was conceived primarily as an honour, its further unusual character as something of a potential 'benefaction' by the Roman honorand should not be neglected. The difficulty of distinguishing the two rests, moreover, in the fact that it is virtually impossible to tell, in any of the instances, whether πατρωνεία

[324] Other examples of office followed by πάτρων καὶ εὐεργέτης: *SEG* 46.1565 (Pompey, Ilion), *Milet* I.7 253 (Pompey), *I.Ephesos* 2942 (Lucullus), *MAMA* IV 52 (Lucullus, Synnada), *IG* XII.4 857 (M. Popillius Laenas, Kos), *Milet* I.3 173 (M. Pupius Naso Frugi), *I.Kaunos* 111 (G. Fonteius Capito), *AE* 1898 128 (G. Attius Clarus, *praefectus*, saviour, patron, benefactor) *SEG* 49.1511 (Q. Tullius Cicero, Klaros, benefactor of Greeks, patron of the city). Rare cases where an individual is honoured as πάτρων alone may suggest synonymity with εὐεργέτης: *AE* 1932 6 (L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, Chios), *I.Kyme* 16 (Sextus Teidius).
[325] *SEG* 49.1507; other examples at Klaros are *SEG* 49.1506 (G. Valerius Flaccus, 95) and *SEG* 49.1510 (L. Valerius Flaccus, 62), *SEG* 37.959 (M. Valerius Messalla Potitus, 38-35); also *I.Labraunda* 63 (L. Cornelius Lentulus, 82), *I.Nysa* 279 (L. Aelius Tubero, 61-58), *I.Ephesos* 663 (Gn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, 32/31).
[326] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 8.2bii ll. 9-24, with Ferrary (1997a) 211, and (1997b) 109-110, *contra* Bowersock (1965) 12-13 (patronage as an honour only).
[327] *I.Ephesos* 630b ll. 1-2 honours L. Calpurnius for having been a patron (πα[τ]ρωνεύσαντα). Πάτρων with a participle: *I.Ephesos* 663 (Gn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, 32/31), *SEG* 37.959 (M. Valerius Messalla Potitus, Klaros, 38/35), *IG* XII.6 358 (L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, Samos, restored).

had been granted before or after an honorand's Roman magistracy, and which of these stages the surviving inscription records:[328] for instance, the granting of πατρωνεία before office would more likely have been conceived as a 'benefaction' than as an honour granted after tenure. This very ambiguity, however, reveals the way in which πατρωνεία served as a rhetorical space by which cities incorporated the foreignness of euergetism by Roman office-holders, and can thus, in a sense, also be regarded as a hybrid product of Roman magisterial power and local honorific titles – a 'Roman office' that was granted by the civic community.

This sort of role-assignation in relation to individual Romans, powerfully expressed in πατρωνεία, served to establish direct relationships of reciprocity with them, reducing the pressure on local notables, and the challenge of double loyalties, to one's city and to Rome, faced by a Chairemon of Nysa. Certainly, the rise of individual Roman euergetism also gave room for even deeper collusion between notables and Romans.[329] In any case, such Roman honours arguably also influenced the honorific standing of local elites. One reason is that, while being distinct as honours for Roman 'officials', they were in a sense *not distinct enough*: although they embodied the authority of the Roman state, Roman officials were not actually the Roman state itself, in the way that Seleukid kings had embodied the 'Seleukid state'. Nor do we find the sort of ideological penetration known in the late Attalid period, where royal officials, even if local elites, were praised for their beneficence towards the king: none of these Roman officials were praised for 'goodwill to the affairs of the Romans'. Instead, when king-like figures who increasingly embodied the Roman state did emerge from the 60s onwards, in *imperatores* like Pompey, Caesar, and Octavian, new levels of

[328] Ferrary (1997a) 210-211, (1997b) 110-111.
[329] *IGR* IV 420 for a L. Cornificius honoured at Pergamon for his goodwill to a Neon Boubas (38/37), although such explicit qualification is highly anomalous; see also Cic. *QFr.* 1.2.14 (an Attalos of Hypaipa honoured Q. Publicius from his own pocket, c. 59) and Plut. *Cic.* 24.9 (Cicero complains to Pelops of Byzantion for failing to obtain honours for himself), cf. Cic. *Att.* 14.8.

universalising rhetoric had to be concocted, as we shall see later. What the socialisation of the majority of Roman officials with civic honorific titles, even patronage, achieved was rather the crystallisation of their interstitial role, as 'ambassadors' of a special kind. This led to the sense that Roman officials were usurping the ambassadorial status and euergetic standing of local notables, leading inadvertently to an inflation of ambassadorial honours.

Challenges to ambassadorial honourability and the emergence of 'super-ambassadors'

Individual Roman euergetism had important effects on the honorific status of local notables. This section argues that it did so by encouraging cities to enhance the honours they conferred on local ambassadors, as direct connections to the Senate (unmediated by Roman honorands) became more valuable. This propelled some of these local notables to establish ambassadorial personas that even approximated them to such Roman honorands, as close associates of powerful *imperatores*, or 'super-ambassadors'.

The agora of Kaunos in the 1st century BCE was dominated by honorific statues to Romans, apparently to the exclusion of those to local citizens: L. Licinius Murena and his son (83/82), P. Cornelius Sulla (Sulla's nephew, 67), G. Scribonius and wife (54/53), three Antonian supporters (L. Caninus Gallus, M. Barbatius Pollio, G. Fonteius Capito), and other patrons and benefactors.[330] A characteristic feature at Kaunos is the inclusion of the honours conferred in the statue-base inscriptions; this was observed especially scrupulously in honours for Romans. Thus, Publius Cornelius Sulla was honoured 'with a gold crown,

[330] *I.Kaunos* 104-113, 120-122; the only other pre-imperial non-Roman honorands in the agora are the family of Neophron: *I.Kaunos* 92-96 (probably late 2nd BCE); cf. Stoop (2017) 29-30.

honour, and a bronze statue'.[331] The inscription for the quaestor Barbatius Pollio,[332] moreover, even features his status as aedile-elect, a function that held no specific relevance to his role in Asia.[333] This punctiliousness in recording the Roman status and honours of their honorands represents a sort of hyper-correctness, and suggests the Kaunians' keenness to over-compensate, before their Roman benefactors, for their prominent participation in the Italian vespers of 88, for which they had been punished with subjection to Rhodes.[334] The respective honorific statuses of L. Licinius Murena at Kaunos and Rhodes differ here in interesting ways. Murena had freed the city from Rhodian subjection in 81 BCE, for which he was called benefactor and saviour, and even received an equestrian statue;[335] the Rhodians in the same period 83-81 only granted him *proxenia*.[336] While this is due in part to Murena's respective roles in the two cities, it is also indicative of the different levels of ambassadorial influence each could exert. Unlike Kaunos, Rhodes' capacity for ambassadorial activity had not been arrogated by Roman benefactors, as the later mission of Apollonios Molon to reverse Murena's liberation of Kaunos would show.[337] This effect is magnified by the fact that Murena's *proxenia* is attested only in the statue-base for a Rhodian ambassador, who was praised for interceding between him and the city.[338] We do not even know if Murena received a statue at Rhodes. At Kaunos, by contrast, he not only obtained an equestrian statue, but seems thereby to have initiated new honorific standards, so that later Roman benefactors, too, would obtain statues in the forum.

Klaros offers a similar example of Roman honorands usurping honorific space, where the monumental statues for Menippos and Polemaios along the Sacred Way were

[331] *I.Kaunos* 106 ll. 1-5; the inclusion of honours can be seen in *I.Kaunos* 90, for Stratios, of the mid-2nd century; see further Ma (2013) 32-33.
[332] *I.Kaunos* 110.
[333] Caninus Gallus's base (*I.Kaunos* 109) similarly records his status as praetor-elect and *praefectus classis*.
[334] App. *Mith.* 22, and Marek (1988) 304-307 for Kaunian history in the early 1st century.
[335] *I.Kaunos* 104.
[336] *IG* XII.1 48 ll. 5-6.
[337] Strabo 14.2.3.
[338] *IG* XII.1 48.

succeeded throughout the 1st century only by statues for Romans.[339] Some cities, nevertheless, maintained proud ambassadorial independence, as the case of Rhodes shows. Certainly, the concretisation of Roman power in Asia in the years after 85 may have entailed greater gubernatorial oversight over the conduct of civic embassies: whereas in the 120s BCE a civic ambassador from Asia could ride through Italy with the pomp of a funeral cortege, and insolently flog a Venusine peasant who had dared to mock him,[340] by 51 BCE the lavishness of ambassadorial expenditure was strictly curtailed by gubernatorial audit.[341] These legal limitations may have encouraged the acquisition of civic patrons, to the detriment of civic ambassadors. In the Mylasan decree for Iatrokles, a major local figure who had saved citizens from mounting post-war debt, and supplied oil and grain for the community, the only major ambassadorial accomplishment recorded is a meeting with the new governor M. Junius Silanus, on his arrival in Asia, to secure his continued goodwill towards Mylasa as its patron:[342] diplomatic affairs between Rome and Mylasa would be mediated through Silanus, and not Iatrokles. This delimitation of ambassadorial horizons to the province alone, and not apparently beyond it to Rome itself, is perceptible also in 1st-century decrees for ambassadors from Priene and Tabai.[343] The consequences of such limitation may have been that some cities, especially those with privileged relationships with Rome, became 'specialists' in dealing with Roman authorities and the Senate: it is striking for instance that we know of two Stratonikeians (Stratonikeia had been granted freedom by

[339] Ferrary (2000a).
[340] Gell. *NA* 10.3.5 = *ORF*[4] 48, 49.8; for this as a Greek ambassador, see Canali de Rossi (1997) 268 n. 313.
[341] Cic. *Fam.* 3.8.2-5, 3.10.6. This may be a legacy of Sulla's *lex Cornelia*: Coudry and Kirbihler (2010) 139-143.
[342] *I.Mylasa* 109 ll. 14-18.
[343] Krates travelled twice to Pergamon to visit G. Julius Caesar (c. 92), and later to Ephesos to meet L. Lucilius: *I.Priene2014* 67 ll. 14-15, 115-118, 139-143 (governor unknown, but probably Caesar, and on the salt-pans; cf. ll. 47-49). He travelled once to Rome, but probably with the help of Lucilius: *I.Priene2014* 67 ll. 140-141, also 147-148 and 116-117; cf. Heller (2006) 49. Herakleitos seems only to have met the governor: *I.Priene2014* 71 ll. 47-49. *I.Priene 2014* 75 ll. 21-24 mentions journeys to numerous cities in Asia, and even to Seleukos VI of Syria, alongside embassies only otherwise to governors and officials, but not the Senate. Two other fragmentary early 1st-century decrees mention trips specifically to the governor at Ephesos: *I.Priene 2014* 77 ll. 6-7 and 85 ll. 7-9. At Tabai, an unknown honorand was praised only for accomplishing embassies ἐν Ἀσίᾳ, while another Tabaian was a member of Dolabella's council (c. 43): *La Carie* 7 ll. 6-7, 6 ll. 5-6.

Sulla in 81) who were highly respected in this regard – a Posidippos and Hermias, with the latter even invited by the Daulians in Phokis to intercede for them before the ἡγούμενοι.[344] Moreover, civic ambassadors who did manage to travel directly to Rome received greater honorific recognition than before. In the late 80s, Pyrrhakos of Alabanda had received a statue for serving as ambassador in various contexts, including travelling to Rome to renew the city's friendship and alliance.[345] When he later died while on another mission, having since travelled again to the Senate to confirm Alabanda's tax-immunity (ll. 25-34), Pyrrhakos was further honoured later with a crown and the annual proclamation of both it and his earlier statue-honour (ll. 40-47); there was special concern to capture the moment of the second honour, as the unusual preliminary clause οἰόμεθα [δεῖν τὴν βου]λὴν ψηφίσασθαι indicates.[346] Elsewhere, we find 1st-century examples of statues being awarded, it would seem solely, for ambassadorial services,[347] and even of posthumous honours for individuals specifically describing their capacity as ambassadors at the moment of death – Posidippos of Stratonikeia mentioned above is one such case.[348]

The most striking example of honorific elevation for ambassadorial service, however, must be Diodoros Pasparos of Pergamon.[349] He had obtained relief for the city in the late 70s BCE, as it still reeled from the harsh effects of Sulla's impositions, in the lowering of high interest-rates, liberation of captured citizens, restitution of property, and

[344] Posidippos of Stratonikeia: *I.Stratonikeia* 1206; Hermias: *F.Delphes* III.4 69 ll. 17-20, 4-5 for the invitation (παρακληθείς) by the Daulians' archons. See also Theopompos of Knidos below.
[345] *I.Nordkarien* 211 ll. 1-25.
[346] Gauthier (2005b) 88-89.
[347] The Ephesians (c. 100) honoured Artemidoros with a bronze statue for defending the Artemision from the *publicani* at Rome: Strabo 14.1.26, Ampolo (2008); two 1st-century bases at Pergamon for the athlete Hippolochos and philosopher Apollophanes honour their embassies to Rome: *IGR* IV 495, *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 408 n. 38; likewise, for a a Menekles (?) around 39 BCE, with a gilt statue: *Milet* VI.3 1091.
[348] Furthermore, the funeral epigram of a Damodike at Kyme mentions her husband had been on embassy at Rome at the time: *I.Kyme* 46 ll. 8-9; the life of Chairylos of Kos, dating to the period of the Mithridatic wars, was memorable solely for his embassy to the Senate concerning the laws and constitution of the city: *IG* XII.4 1036 ll. 5-9, with Buraselis (2000) 13-20.
[349] Jones (1974) and (2000) decisively dates him to the early 1st century BCE, *contra* the higher dating to the late 2nd century of Musti (2005a), (2005b), and (2009); for a detailed account and chronology of the other decrees relating to his gymnasiarchy, Chankowski (1998).

reduction of fiscal obligations.[350] The honours he received in return were staggering: an *aristeios* crown, seating privileges at games, multiple statues (gilt, equestrian, bronze colossal, bronze colossal equestrian), and the apparatus of a local hero-cult, including a cult-statue, a sacred day (his date of return from Rome, 8th Apollonios), an eponymously named tribe (Paspareis), priesthood, and shrine (the Diodoreion); he would also receive intramural burial.[351] The tone of these honours is remarkable in its resemblance to living Hellenistic ruler-cult of the 3rd and 2nd centuries, and its evocations of Attalid tradition.[352] Why precisely Diodoros was thought worthy of them is not entirely clear: his benefactions in this decree are only the last surviving portions of a longer section of considerations. One factor, however, may have been his closeness to Roman authorities, as a later decree reveals:[353] he was probably known personally to Lucullus, whose measures in relieving the province of exorbitant interest-rates closely matches Diodoros' activities.[354] Cultic honour may thus have served to characterise a new level of ambassadorial influence and standing *vis-à-vis* Roman authorities, marked by close personal relationships, and not merely the fact he had communicated directly with Rome. In any case, the localised character of his honours, in their concern to embed Diodoros in Pergamene ritual time, clearly present him as a local counterpoint, even conceptual equal, to the city's Roman benefactors.[355]

Some corroboration for this reading is found in figures who lived in the decades after Diodoros (roughly 70-30), whose relationships with their Roman patrons went beyond those that Menippos and Polemaios of Klaros, and even perhaps Diodoros himself, entertained:

---

[350] *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 5 ll. 4-14.
[351] *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 5 ll. 21-46, 51-54 with Fröhlich (2013) 259-261.
[352] Notably, the echoes of the late Attalid decree for Attalos III, *OGIS* 332: Gauthier (1985) 62-63, and Virgilio (1993) 85-94 and (1994).
[353] *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 6γ ll. 15-16 for his influence (ἐντροπή) with the Romans.
[354] Plut. *Luc.* 20, and also App. *Mith.* 63 (mortgaging of public buildings and piracy) and Plut. *Sull.* 25.2 (rapacity of billeting soldiery), with Jones (1974) 190-197.
[355] He is later offered prayers second in precedence only to those for Manius Aquillius, thus placing him on par with other succeeding governors: *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 6γ ll. 24-25; Lucullus received cult honours in 71/70 as well: Plut. *Luc.* 23.2; The governors M. Junius (75/74) and P. Cornelius Dolabella (68) honoured as benefactors: *I.Pergamon* 408, 405; the legate G. Sornatius: *IGR* IV 437.

Theophanes of Mytilene, Theopompos of Knidos, and Diodoros' political successor Mithridates, who formed a class of 'super-ambassadors', who not only served their cities, but were also long-term counsellors, close friends, and military lieutenants of Pompey and Caesar, and participated directly in the upheavals of the Civil War years.[356] Their exceptional ('mega-') honours, including titles of founder and even divine cult, comprise attempts to capture their new ambassadorial standing as intimates of powerful Roman benefactors – benefactors who were also now their personal patrons. 'Mega'-honour allowed cities to articulate relationships with these Roman benefactors through their 'super-ambassadors', sometimes even elevating the latter at the expense of the former. Theophanes had regained freedom for his native Mytilene in 67 through his patron Pompey;[357] the honorific statue commemorating this act does not mention Pompey, however, but only 'the common benefactor Romans'.[358] In a later triptychal dedicatory inscription we find Theophanes honoured in the centre as benefactor, saviour, second founder (δεύτερος κτίστης) of the city, and even equated to Zeus Eleutherios, while flanked by dedications to Pompey and the later politician Potamon: both are only honoured as benefactor, saviour, and founder, and therefore clearly regarded as subordinate to Theophanes within Mytilenian honorific hierarchy.[359]

At Knidos, Theopompos and family were revered for their signal role in liberating their city and obtaining an alliance with Rome; while this treaty was inscribed for public display, the honorific exedra that commemorated Theopompos, his wife, and children – such

[356] Theophanes: Labarre (1996a) 92-99, Gold (1985), Thériault (2011) 56-58, Santangelo (2018); Mithridates: Hepding (1909) and Heinen (1994); Theopompos and family: Thériault (2003) and Bruns-Özgan (2009) 103-113.
[357] Vell. Pat. 2.18.3, Plut. *Pom.* 42.4, with Labarre (1996b).
[358] *SEG* 62.493; he reclaimed the city, its territory, freedom, and ancestral rites, παρὰ τῶν κοινῶν εὐεργετᾶν Ρωμ[αί]ων (l. 3); Pompey unmentioned: Robert (1969) 61.
[359] *IG* XII.2 163; Pompey was also widely honoured across Lesbos as saviour and founder in 67: *IG* XII.2 202, 140-147, 163a, Suppl. 39-40; cf. Heller (2020) 32-33. The title δεύτερος κτίστης is also attested for Panaitios of Rhodes: Dorandi (1994) 122 cols. 72 and 171, with Ferrary (1997b) 119 n. 57; this was probably a first-century re-imagining of Panaitios' local status.

publicly erected exedras being rare and an exceptional public honour –[360] makes no mention of Rome, but focuses only on their civic virtuousness in restoring Knidos' democratic constitution.[361] Moreover, at a later stage Theopompos' son Artemidoros even received divine honours, including ten statues (one would share temple-space with Artemis Hyakinthotrophos), intramural burial, and an eponymous penteteric festival.[362] The honours for Theophanes and Theopompos' family were therefore deliberately localising, and intended to present them as something like 'patrons' – local equivalents to the benefactions that were equally due to their own personal patrons, Pompey and Caesar. At Knidos, Caesar had also been honoured with a statue as patron and benefactor.[363] Likewise, at Pergamon two decades after Diodoros, Mithridates son of Menodotos was honoured (around 48) as the 'new founder after Pergamos and Philetairos' (μετὰ Πέργαμον καὶ Φιλέταιρον νέον κτίστην) after retrieving civic territory for the city.[364] He must have achieved this through intercession with Caesar, however, as Caesar too received two statues from this event, and honours as saviour and benefactor for restoring civic territory (in similar wording to Mithridates' bases).[365] In 46-44, the governor Servilius Isauricus would also be honoured as saviour and benefactor for restoring the city's ancestral laws and democracy.[366] The highly Pergamon-specific traits exhibited in Mithridates' statues, emphasising both his founder-status and his local offices of high-priest and priest of Dionysos Kathegemon, were therefore arguably intended to present local counterparts to the Roman euergetism of Caesar and Isauricus. These mega-honours did not necessarily accord him an honorific status superior to theirs,

[360] Ma (2013) 236.
[361] Treaty with Rome: *I.Knidos* 33 and Famerie (2009); for Theopompos' intercession, Plut. *Caes.* 48. The honorific exedra: *I.Knidos* 51 ll. 5-7, 52 ll. 9-10, 53 ll. 6-8, 54 ll. 8-11, 55 ll. 8-11.
[362] *I.Knidos* 59; these were ἰσόθεοι τιμαί (l. 19); cf. Price (1984) 48-49, Strubbe (2004) 324, and Bruns-Özgan (2009) 109-111.
[363] *I.Knidos* 41.
[364] Hepding (1909) 330-331 ns. i ll. 4-6 and ii ll. 3-5.
[365] *I.Pergamon* 379, ll. 2-6, *I.Pergamon* 380, ll. 1-5; a fragmentary letter of Caesar mentions Mithridates in relation to restoration of *asylia*: *I.Smyrna* 590 ll. 4, 13; cf. Segre (1938b).
[366] *I.Pergamon* 413.

however, as with Theophanes at Mytilene: receiving only two statues (so far as we can tell), Mithridates would have been much less visible than Caesar, who obtained at least five statues.[367] The point was rather, as happened in slightly different ways at Mytilene and Knidos, to articulate local ambassadorial agency more distinctly within the context of undeniable Roman euergetism.[368]

These civic characterisations of exceptional ambassadorial status must also, however, be read in light of the 'honours' that all three individuals received from their patrons, in the form of Roman citizenship (Theophanes, Theopompos, Artemidoros), and even rulership of states – Mithridates was appointed ruler of Galatia and Bosporos by Caesar in the 40s.[369] This sort of closeness to the leading personalities of Roman power is likely to have been exceptional within the ranks of *polis* elites, but undoubtedly reflects a pattern of activity ranging across the Civil War and triumviral decades largely unprecedented in the 3rd and 2nd centuries: namely, the rapid ascension in political and social fortunes of citizen elites afforded by patronal ties to super-*imperatores*, a Pompey, Caesar, Antony or Octavian. Chairemon of Nysa's son Pythodoros attained the wealth of a king, spanning over 2,000 talents, through friendship with Pompey;[370] his son-in-law Polemon was subsequently made ruler of Ikonion, and then Pontos, by Antony and Octavian.[371] The Antonian era (c. 42-31), in particular, abounds in obscure figures, whose existence nevertheless compels us to consider how Roman gift-giving altered local political dynamics: Kleon of Gordioukome, made a dynast in Mysian Olympos for loyalty during Labienus' invasion, a Curtius Nikias, made tyrant of Kos, or Anaxenor of Magnesia (a favourite kitharode of Antony), given the

[367] Three other statues: *IGR* IV 305 (l. 3 patron and benefactor), *I.Pergamon* 377 (l. 4, saviour and benefactor), 378 (ll. 3-4 common benefactor of the Greeks).
[368] Note that in 49/48 the Pompeian Q. Caecilius Scipio had already been hailed as saviour and benefactor: *I.Pergamon* 411 ll. 4-5.
[369] Cass. Dio 42.48.4. Caes. *BCiv* 26.1, 78.2, Strabo 13.4.3; for the politics of the Bosporan appointment, Heinen (1994) 74-79.
[370] Strabo 14.1.42.
[371] Ikonion: Strabo 12.6.1; Pontos: Thonemann (2011a) 208-209 and Campanile (2012) 244-248.

command of the taxes of four cities.[372] While these were undoubtedly major local figures, the patronal power of a super-*imperator* could provide distance from their *polis* identities, and even offer metamorphosis from citizens to kings, like Polemon and Mithridates. Theophanes and Theopompos seem to have acquired regional renown across the eastern Mediterranean, becoming something like Roman patrons themselves: Theopompos was even honoured at Knidos by Laodikeia-on-the-Sea and the resident Roman community.[373] Another Knidian and member of the entourage of Caesar, Kallistos, was described as having 'much influence' (πλείστην ῥοπήν) among the Romans, and honoured at Delphi as a benefactor of the Greeks. Significantly, his honours, including a bronze statue, were reported only to him personally, and not also to Knidos: that is, Kallistos' public identity was not tied specifically to his *polis*.[374] Likewise, Theopompos and his sons Artemidoros and Hippokritos are listed in the Knidian treaty with Rome as entities separate to Knidos' official embassy.[375]

The emergence of these 'super-ambassadors' in the decades after Diodoros Pasparos reflects the opportunism and tumult of the Civil War and triumviral periods, but are also the long-term results of local attempts to circumvent constraints on ambassadorial activity brought about by the rise of individual Roman euergetism, as leading citizens nurtured close and longstanding patronal relations with the leading senators of Rome as alternatives to confronting gubernatorial administration. The Theophaneses and Theopomposes of the triumviral period did this only too well, receiving rewards and privileges that presented

[372] Kleon: Strabo 12.8.8-9; Augustus later awarded him the priesthood of Pontic Komana, for which he renamed Gordioukome Juliopolis, cf. Syme (1995) 169; Nikias: Herzog (1922) 190-216, Buraselis (2000) 30-65, Yarrow (2006) 33-36; Anaxenor: Strabo 14.1.41, Plut. *Ant.* 24, and *I.Magnesia* 129. Other Antonian appointments include Adiatorix, tyrant of Herakleia Pontike, and Straton, tyrant of Amisos: Strabo 12.3.6, 12.3.14.

[373] Theophanes: a number of commemorative bowls and plates across the eastern Mediterranean engraved with his portrait, found (apart from Lesbos) at Athens, Corinth, Delos, Rhodes, Alexandria, the Fayum, and Samaria, suggest widespread influence: Grimm (2004) 68-69; Theopompos' honours: *I.Knidos* 58 and 701.

[374] *F.Delphes* III.3 480 ll. 10, 16-17, 22-27.

[375] Famerie (2009) 266 ll. 6-9, with Ferrary (2005) 57.

concrete alternatives to those available at their home cities. Beyond awards of Roman citizenship or fiefdoms, the gifts of powerful Romans could have very real impacts on local euergetic ethic. In documents like Lucullus' letter to Mopsuestia on the privileges granted Diodotos (c. 85), the *senatus consultum* on three loyal captains of the Mithridatic War (78), or the dossier relating to Seleukos of Rhosos (40), who received citizenship from Octavian, we find grants of immunity from local taxes,[376] and privileges in judicial matters, including the right to choose a court of appeal outside one's city, or the right to appeal to the Senate in legal disputes.[377] The grant of citizenship to Seleukos of Rhosos also entailed the right to settle in Italy, and was further extended also to his family members.[378]

The mega-honours these 'super-ambassadors' sometimes received at home, then, arguably also formed local responses to their privileged positions as clients of leading Romans. In the terms of reciprocal gift-exchange, privileges from Roman patrons formed a counter-gift tantamount to the benefactions conferred on the client's home city – the freeing of Mytilene and Knidos, restitution of Pergamene territory – which Theophanes, Theopompos and Mithridates had earned through the 'gift' of loyal service to Pompey and Caesar; their civic honours comprise the other end of this exchange, in the counter-gifts offered by their cities in requital for these benefactions, but also for the privileges conferred on them by their patrons. The heavily localising tone of the honours for Diodoros, Theophanes, and Mithridates presented counterweights to their increasingly *polis*-independent statuses; Anaxenor of Magnesia was also honoured in terms close to divinity, with his statue clad in the purple of Zeus Sosipolis,[379] while Nikias was called saviour,

[376] Lucullus granted local fiscal immunity to Diodotos: *SEG* 44.1227 ll. 23-29; the *senatus consultum* on Asklepiades of Klazomenai, Polystratos of Karystos, and Meniskos of Miletos granted them immunity from financial obligations and liturgies in their cities, as well as the need to contribute to public debt, or provincial taxes: *RDGE* 22a ll. 8-9, b l. 12; a ll. 15-16, b l. 22; a l. 16, b l. 23; these may have been separate from the grant of status as *amici populi Romani* listed at a ll. 17-18, b ll. 24-26: Raggi (2001) 109-113.
[377] *RDGE* 22a ll. 11-14, b ll. 17-20; a ll. 18-19, b ll. 26-28.
[378] *SEG* 54.1625 l. 27; immunities were not necessarily tied to citizenship, however, as the clauses show: Raggi (2006) 125-145.
[379] *I.Magnesia* 129, known to Strabo (14.1.41); cf. Buraselis (2000) 131.

benefactor, son of the people, and even ἥρως, implying living cult honours.[380] Marks of Roman client-status formed part of their honours, in the inclusion of their Roman *gentilicia* on Theophanes' and Theopompos' statue-bases,[381] and the stylising of their honorific portraits in the hard-edged realist mode adopted by φιλορώμαιος client-rulers like Tarkondimontos and Ariobarzanes I of Kappadokia.[382] Such honours as civic founders and even cult, while defining and elevating the political identity of their honorands above other citizens, were nevertheless fundamentally still aimed at grounding their honorands and their families within euergetic bonds to the city, in response to, or perhaps even anticipation of, the privileges they stood to gain as Roman clients. Thus Epikrates of Miletos, another local worthy who received Roman citizenship from Octavian after 39, and posthumous heroic honours from the city, was praised in his honorific decree for having contributed to public debts – an obligation from which the three captains of 78 BCE had been declared exempt, for example.[383] More telling is the case of Asklepiades of Kyzikos, who had fought at the battle of Alexandria in 49 under Caesar, and seems to have received the title of οἰκιστής (an alternative to κτίστης) and heroic honours at Kyzikos, including commemorative contests, on this account alone.[384] It may be that in this case heroic honours were intended to pre-empt the deracination of Asklepiades and his family by embedding him irreversibly in local cultic time.

[380] For Nikias' dedications, *IG* XII.4 682-711, only 689 does not call him ἥρως. Cf. Buraselis (2000) 63-64.
[381] *SEG* 62.493, *I.Knidos* 51, 57-58, 701.
[382] Pasparos' portrait head: Smith (1988a) 105-6, 131-132; Theophanes' portrait head: Salzmann (1985) 253-255, 258-260; Nikias: coins also present φιλορώμαιος-style portraits imitating busts of Octavian: *RPC* I 2724-2731 with Smith (1988a) 131. For the Romanising veristic style in late Hellenistic φιλορώμαιος portraiture, Smith (1988b).
[383] *SEG* 44.940b ll. 7-8; see also *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.103 l. 9 (Kallikrates of Aphrodisias).
[384] *SEG* 55.1329 ll. 11-13: ἐν τοῖς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν τιθεμ[έ]νο[ις εὐχ]αριστηρίοις ἀγῶσιν Ἡρώοις τῷ πάπ|πωι αὐτοῦ Ἀσκληπιάδηι τῶι οἰκ[ίστηι καὶ τ]οῖς συναγωνισαμένοις αὐτῶι κατ' Ἀ|λεξανδρεία<ν> ἐν τῶι [κα]τ[ὰ] Πτο[λεμ]α[ῖον πο]λ[έ]μῳ, and Chiricat (2005) 214-222, especially 220-221.

Ambassadors of the province

While the proliferation of individual Roman euergetism over the 1st century BCE was therefore arguably a disruptive force in encouraging the emergence of increasingly independent civic ambassadors, this did not result, at the end of the Republic, in the widespread unshackling of civic elites from their local communities.[385] Instead, what one does find, traceable already in the triumviral period, is the emergence of super-ambassador-esque figures who were firmly established as regional figures: beyond the highly mobile careers of the adventurous Theophanes, Mithridates, and Theopompos, were those of men who seem to have been based primarily within Asia, like Hybreas of Mylasa, Epikrates of Miletos and Xenon of Thyateira.[386] All likewise received Roman citizenship from Octavian, most probably as a result of displaying loyalty during the invasion of Labienus in 39, but none became close advisors to him or Antony, even if they knew them personally.[387] They received heroic honours, but these must be seen in the context of a new sort of honorific status – that which was to be gained within the framework of the province, and in particular the *koinon* of Asia, as will be presently argued. Its antecedents in the 1st century BCE form an important counterpoint to the disruptiveness implied by the euergetic interactions of Asia's cities with its Roman rulers, and therefore deserve brief treatment before concluding this chapter.

While the *koinon* of Asia may have existed in an embryonic form in the late 2nd century,[388] it is first properly attested as an association of 'the cities and peoples of Asia' in

[385] As implied somewhat by Ferrary (1997a) 204.
[386] Hybreas: Strabo 14.2.24, with Marasco (1992) 37-59, Noè (1996) and Delrieux and Ferriès (2004a), (2004b); for coins of Hybreas, Ashton (1990); Epikrates: Herrmann (1994), Ferrary (2005) 58-61; Xenon: *TAM* V.2 1098, Strubbe (1984-1986) 299, (2004) 327.
[387] The distinction between earlier and later recipients of citizenship under Caesar and Octavian should therefore be noted, *pace* the 'Gaii Julii' of Robert (1966) 418-422: Ferrary (2005) 58-61.
[388] As a βουλευτήριον κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν νομοθεσίαν: *SEG* 50.1211 ll. 13-14; for the early *koinon*, see also Deininger (1965) 14-16, Vitale (2012) 62-63.

honours for Roman governors: an eponymous festival for Q. Mucius Scaevola in the 90s, responding to his restoration of civic judicial authority, similar festival honours for L. Valerius Flaccus in the same decade, and Lucullus in the late 70s.[389] In the decades following, however, there is little evidence for cults or honours for Roman officials organised at the provincial level. Certainly, we find honours for individual officials and *imperatores* that had resonance within a provincial framework, like L. Antonius (50/49) and M. Cocceius Nerva (38/37), who were praised for service to the ἐπαρχεία,[390] while individual honours for Aemilius Lepidus (early 1st BCE) and Q. Cicero (61-59) laud services 'to the Greeks'.[391] With super-*imperatores* like Pompey and Caesar an elevated rhetoric develops. Half of the statue-bases for Pompey from 67-62 honour him for establishing peace 'across land and sea'.[392] The next certain example of *koinon* honours for a Roman after Lucullus, however, is an Ephesian base for Caesar calling him the manifest god, descendant of Aphrodite and Ares and common saviour of human life.[393] Whether or not this actually implies a *koinon* cult for Caesar is highly uncertain,[394] and in any case the numerous other statues honouring him across Asia make no specific mention of *koinon* honours, or his divine status,[395] even if the similarity in wording, often including praise of his beneficence to the

[389] Μουκιεῖα: Ferriès and Delrieux (2011) 210-224; Φλάκκεια: Cic. *Flac.* 55-56, with Erkelenz (1999); Λευκόλλεια, Plut. *Luc.* 23.2; in general, Thériault (2012) 377-381, Mileta (2008) 102-107.
[390] L. Antonius: *I.Pergamon* 410 ll. 4-5, *IGR* IV 401 l. 4; M. Cocceius Nerva: *SEG* 4.604 ll. 3-4.
[391] Lepidus: *I.Priene2014* 233 ll. 5-6; Q. Cicero: *SEG* 49.1511 ll. 5-6; for Ἕλληνες as referring to the *koinon*, Ferrary (2001a) 20-26.
[392] Of nine statue-bases known, five comprise honours to Pompey as imperator, benefactor, patron, and saviour: *I.Ilion* 74, *IG* XII.5 627 Keos, *TAM* V.2 1427 (Thyateira), *IG* XII.6 352, *Milet* I.7 253; four, however, include praise of his services to land and sea: *SEG* 46.1565 ll. 7-8 (Ilion), *IG* XII.2 202 ll. 4-7 (Mytilene); the bases at Klaros and Miletoupolis describe Pompey as γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης ἐπόπτης: *SEG* 49.1509 ll. 4-5, *I.Miletoupolis* 24 ll. 6-8. Possible Pompeian initiative: Ferrary (2000a) 343-344.
[393] *I.Ephesos* 251 ll. 5-7: τὸν ἀπὸ Ἄρεως καὶ Ἀφροδε[ί]|της θεὸν ἐπιφανῆ καὶ κοινὸν τοῦ | ἀνθρωπίνου βίου σωτῆρα.
[394] Mileta (2008) 107 believes so.
[395] Caesar's honours: Raubitschek (1954), with *SEG* 15.748 (Phokaia). The other examples only praise him as 'saviour of the world' (*IG* XII.5 557 l. 3, Karthaia), or benefactor of the Greeks: Zolotas (1908) 238 n. 51 ll. 6-8 (Chios, benefactor and saviour), *IG* XII.6 389 ll. 4-6 (Samos), *IGR* IV 305 l. 5 (Pergamon), *SEG* 15.748 l. 5 (Phokaia).

Greeks, suggests the sort of provincial framework perceptible in the honours for L. Antonius or M. Cocceius Nerva.

While the province did facilitate the honouring of governors, the relative paucity of active *koinon* honours for Romans across the late Republic suggests that such collective honouring formed only a minor part of its activities; this may be due in part to the modesty of Roman honorands.[396] Another factor, however, is the *koinon*'s own emergent role in enhancing, even superseding, local ambassadorial activity by communicating directly with Rome, and by-passing gubernatorial administration. It is not coincidental that the concretisation of the *koinon* as a provincial association of cities seems to have intensified only after the Mithridatic war, at the same time as individual Roman euergetism and civic patronage were increasingly prevalent, and Roman provincial administration more intrusive.[397] In the years after 85 we find ambassadorial representatives to Rome representing the interests of Asia at large;[398] Diodoros Pasparos, although honoured by Pergamon, was praised for serving the inhabitants of the province.[399] In the 60s or 50s the *koinon* even honoured two such representatives, two Aphrodisians Dionysios and Hierokles, for standing up for the province's rights at Rome in the face of rapacious *publicani*.[400] The honorific status they received was province-wide, in a statue commemorating honours by the *koinon* itself (ll. 25-30). Moreover, the fact they were chosen from among the 'first and most honoured' men of the province (ll. 7-8) hints at the emergence of provincial gradations of honour around ambassadorial representation. Around this time, Pythodoros of Nysa and Euthydemos of Mylasa, too, could be known as leading men in 'Asia'; Pythodoros may even

[396] Cicero and his brother rejected honours by the *koinon* in 61-59: Cic. *QFr.* 1.1.26.
[397] Campanile (2007), Edelmann-Singer (2015) 60-71.
[398] Diodoros Zonas of Sardeis, Xenokles of Adramytteion, Aeschines of Miletos: Strabo 13.4.9, 13.1.66, 14.1.7.
[399] *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 5 ll. 3, 16.
[400] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 2.503; the dating here follows that of Jordan (2019) 98-100.

have held an early form of the asiarchy.[401] It is this formalisation of provincial honorific status that must underpin the change in the titulature of the *koinon*, which had more or less arrived at 'the *koinon* of the Greeks in Asia', and 'the cities and peoples in Asia', by the 60s or 50s of the Aphrodisians' decree (ll. 5, 22, 23, 25-26, 29); the former would be the dominant form in the early empire.[402] In earlier decrees before 85, however, we also find the additional phrase including 'those judged to be in friendship with the Romans' (οἱ κατ' ἄνδρα κεκριμένοι ἐν τῆι πρὸς Ῥωμαίους φιλίαι):[403] that is, a special category of elite citizen defined by inscription into the *formula amicorum*. Its disappearance by the 60s may reflect a concern to mitigate against the emergence of independent ambassadorial, supra-*polis* actors who had obtained special privileges through their Roman patrons, like Theophanes of Mytilene and Mithridates of Pergamon.[404]

One product of this interest in constraining the ambitions of local notables seems to have been Hybreas of Mylasa. A civic notable who enjoyed regional influence, he openly spoke on behalf of Asia when Antony imposed harsh requisitions in 40, and decried the damage caused by Antony's 'super-ambassador' clients, whereby 'the property of the well-born had been handed to flatterers and scoundrels' – individuals like the kitharode Anaxenor of Magnesia.[405] Hybreas did not become the client of Octavian, even when he obtained Roman citizenship for service during the invasion of Labienus, but seems to have turned such privileges primarily towards consolidating his prestige within the province. His contemporaries Epikrates of Miletos and Xenon of Thyateira followed a similar pattern, receiving the Julian *gentilicia*, but only pursuing regional status: while Epikrates gained

[401] Strabo knew Pythodoros as one of Asia's ἀσιάρχαι: 14.1.42; Euthydemos: 14.2.24.
[402] The *koinon* is only presented as 'the Greeks of Asia', and sometimes as 'Asia' alone, in honorific decrees and inscriptions up to the early 2nd century CE; in roughly chronological order: *I.Sardis* 8 (see chapter 4), *I.Priene2014* 14, Müller and Staab (2017) 344, *I.Pergamon* 538, *AvP* VIII.3 19, *I.Smyrna* 591, *I.Tralleis* 65, *TAM* V.2 973, *I.Laodikeia am Lykos* 82.
[403] *OGIS* 438 ll. 2-3 and *IGR* IV 291 l. 1; the title should be restored for *I.Ephesos* 205 ll. 1-2, *OGIS* 439 ll. 1-2.
[404] Raggi (2010) 149-150 points also to increasing grants of Roman citizenship as a factor.
[405] Plut. *Ant.* 24.4.

territorial privileges for Miletos as ambassador to Augustus,[406] he would also be ranked, like Xenon, among the 'first' men in Asia; both were early high-priests of the imperial cult (see chapter 4).[407] Importantly, none of these three men received divine cult like Theophanes or Artemidoros, but only heroic cult (all were called ἥρως).[408] The fact that Xenon was honoured by the Jouliastai, an otherwise unknown cultic association whose name was formed on Julius (and not on Xenon) may indicate a province-wide response to the novel phenomenon of Gaii Julii like Xenon, Epikrates and Hybreas;[409] this would suggest heroic honours may have formed a 'regularised' way of talking about notables who were honourable at the provincial, and not just civic, level. Perhaps the best exemplification of the constraining effect of the *koinon* in mitigating against the 'super-ambassador' phenomenon, however, is Theophanes' political successor at Mytilene, Potamon.[410] Over his long life he served several times as ambassador to Caesar and Augustus, and nurtured friendships with leading Romans; he never obtained Roman citizenship, however, and maintained strong attachment to his native city, contributing to its cults, the *koinon* of the Lesbians, and preferring instead to adapt Mytilene to its provincial framework, in establishing a local version of the imperial cult after 29.[411] Like Hybreas, Epikrates and Xenon, he too only received heroic honours.[412]

Epilogue

[406] *SEG* 44.938 ll. 4-8.
[407] Epikrates: *SEG* 44.938 l. 8 (high-priesthood), *SEG* 44.940a ll. 9-10; Xenon: *TAM* V.2 1098 ll. 5-11.
[408] For Epikrates' cult, Herrmann (1994) 229-235; Xenon: *TAM* V.2 1098 (an eponymous Xenoneion); Hybreas: *I.Mylasa* 534-536.
[409] Robert (1966) 420-421; dedications to Epikrates and Hybreas by associations of people may derive from a similar context: *IG* XII.7 418 (Aigiale), *I.Mylasa* 534-535.
[410] For Potamon's career, Parker (1991) 115-121 and Thériault (2011).
[411] *IG* XII.2 58a, with Dimopoulou (2017) 407.
[412] His place in Mytilenian honorific hierarchy: *IG* XII.2 163; for the Potamoneion, Thériault (2011) 62-63; one fragment mentions heroic cult: *IG* XII.2 29 l. 10.

This chapter has surveyed the interactions between the cities of Asia and their Roman rulers, as articulated through euergetic ideology, 129-29 BCE; the main method has been to use such discourse as a thought-exercise – to presuppose the sorts of ideological intertwining we observed with the late Attalid state in chapter 1, itself a development from Seleukid-era euergetic ideology, and to ask if they are observable also in the first century of Roman rule. The major finding is that such continuity is not traceable. The Roman Republic was not actively interested in nurturing an euergetic relationship with Asia's cities; the Senate never sought to present itself as a beneficent force, beyond the cults of Roma, or the conception of the Romans as common benefactors. We do not have official letters of the Senate couched in the compromising language of euergetic reciprocity, as with royal letters; rather we only have authoritative, highly foreignising *senatus consulta*. Individual Romans certainly did establish euergetic relationships with cities, especially in the 1st century, but the character of Roman governance precluded continuity. Indeed, in official letters of Roman magistrates of this period we find little evidence of an euergetic contractual attitude.[413] A number of letters, however, emphasise the ethical qualities of the ambassadors that were met, often qualifying them as 'fine, good, and friendly men': such qualification is relatively absent in letters of Hellenistic monarchs.[414] What this would reflect is the pivotal role, in the cities' interactions with Rome, of their ambassadors as mediators of power inequalities: where euergetic politesse had been a standard feature of the kings' interactions with cities, this now had to

[413] The only example of a 'contract-clause' is the earliest: *RDGE* 34 ll. 22-24 (Messala to Teos, 193); see Jordan (2019) 170-171.

[414] Based on the collection of Bencivenni (2014) 165-171, qualification of ambassadorial activity is attested in eighteen of 113 Seleukid and Attalid letters (following Bencivenni's numbering): A1, S5, S8, S13, S24, S25, S27, S28, S31, S34, S35, S36, S47, S54, S65, and, dating to after 188, A15, A26, but all only in generic terms, praising ambassadors for speaking in accordance with their instructions (ἀκολούθως τοῖς κατακεχωρισμένοις). Only A15 (*OGIS* 763, Eumenes II to the Ionian *koinon* in 167/166) qualifies the ambassadors further as having spoken μετὰ πλείονος σπουδῆς (ll. 37-39). Of the roughly sixty-four inscribed letters of Roman magistrates to the Greek east from c. 193 to 27 BCE (collated from Sherk (1969) and Haddad (2018) 519-594), however, twenty-six mention ambassadors, of which nineteen exhibit a tendency to qualify ambassadorial activity in ethical terms. 193-133 BCE: *RDGE* 34, 35, 36, 38, 39; 133-c. 85 BCE: 7, 47ii, 48, 49, *SEG* 44.1227, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 8.2; c. 85-40 BCE: *RDGE* 21i, 23, 52, 26i, 26iii, 54, 55, 56; c. 40-27 BCE: *RDGE* 28, 60, 58iii, 61, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 8.29, 8.31, *SEG* 43.758; only seven (*RDGE* 21i, 57, 56, 60, 61, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 8.29, *SEG* 43.758) do not provide ethical qualification beyond a generic ἀκολούθως τοῖς κατακεχωρισμένοις.

be affirmed and embodied by cultural intermediaries like ambassadors. The alienness of Roman rule as experienced by the cities was mirrored by the alienness, for the Romans, of governing a region densely populated by confident cities. Indeed, it is this need for the ambassadorial that forms the leading theme of our evidence for euergetic interactions with Rome in this period, from the long decrees of the 120s and 110s for civic ambassadors, through to the proliferation of Roman euergetism and civic patronage, and indeed the further honorific elevation of civic ambassadors and emergence of 'super-ambassadors', in the post-85 period. This dominance of 'ambassadorial euergetism' in our evidence as a proxy for a more unified 'Roman' euergetism in the manner of the Attalid or Seleukid kings may also be said to have, ironically, had the effect of making Asia's cities think in more 'Roman' terms: the consolidation of the *koinon* of Asia as a framework for communicating with Rome, and restraining the tendency of 'super-ambassador'-like figures to operate outside the realm of the civic, and regionally civic, seems strongly to suggest this. What Asia's cities thereby achieved was something like a re-enactment of the late Attalid state, where honourability had been centred on the king and his family, only that the focal point was, by the mid-1st century BCE, 'Asia'. The institution of imperial cult in 29 BCE, then, was not only a radical innovation reacting to the unparalleled position of Octavian after Actium, but also the culmination of a century-long effort on the part of Asia's cities to establish direct rapport with central Roman authority, while providing outlets for the increasingly supra-*polis* interests of civic elites. What this entailed for local honourability is discussed in chapter 4; first, however, we need to consider how it is that elite citizens came to assume important roles as ambassadors in the period 188-29 at all, as studied in the last two chapters, for which some answer must be sought from within and among the cities themselves.

Chapter 3: Gymnasia and Gods. Civic elitism in the post-Apameian century

We have met Apollonios of Metropolis in the last two chapters as a figure exemplifying both the growing confidence of the cities of the late Attalid empire (in the 140s BCE) and civic goodwill towards the Romans, the common benefactors (in 132 BCE). Above all, however, he was an exemplar to the Metropolitans, a model citizen who embodied the virtues of community-mindedness and self-sacrifice nurtured in the gymnasium. As his decree relates, he had received the finest gymnasial education (τῆς καλλίστης ἀγωγῆς τετευχώς) from his earliest youth, and, determined to strive for virtue in all things and to organise his life with industry and discipline, had thereby earned fair repute at both his native city and other cities (ll. 4-8).[415] His every public action was conducted in the same self-disciplined spirit, in 'bearing himself in an unhesitating manner' (l. 11), and conducting his embassies to kings 'with all zeal, falling short in no aspect of zeal or ambition' (l. 13). A particular feature of Apollonios' virtues is that they are characterised as being 'his own': thus, he placed his own tirelessness and zeal at the city's disposal (ll. 15-16), and obtained funds from the king through his own energy (ll. 23-24). He is all the while aware of placing city before self, regarding all as secondary to goodwill to the fatherland (l. 15), never compromising the city's affairs for his own advantage (ll. 16-17), and assuming any loss to the city as his own (ll. 21-22). At the final battle at Thyateira, he displayed the good order, courage, and selfless patriotism which was drilled into members of the gymnasium (ll. 26-35). This sort of individualising rhetoric, simultaneously outlining the honorand's actions, but invariably locating them within the highly constrained ethical universe of the self-abasing ideal citizen,

[415] *I.Metropolis* 1b ll. 4-8.

emerges, as we shall see, in honorific decrees from the later 2nd century BCE, and invites questions about the role of elite citizens in shaping civic identities in the century after the peace of Apameia. The following pages will examine these in more detail by setting them against ideological developments within *poleis* after 188, in particular the rising significance of gymnasia as sites for articulating civic identity and the concomitant interest in promoting local cults. Both developments generated effects in euergetic behaviour at the local level that form a corollary to the broader interactions between hegemonic powers examined in the preceding chapters.

Individualising honorific rhetoric in the late 2nd century BCE

The portrait of Apollonios presented above – a zealous citizen who had nurtured his virtues from a young age through the gymnasium, and continued to deploy the same self-sacrificing and relentlessly self-abasing goodwill towards the community throughout his public career – is repeated in a number of other decrees in the late Hellenistic period. We might consider also the opening lines of the decree for Athenopolis, a leading figure of mid- to late 2nd-century Priene:[416]

> '…Since Athenopolis the son of Kydimos, being a fine and good man and worthy of the virtue of his ancestors, and formerly comporting himself as one who is loving of the good in all affairs, has received honours from the people, having arranged many useful things for the city through the nobility of his character; since then, remaining in the same mindset, he has not desisted in any way from the advantage of the people, saying and doing what is best while leaving no element of benevolence behind, bearing himself in a manner worthy of the honours conferred on him, not forgetting any of the aforementioned, but much rather preserving his goodwill to the citizens, considering the preservation of his zeal for those that live alongside him to be of the greatest importance; in this he has not been lacking in any respect, but has only continued to increase

[416] *I.Priene2014* 63 ll. 8-24.

> his eagerness for what is excellent. As it is fitting and worthy of the benevolence of the man that Athenopolis meet with all honour, the council has decided…'

There is perhaps slightly greater emphasis here on the community-mindedness of Athenopolis than in the Metropolitan decree for Apollonios. Even so, the insistent and recurrent theme is Athenopolis' continual striving for moral excellence and his desire to constantly increase this excellence in relation to his past actions. The most notable feature of the decree, however, is that we actually hear nothing about the concrete ways in which Athenopolis enacted his virtue, but only that he did so: he forms an ἀπόδειγμα, an example for others, such as other contemporary Prienian decrees claim their honorands to be.[417] The image presented here of an untiringly dedicated citizen, whose praiseworthiness is not limited only to the fact of his own selflessness, but consists also in his continual effort to improve this selflessness – that is, of one who had welded the virtues of community-spiritedness into his every individual action – is fairly unparalleled in honorific decrees for citizens, and indeed also non-citizens, at Priene up to this point. In earlier Hellenistic honorific decrees from the late 4th to early 2nd century we find a far more subdued rhetorical tone that attributes little agency to the individual. Thus, the achievements of Nymphon, garrison-commander sometime in 275-250, were praised in the following way:[418]

> '…Elected garrison-commander of the citadel by the people he remained the whole time in the fort in accordance with the law, and guarded it carefully and zealously with the garrison-soldiers, returning it to the people in the same manner he had received it, and consistently handled his garrison-soldiers in an upright and just manner…'

Nymphon's praiseworthiness rests on the fact that he was unremarkable and reliable, had simply conformed to strong community standards of behaving in an 'upright' and 'just' way,

[417] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 28-30, 65 ll. 34-36, 71 ll. 57-58 (ὑπόδειγμα to the *neoi*), also Menippos: *SEG* 39.1244i ll. 4-5 (δεῖγμα).
[418] *I.Priene2014* 22 ll. 3-8; *I.Priene2014* 21 and 23 are also garrison-commander decrees for Nymphon.

and acted 'in accordance with the law'. This is the tone that dominates Prienian honorific decrees until c. 130, which mainly honour single achievements or offices, often in unspectacular, sedate terms.[419] From the period c. 130 to 70 BCE, however, honorific rhetoric for citizens sounds more like that found in Athenopolis' decree: his brother Moschion and others like Heroides, Menedemos, Krates, Herakleitos, and Zosimos were praised as masters of the virtues they represented.[420] Moreover, these decrees typically record a wide range of services, and present the impression of being 'career' decrees. They were also far more monumental in character. Where earlier decrees were predominantly set up on stelai in the sanctuary of Athena, those of Athenopolis and his successors were inscribed on the eastern and western interior walls of the North Hall of the agora, built between 150-130. They were also preceded by prominent honorific inscriptions summarising their contents and carved in large lettering, thereby enlarging their visual impact.[421] Where citizens had primarily been honoured with crowns up to the early 2nd century BCE, these late Hellenistic citizen benefactors received increasingly lavish honours, such as crowns and the honour of the decree (itself now a monument), but also statues, dining and seating privileges at the *prytaneion*, lifetime announcements of crowning, and even public funerals.

This change in honorific tone at Priene forms just the best documented instance of a development that is traceable across western Anatolia and its neighbouring islands at precisely this time. Elsewhere, citizens were increasingly honoured as virtuosos of the gymnasium's ethics of communitarian spirit and continual moral betterment, at cities both

[419] *I.Priene2014* 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 28, 32, 34.
[420] *I.Priene2014* 63-85; for some examples of this individualising accent: 64 ll. 32-33, 43-44, 54-55, 56-57, 69, 87-89, 99-101, 105-106, 115-117, 251-253, 274-277, 310; 65 l. 101; 66 ll. 20-21; 67 l. 122, 68 ll. 12-19; 59-60, 65-66, 85-86, 114; 69 ll. 27-28, 33-35, 55-56, 62-63, 73-74, 88-89, 89-91; 71 l. 35; 75 l. 28.
[421] Some honorific decrees for citizens may already have been set up in the agora in the early 2nd century, but these would have been far less monumental in character: *I.Priene2014* 46, 47 (inscribed columns from west and east hall of market), 51-54 (agora fragments); *I.Priene2014* 117 ll. 6-7 (early 2nd century) mentions inscription of a Chian decee for Priene in the double stoa in the agora; cf. Bielfeldt (2012) 101-102.

great and small. So Menodoros of Pergamon 'overlooked no danger or suffering, and shied away from no expense',[422] the son of Anaximbrotos of Gordos 'made the greatest display of his own nobility of spirit',[423] Apollonios of Bargasa 'consecrated his life wholly and steadfastly to the benefaction of the citizens';[424] even the female benefactor Archippe of Kyme was now praised in terms redolent of gymnasial training: 'acting in accordance with her nobility, and the goodwill and zealousness she has continually brought forth for the fatherland, she has neglected no occasion appropriate (to manifesting) her love of the good and zealousness'.[425] Many more examples could be cited. Individualising rhetoric is traceable in decrees of other western Anatolian communities from the last third of the 2nd century (Kyzikos, Bargylia, Sestos, Ephesos, Klaros, Mylasa, Amorgos) and into the 1st century (Miletos, Iasos, Alabanda, Aizanoi).[426] As at Priene, these decrees also exhibit a monumentalising turn in their content and length, either detailing service over long periods of time (Klaros, Bargylia, Sestos, Mylasa, Pergamon, Kyzikos, Gordos, Bargasa), exceptional service in single magistracies (Pergamon, Ephesos, Amorgos), or a combination of the two, in collections of decrees recording honours, presenting the impression of career-length service (Kyme);[427] these were also often physically monumental, as at Klaros and Metropolis, where the decrees were inscribed on statue-bases, or on architectural members, as at Kyme. Moreover, the honours conferred were increasingly imposing: honorific statues grow in stature, either in their architectural form (Klaros), iconographic uniqueness (Kyme), or sheer number (Pergamon, Priene); sometimes these statues were also now paid for by the

[422] *SEG* 50.1211 ll. 16-17.
[423] *SEG* 34.1198 ll. 19-21.
[424] *I.Nordkarien* 551 ll. 10-11.
[425] *SEG* 33.1037 ll. 3-7.
[426] Kyzikos: *IGR* IV 134; Bargylia: *SEG* 44.867; Sestos: *I.Sestos* 1; Ephesos: *I.Ephesos* 6; Klaros: *SEG* 39.1243-1244, Mylasa: *I.Mylasa* 101, 102, 105, 106, 107, 108, 110, 127; Arkesine: *IG* XII.7 33, 35, Suppl. 330; Minoa: *IG* XII.7 229; Aigiale: *IG* XII.7 389; Miletos: *SEG* 44.940; Iasos: *I.Iasos* 98; Alabanda: *I.Nordkarien* 211; Aizanoi: *SEG* 63.1220.
[427] Collections of decrees: Forster (2018) 381-382.

benefactors themselves (Klaros, Sestos).[428] At the same time, new forms of honour emerge on the scene, in public funerals and burial (Kyme) and even posthumous cult (Metropolis).

There are inevitably methodological problems with conceiving of these texts as a single group. One is that we are at the mercy of archaeological survival, and are faced here only with local epigraphic habits and contexts: while some of the cities represented are, epigraphically speaking, otherwise practically non-existent in the earlier Hellenistic period (Sestos, Metropolis, Bargylia), we do not, on the other hand, find a comparably stark shift in honorific representation for citizens at better documented sites like Miletos or Rhodes, for instance.[429] Moreover, while the same general individualising trend in decree-rhetoric is perceptible, stylistic variations may have existed across the different sites: for instance, Priene's decrees tend towards longer, attenuated clauses, while the decrees at Klaros tend to be syntactically denser. Nevertheless, the commonalities in rhetorical theme, the trend towards a lifetime conception of the honorand, and the tendency towards physical monumentality in some cases, altogether suggest that these decrees represent a shared response to political change: the stark concentration of material in late 2nd-century western Asia Minor makes it difficult to deny that they formed ideological responses to the advent of Roman rule (part of this response we have already examined in chapter 2). Decrees of a similarly rhetorical character are later found in other parts of the Hellenistic world in the 1st century BCE, but few are contemporary with the earlier texts from Asia Minor, which seem, so far as our evidence allows, to have served as a forerunner in this regard.[430]

What does this change mean? Attention has centred dominantly on the extent to which it reflects an evolution in the balance of political power within *poleis*, by which

[428] Gauthier (2000).
[429] Although at Rhodes a different phenomenon is perceptible in the rise of so-called 'CV' inscriptions cf. Kah (2018) 275-276.
[430] The only other comparably loquacious honorific decrees are those for Athenian *kosmetai* beginning in the 120s; they are more common in the 1st century: *IG* VII 190 (Pagai), *IG* XII.9 234-236 (Eretria), *IG* V.1 1432 (Messene), *SEG* 28.1540 (Kyrenaikan Berenike), *IGBulg* I^2 13 (Thracian Dionysopolis).

societies shaped primarily by the constraining forces of civic institutions became societies where elite citizens could determine the tone of governance, and where private wealth came to supplant civic institutions. Generosity as expressed through euergetic giving came to take place outside civic frameworks, so that the influence gained by elite individuals through their generosity elevated them to a status that lay conceptually outside the *polis*, leading to a 'depoliticisation' of civic life, with the result that they emulated the Hellenistic kings of old.[431] This is a view that takes rhetorical change as a serious reflection of social change. It has not gone unchallenged, with criticism largely emphasising, in contrast, continuities in the relations between elite and non-elite citizens over the *longue durée*: in such a view, the late Hellenistic change was mainly a rhetorical one that did not substantially alter relations between elites and their communities, with the continuing persistence of civic institutions well into the late Hellenistic period rendering problematic any hard and fast distinction between 'early' and 'late' Hellenistic periods.[432] While the persistence or decline of institutional constraint is certainly a central and unavoidable issue in the debate, it is not the purpose of this chapter to address this. The fact of a change in rhetorical style is indisputable, but this should not confine the focus only to the question of institutional vitality. I follow Gauthier in suggesting that a genuine change in political balance was emerging between elite and non-elite groups, so that the late Hellenistic *polis* was increasingly an 'elitist' one; institutional continuities were important, however, and indeed complemented elite power. The changes in *polis* culture in late 2nd- and early 1st-century western Asia Minor can rather be defined as the *intensification* of pre-existing elite and communitarian tensions, a persistent theme in Hellenistic *polis*.[433] Elite citizens gained more control, and wealth played a greater role, but this was never in contexts fully external to civic institutions: in fact, it is

[431] Gauthier (1985) 53-63, 72-75, with Hamon (2007), Scholz (2008) 83-99, and also Thonemann (2011a) 249, (2013a) 43 for 'depoliticisation'.
[432] Habicht (1995), Quaß (1993) 15-16.
[433] Ma (2013) 294-297, and *passim*.

precisely through our evidence for late Hellenistic euergetism that we observe civic communities adapting to growing elite power through the inflation of honours, and practices like public promise-making.

The chief aim in the following sections, then, is to contextualise this late 2nd-century development in honorific style against heightening socio-political tensions around the status of *polis* citizenship. Rather than interpreting the phenomenon only as a function of tensions between elite and non-elite citizens, it is important also to bear in mind the tensions that existed between citizen and non-citizen groups, as well as those between civic communities altogether: these were relationships that were increasingly strained in the post-Apameian period. As a consequence of these heightened tensions, civic communities more and more felt the need for leading individuals, resulting in an elevation of elite power that, by the mid-1st century BCE, had established a subtly different *status quo* within most western Anatolian *polis* societies to that which had subsisted c. 150, or even in 188. This process comes best into view at Pergamon, Klaros and Priene; we begin with the first.

The gymnasialisation of post-133 Pergamon

A remarkable aspect of the early decades of Roman rule at Pergamon, the heart of political change in the region, must have been the coexistence of a Roman apparatus of state – whatever primordial form the administration of the governor assumed after 129 – with the lively and highly chauvinistic attachment of the civic government to its local traditions. The most notable of these were those represented by the gymnasium, as seen in six surviving honorific decrees for gymnasiarchs, for Agias, M[---], Strato, Metrodoros, Athenaios, and a sixth unknown individual.[434] These decrees offer insight both into the heightened socio-

[434] Agias: *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 379 n. 2; M[---]: *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 375 n. 1; Strato: *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 278 n. 11, Metrodoros: *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 273 n. 10; Athenaios: *MDAI(A)* 35 (1910) 401 n. 1; unknown

political tensions around citizenship at early post-Attalid Pergamon, which can also be further illuminated by considering a broader western Anatolian intensification in euergetic activity at gymnasia, reflecting an interest in emphasising civic identity through gymnasial education, in the post-Apameian decades.

Apart from Athenaios, who is likely to be the latest, and dating to the last decade of the 2nd century, these texts can be placed in the years immediately preceding and following the end of the Attalid monarchy.[435] They were hardly, of course, the first to be honoured as gymnasiarchs at Pergamon; the institution is attested there from at least the 3rd century,[436] and must have received considerable patronage under Eumenes II, under whom the monumentalisation of the upper gymnasium had taken place.[437] The praise they received for their oversight of core aspects of the gymnasium's functions and ideals, in the education (ἀγωγή, παιδεία) and good-order and discipline (ἐυταξία, ἐυκοσμία, κοσμιότης) of the ephebes and *neoi*, suggests a long entrenched gymnasial tradition.[438] At the same time, however, we find these gymnasiarchs engaged in benefactions that went beyond the purely pragmatic and necessary, and which encouraged a dynamic of inter-elite competitiveness. Already in the last years of Attalos III Agias and M[---] set up statues of the king,[439] while Metrodoros further sacrificed and provided prizes at the erection of another statue of a king.[440] In two key areas of gymnasial expenditure, the provision of contest-prizes and of oil, we find heightened emphasis on personal generosity. Both M[---] and Athenaios

gymnasiarch: *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 381 n. 3. See also Wörrle (2000) 555 n. 59 for a possible gymnasiarchal decree for the politician Menodoros.

[435] For chronology, Wörrle (2000) 554-557 and (2007) 509-516.

[436] See *I.Pergamon* 9 for Diodoros, an early 3rd-century gymnasiarch.

[437] Wörrle (2007) 504-508. A gymnasiarch of the late Attalid period: *MDAI(A)* 27 (1902) 99 n. 98, perhaps identical to *MDAI(A)* 35 (1910) 469 n. 53a.

[438] *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 379 n. 2 ll. 9-13; *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 278 n. 11b ll. 45-49; *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 273 n. 10 ll. 43-47; *MDAI(A)* 35 (1910) 401 n. 1a ll. 23-24; *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 375 n. 1 ll. 10; another gymnasiarch: *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 311 n. 34 ll. 5-8 and, earlier, Protarchos son of Aristomachos: *MDAI(A)* 35 (1910) 469 n. 53a ll. 4-7.

[439] With different ideological meaning: *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 379 n. 2 ll. 27-30 (προαίρεσις of king towards people), *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 375 n. 1 ll. 18-23 (his goodwill to people emphasised first), with Chin (2018) 133.

[440] *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 273 n. 10 ll. 4-7.

provided prizes, while also going beyond this, in respectively dedicating the prize-shields at the Lakinia (for Hera) and Hermaia at their own expense – this was especially noteworthy, as it is likely the normal practice was for victors to pay for their own dedication.[441] Oil was distributed in increasingly unique ways. M[---] distributed oil in many vessels,[442] while Strato distributed oil for the whole year at his own cost, and even gave out a special white oil on his first day as gymnasiarch;[443] the unknown gymnasiarch moreover made distributions of aromatised oil (ἔλαιον ἠρωματισμένον).[444] Athenaios set up a fund for oil.[445] We even find gifts towards gymnasial architecture, like Metrodoros' provision of washing-basins for the bathing-room and σφαιριστήριον.[446] The honorific status of these gymnasiarchs corresponds to this heightened interest in the gymnasium. Where honours for Pergamene citizens are practically non-existent in the Attalid era (as observed in chapter 1), the gymnasiarchs Strato, Metrodoros, and Athenaios, for whom honorific clauses survive, were awarded a gold crown, designated the 'greatest' (μέγιστος) – Athenaios' is even called 'double' (διπλασίων) – and statue-honours: the first two even received two statues each, by the city and *neoi* respectively.[447] This may have sparked a tradition of elevating gymnasiarchs to new heights; by the early 1st century we even find cultic honour, culminating ultimately in the outstanding example of Diodoros Pasparos in 69 BCE (on whom see below).[448]

---

[441] *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 375 n. 1 ll. 12-15 (for specially created contests in παιδεία), 23-27 and *MDAI(A)* 35 (1910) 401 n. 1b ll. 6-7, 13-16. Victors pay for their own dedication in the Beroian gymnasiarchal law: *SEG* 27.261b ll. 67-71; see also *I.Sestos* 1 ll. 42-43, 79-81, 94.
[442] *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 375 n. 1 l. 28.
[443] *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 278 n. 11a ll. 16-18, 19-21; for 'white oil', Robert (1969-1990) 1.291. Another late Hellenistic gymnasiarch, Kausilos, distributed oil throughout the year from his own funds: *MDAI(A)* 35 (1910) 468 n. 52 ll. 3-5.
[444] *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 381 n. 3 ll. 7, 13.
[445] *MDAI(A)* 35 (1910) 401 n. 1a ll. 25-30 (2500 drachmas); b l. 26-29 implies a posthumous fund towards afternoon oil.
[446] *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 273 n. 10 ll. 9-13, with Mathys (2014) 167-169.
[447] *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 278 n. 11b ll. 40-57; *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 273 n. 10 ll. 35-52; *MDAI(A)* 35 (1910) 401 n. 1b ll. 33-39, 39-40 may refer to the special honour of annual crowning ([στεφ]ανωθῆναι) of the statue.
[448] See Biard (2017) 101-103. *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 6γ ll. 19-22 mentions honours paid to benefactors to the city before Diodoros' time; for the cultic honours for Diodoros' father Herodes, see below; an unpublished decree records posthumous honours for an earlier notable, Menophantos son of Menogenes, whose decease is

Why this focussed activity in the post-133 gymnasium? A straightforward answer would be that the Pergamenes were keen to display the vitality of their civic identity, a particularly charged concept at the former Attalid capital. Likewise, they honoured an *agonothetes* who held the first Herakleia and Soteria after the war against Aristonikos,[449] and Lysandra, praised as the priestess of Athena in the year when the city regained its ancestral δημοκρατία.[450] This civic identity was, however, not simply a matter of city versus king, democracy versus monarchy: it was wound up also in a problematic and recent history of tensions with its extensive non-citizen population.

In the immediate aftermath of Attalos' death in 133, as debates about the fate of the kingdom raged at the Senate, and war with the pretender Aristonikos loomed, the Pergamenes had passed a decree extending citizenship to a wide range of non-citizen inhabitants of the city and its extensive *chora*, including *paroikoi*, resident soldiers, Macedonian and Mysian settlers, the Masduenoi (an indigenous population), guardsmen and other garrison-soldiers, and the wives and children of these groups; moreover, the descendants of freedmen, royal slaves, their women, and public slaves were made *paroikoi*.[451] In a single administrative act, we gain insight into the complex and deeply militarised social makeup of the Pergamene community. The decision was sweeping, and meant to forestall secession to Aristonikos, particularly from among the Macedonian settlers, many of whom would have benefited from Attalid settlement programmes in Lydia and the Kaikos valley.[452] Settlers who had already left the city would be stripped of their legal rights and property.[453] Nevertheless, such threats may have been ineffectual: as events

described as an ἀποθέωσις (ll. 15-16), and received sacrifices in his honour (ll. 40-41). I thank Professor Andreas Victor Walser for permission to cite this new inscription.

[449] *IGR* IV 300; Menodoros also passed a law on honours for sacred victors: *SEG* 50.1211 ll. 7-11, with Brixhe, *BE* 2001 366 p. 556.

[450] *OGIS* 337 ll. 4-5 (ἐφ' ἧς ὁ δῆμος κατεστάθη | εἰς τὴν πάτριον δημοκρατίαν), and also 338 l. 5 (Pergamon made ἐλευθέρα in Attalos III's will).

[451] *OGIS* 338 ll. 10-26.

[452] Hopp (1977) 133-134.

[453] *OGIS* 338 ll. 26-30.

turned out, Aristonikos managed to draw on large support from military colonists and settlers, and managed to wage war for nearly a decade.[454]

Moreover, some settlers may have had legitimate grounds for disaffection with the Pergamene citizen community. One may have been sheer economic exploitation by citizens in the late Attalid period. A petition to Eumenes II in 165/164 made by settlers based at Apolloniouchorax, on the road between Pergamon and Sardeis, reveals some of these dynamics.[455] They had agreed to a contract with a certain Meleagros, by which he gained the usufruct of the village of Sibloe for a fee, and had hoped to be able to re-acquire it later by paying him back. Lacking the funds to do so, however, Meleagros had presently appropriated the village for himself.[456] The Apolloniouchorakians therefore appealed to Eumenes for his financial assistance.[457] Whoever Meleagros was, he was clearly wealthy enough to propose a contract involving a village – he may have been a wealthy citizen of Sardeis, for instance.[458] A similar dynamic may well have subsisted between citizenry and military settlers in the Pergamene *chora*.

'Pergameneness' is therefore like to have been a particularly contested issue in the post-129 years: while the citizen body had been enlarged after the decree of 133, a large part of it would have consisted of former *paroikoi* and military settlers – precisely the constituencies that the Pergamenes may have fought against in the recent war. The role of the gymnasium as a site for citizenship-building naturally gained in importance. In the late Attalid era some non-citizen groups had already obtained entry to gymnasial life, including military settlers, and especially Masduenoi, who are frequently encountered on ephebic lists.

---

[454] Strabo 14.1.38, Diod. Sic. 34-35.2.26 (slaves only); cf. Hopp (1977) 136-137, 142-147; Daubner (2006) 62-70.
[455] *SEG* 57.1150; for the geography, Thonemann (2013a) 20.
[456] The letter describes the village as having 'formerly' belonged to the settlers (*SEG* 57.1150b l. 12: τὴν πρότερον οὖσαν ἡμετέραν).
[457] *SEG* 57.1150b ll. 11-19.
[458] Thonemann (2011b) 26 suggests that the usufruct of Sibloe was worth more than the 448 drachmas and 1.5 obols recorded in the inscription (b l. 14), and probably in the vicinity of several thousand drachmas, at least.

Paroikoi, however, are desperately rare.[459] With the influx of former *paroikoi* into the ranks of citizens, gymnasium participation is likely to have surged; a key ideological priority of the civic elite would therefore have been to affirm the role of the gymnasiarch in overseeing citizen education, as the constituency of its gymnasium-goers was, now, basically much larger and socially diverse. This urgency is what we find, for instance, in Metrodoros' statue-base inscription, which expressly states that his statue was meant to present his achievements as worthy of the 'people who appointed him';[460] this qualification is also found on other bases.[461]

Another related feature of the Pergamene gymnasiarchy in the post-129 years was its imbrication into wider civic life, as gymnasiarchs became a lubricant to the shocks of social change. As well as carrying out strictly gymnasial duties, Metrodoros conducted public funerals not only for leading citizens, but also for 'commoners', δημοτικοί – presumably including a number of Pergamon's new citizens, thereby presenting an image of citizen solidarity and 'equality'.[462] He also seems to have led processions for gods and unnamed benefactors (perhaps an oblique reference to Attalid kings), and held the Kabeiria.[463] Such involvement in local cults beyond those of the gymnasium alone seems to have been a feature of the post-Attalid gymnasiarchy. Another gymnasiarch is attested as a priest of Arete, while Athenaios also held the *agonothesia*, and was priest of Herakles.[464] The most prominent indication of the embedding of the gymnasium in Pergamene cultic life,

[459] For the Masduenoi, see Chankowksi (2010) 279; only one *paroikos* is attested: *MDAI(A)* 27 (1902) 118 n. 124 l. 4 [---]λαίου πάροικος Τηλεφίδος.
[460] *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 273 n. 10 ll. 46-47.
[461] *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 278 n. 11b l. 48 (Strato), *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 311 n. 34 l. 8.
[462] *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 273 n. 10 ll. 19-23, with Hamon (2012a) 62-64, Gray (2018b) 155-156.
[463] For all these, *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 273 n. 10 ll. 23-30. Diodoros Pasparos also celebrated the Kabeiria in 69: *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 1 ll. 6-9, 17-19.
[464] *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 311 n. 34 l. 2 and *MDAI(A)* 35 (1910) 401 n. 1b ll. 16-20, 36.

however, must have been the distribution of oil by gymnasiarchs at the Nikephoria, Eumenes' penteteric festival, now a civic event in the post-133 era.[465]

The fact that these other functions were honoured alongside their gymnasiarchy, at any rate, must be indicative of the increasingly political role of the office: the prominence of the gymnasium in our Pergamene evidence, from this standpoint, is not merely a function of the vagaries of documentary survival.[466] Moreover, it is noteworthy that the gymnasium increasingly served as a site for honours for individuals who may not even have held gymnasium-specific roles. A Pyrrhos son of Athenodoros was honoured for exhibiting gymnasial virtues (ἐυταξία, κοσμιότης);[467] known elsewhere as a *prytanis*, he dedicated an exedra in the gymnasium's west wing, but may not have been a gymnasiarch.[468] This process accelerated in the 1st century, so that Diodoros Pasparos actually came to the gymnasiarchy after having served as civic ambassador, while already being a high-priest and priest of Zeus.[469] The two statues of his political successor Mithridates son of Menodoros, praised as the city's second founder and priest of Dionysios Kathegemon (albeit not as gymnasiarch), stood in the gymnasium,[470] all the while flanked by an ever-growing number of statues for other civic leaders and benefactors, many of whom did not hold gymnasiarchies, like the ambassador son of Charinos, or Mene[---], *prytanis* and priest.[471]

[465] *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 381 n. 3 ll. 8-10 (unknown gymnasiarch), *MDAI(A)* 35 (1910) 401 n. 1 ll. 33-36 (Athenaios), *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 311 n. 34 ll. 3-5 (unknown gymnasiarch at the 19th Nikephoria).
[466] Wörrle (2007) 511.
[467] Mathys, *Architekturstiftungen* Gy 7; he is known also from honours in the sanctuary of Demeter: *MDAI(A)* 35 (1910) 471-472 n. 57.
[468] *I.Pergamon* 247ii ll. 1-9; his exedra dedication: *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 403 n. 31; cf. Mathys (2014) 165-167.
[469] *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 5 ll. 21-55. He is praised for these functions across his gymnasiarchy honours.
[470] *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 407 n. 36 and *MDAI(A)* 24 (1899) 177 n. 27.
[471] Mathys, *Architekturstiftungen* Gy 21, U8; other non-gymnasiarch honorands: Gy 10,13, U7; also, Italians and descendants: Gy 12, U6. Gymnasiarchal honours continue: Gy 8-9, 11, U1, U9.

Euergetism at Pergamon's gymnasium in the decades following 133 therefore presents two contexts for the rise of elite citizens. The first is that of localised tensions in the social order – tensions that were possibly more charged in the years around 133-129 than in earlier periods of the city's history. A second, as we now consider in more detail, is the broader context of inter-city competition around the cultural status of being a *polis* in the 2nd century, whereby the gymnasium increasingly formed a core asset, and was integrated more visibly into public life, becoming something like a 'second agora'.[472]

An arresting parallel contemporaneous to Pergamon's gymnasiarchs is Menas of Sestos. His decree reveals a similar conception of the gymnasiarchy as the premier civic office, crowning a career already distinguished by ambassadorial service to the Attalids and Romans, and a priesthood of Attalos III. In between his two stints as gymnasiarch, Menas was also a civic moneyer. Apart from its rich description of Menas' provisions of athletic training and contests,[473] the most striking aspect of the decree is that it honours him for his public career as a whole, and not only for gymnasiarchal service. Moreover, it is the city which administers his honours, even if the *neoi* are included alongside it on his statue-base inscription (ll. 99-100). Slightly different factors to those at Pergamon may account for Sestos' incorporation of its gymnasium, with the constant threat of conflict with Thracian neighbours, and the need to produce well-rounded 'everyman' citizens, adept not only as soldiers, but also as skilful diplomats. These were pressures more keenly felt at a smaller community like Sestos. Yet another aspect, however, and one arguably common to both Sestos and Pergamon, was an ideological one – namely, the pressure to present one's

[472] Robert (1969-1990) 6.46 and n. 7.
[473] *I.Sestos* 1 ll. 35-43, 61-64, 67-72, 77-86.

community as a recognisable *polis*, which was now inextricably associated with possessing a vigorously maintained gymnasium.

This pressure underpins an important feature of euergetism at Hellenistic gymnasia, which is that gymnasium officials, chiefly gymnasiarchs, were honoured in larger numbers over the 2nd and 1st centuries than in any other.[474] This was a truly Hellenistic phenomenon, spanning communities from the Black Sea to Sicily, even if heavily represented by the Aegean and Anatolian sphere. Moreover, within this 2nd- and 1st-century chronological span, a significant chronological concentration is perceptible in the period from the second half of the 2nd century onwards, of which the Pergamene decrees form the centrepiece: of the thirty-three decrees and statue-base inscriptions for gymnasiarchs from Asia Minor and its islands (outside of Pergamon) dating to the 2nd century, only two are securely dateable before 150, while twelve date to after this point, and nineteen are only dateable roughly to the 2nd century; the numbers are similar for Greece, the Aegean, and the Black Sea region: of nineteen texts, two are securely pre-150, seven securely post-150, and ten roughly 2nd-century. Notwithstanding the difficulty of obtaining more precise dating for texts only roughly dateable to the century, our evidence after 150 is generally also qualitatively richer: to this period belong a series of stelai for gymnasiarchs in northern Greece (Amphipolis, Demetrias) and Eretria (where non-gymnasiarch benefactors were also prominently honoured c. 100 BCE),[475] the loquacious decrees for high-achieving *kosmetai* at Athens,[476] and, in Asia, apart from the Pergamene and Sestian decrees, those for Diodoros of Ephesos and the *paidonomos* Chrysippos of Iasos;[477] in the 1st century, we reach something of an apogee in quality and quantity (Paramon at Thessalonike, Hegemandros at Patmos, Zosimos

[474] The documents summarised in the following have been drawn from the collections of Curty (2015) and Skaltsa (2008).
[475] Theopompos, donor of 40,000 drachmas towards oil-provision: *IG* XII.9 236; also, a Hipposthenes: *IG* XII.9 237.
[476] For these, Deshours (2010) 155-177 and Perrin-Saminadayar (2008) 256-266.
[477] *I.Ephesos* 6, *I.Mylasa* 909 (with Boulay and Pont (2014) 73 for the Iasian provenance).

at Priene, Diodoros Pasparos at Pergamon, Chares at Themisonion, L. Vaccius Labeo at Augustan Kyme, not to mention the decree for the ephebarch Melanion at Iasos).[478] Decrees for gymnasiarchs thus form a subset of the broader change towards individualising rhetoric, with a number being exemplars of this emerging style (Menas, Diodoros of Ephesos, Zosimos of Priene).

Furthermore, the majority of these late Hellenistic decrees were set up by civic authorities, with their honorands being publicly elected gymnasiarchs, and therefore represent documents embodying authoritative civic control over gymnasia. A broader process is reflected here, by which gymnasia were gradually integrated into civic space across the Hellenistic period, where they may have previously been run primarily by gymnasial authorities, and honours set up only by *neoi*, for instance. This 'transfer' of authority over gymnasia to cities happened at different tempos at different places: for instance, while gymnasiarchs were already civic at Athens, Ilion or Samos by the late 3rd century, they were still elected only by *neoi* at early 2nd-century Xanthos.[479] The concentration of civic decrees for gymnasiarchs over the 2nd and 1st centuries would suggest that a more generalised institutionalisation of gymnasia across the Hellenistic world had occurred by this period,[480] but also implies a representational change: honours for gymnasiarchs by cities were more likely to be inscribed anyway, because they were usually more monumental (often consisting of a statue and stele) than those conferred by *neoi*

[478] *IG* X.2 4, *Syll.*[3] 1068, *I.Priene2014* 68-70, *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 1-11, Michel, *Recueil* 544, *I.Kyme* 19, *I.Iasos* 98.
[479] Gymnasiarchs as civic officials at Ilion: *I.Ilion* 31 ll. 8-10 (281 BCE); by the late 3rd century at Samos: *IG* XII.6 11 ll. 23-25; also at Troizen: *IG* IV 749 (4th/3rd century BCE); for the Athenian gymnasiarchy, Culasso Gastaldi (2009) 119-123; Xanthos' gymnasiarch was still elected by *neoi* in 196: *SEG* 46.1721, with Gauthier (1996) 12-15; cf. Gauthier (1995) 7-8, Schuler (2004) 172-178.
[480] Further east, gymnasiarchies are first attested at Tyana only around 125 BCE: *I.Tyana* 29, with Robert (1963) 492-497; at Babylon our first evidence for the gymnasium is a victory-list of 110 BCE: *SEG* 7.39; the earliest evidence for gymnasia in Syria, Phoenicia, Mesopotamia and the Iranian plateau all post-dates the 3rd century (except for Seleukid capitals): Daubner (2015) 42.

(mainly crowns). In short, it suggests a greater need to display the virtues of local gymnasia at this time.

This urge to enhance the visibility of gymnasia was a function of inter-city competition. In western Anatolia, Attalid patronage of gymnasia undoubtedly played some role by encouraging the identification of *polis*-status with the gymnasium, as with Eumenes' grant to the Toriaions. It arguably only served, however, to galvanise a broader emerging dynamic of competitive interactivity among the cities; this is corroborated by the archaeology of contemporaneous gymnasia, of both free and Attalid subject cities. Well-documented examples at Pergamon, Delos, Priene, Assos, and Miletos exhibit a trend towards greater monumentality in the 2nd century, in the construction of peristyle courts, impressive propyla, and use of stone and marble, while the inclusion of seating alongside running-tracks, and the growing popularity of exedrae, suggest the role of gymnasia as increasingly 'civic' spaces for festivals and public display.[481] Certainly, military functions for gymnasia continued to be important, especially in the militaristic post-Apameian period.[482] Increasingly compelling, however, was the need to live up to neighbouring communities as equals, or better. This, not military need, was the primary reason for the Beroians' inscription of their gymnasiarchal law sometime between 200 and 167.[483] Stratonikeia's gymnasium, built in the mid-2nd century, was meant to impress: built of marble, its peristyle court was the largest in mainland Anatolia outside of Pergamon. A dedicatory inscription proudly proclaimed it as the work of the *demos*, free after 167.[484]

[481] Von den Hoff (2009) 254-260 and Von Hesberg (1995) 17-20; for exedrae as architectural benefactions, Delorme (1960) 325-326.
[482] For the continued military function of gymnasia in the Hellenistic period, Gauthier (1995) 3-7, Hatzopoulos (2004) 91-95, Chankowski (2004); Kah (2004) 50-74, D'Amore (2007) 156-173.
[483] *SEG* 27.261a ll. 6-8.
[484] Von den Hoff (2009) 255, 260, Von Hesberg (1995) 17. Mert (1999) 16-23, 197-200 for an overview, 125-126 for a comparison of gymnasia sizes, and 201-202 for the inscription.

It is against this backdrop of proliferating gymnasia and gymnasial euergetism, with communities increasingly propounding the ethics praised in the Pergamene gymnasiarchal decrees, founded in a programme of citizen education that encouraged self-sacrificial subordination to the community, that we should analyse the individualising rhetoric of decrees from the late 2nd century onwards, as outlined earlier. It is more problematic to interpret this rhetoric, *pace* Gauthier, as evidence for an incipient aristocratising tendency towards regarding the virtues of civic elites as innate or inherited, and therefore reflective of a class of individuals existing beyond the ranks of ordinary citizens. Rather, the point of individualising the honorand was precisely to demonstrate their exemplary worth, even at the expense of individuality. The notion that the honorand was a benefactor 'from earliest youth', often encapsulated in the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡλικίας, is a case in point.[485] In Gauthier's view it is synonymous with the 'ancestral' virtue for which some honorands are praised, indicating a capacity for goodwill deriving from familial worth.[486] While it is certainly the case that familial ancestry does feature more frequently in honorific rhetoric from the late Hellenistic period onwards, and even becomes reified as an honorific virtue in the later 1st century BCE (as we will see in chapter 5), the ideological force of being a benefactor from 'earliest youth' arguably derives primarily from the gymnasium's emphasis on character development, and its notionally egalitarian ethos – with which ancestry was not incompatible – and less from the aristocratising self-awareness of an elite citizenry. This is why, for instance, the hortatory clause in the Sestians' decree for Menas claims to honour him so that 'the people may be seen honouring fine and good men, and receiving in proper

[485] Some examples of the late 2nd century: *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 14-15, 66 ll. 11-12, *SEG* 50.1211 ll. 2-4 (Pergamon), *I.Sestos* 1 ll. 2-3, *I.Mylasa* 102 ll. 10-11, *IG* XII.2 528 ll. 3-4 (Eresos), *Syll.*[3] 1068 l. 7 (Patmos), *SEG* 18.570 (Araxa), *IG* XII.7 232 l. 3 (Minoa), *IG* XII.9 236 ll. 5-6 (Eretria), *SEG* 53.1357 l. 5 (Silandos, ἐκ παιδὸς ἡλικίας); of the 1st century: *I.Mylasa* 109 ll. 5-6, *TAM* V.1 514 l. 5 (Maeonia), *I.Iasos* 98 ll. 10-11, *SEG* 63.1220 ll. 4-5 (Aizanoi).

[486] Gauthier (1985) 57-59 and especially 58-59: 'tous ces "grands évergètes" sont loués pour les vertus qu'ils ont héritées de leurs ancêtres et qu'ils ont manifestées, precise-t-on, "dès leur plus jeune âge" – c'est-à-dire sans attendre que telle charge ou telle mission délicate leur aient donné l'occasion de les "reveler"'.

measure those who have been from the earliest manhood zealous for our common affairs and dedicated to seeking fame', and 'that others, observing the honours conferred by the people on those who are fine and good, may become emulators of the finest deeds'.[487] The hortatory point of the decree would be meaningless if the notion of being virtuous 'from earliest youth' was understood as synonymous with an innate sense of ethical superiority, and not rather, as is the point here, something that could be emulated by others through similar dedication to ethical training in the gymnasium. It is also this gymnasial emphasis that explains why, at the other end of the life-spectrum, the funeral honours granted to some late Hellenistic citizens were invariably presided over by the gymnasiarch and ephebes, as at Kyme and Priene, and in extraordinary cases in the 1st century even featured burial in the gymnasium – this was to ensure a sense of full continuity, of a life lived wholly in the light of community values.[488]

Recounting lifelong virtue presents the honorand as a paradigm, an ideal citizen embodying civic virtues in their varied and concrete forms, but ultimately as an abstraction: the image in these late Hellenistic decrees is not that of aspiring civic aristocrats, but rather of *Polisfanatiker*, citizens 'on steroids':[489] individuals so committed to the values of the community that their own distinct identities, ironically, are effaced in the process. This is especially acute in the case of Archippe of Kyme, who even though a woman is praised throughout her eight surviving decrees primarily in the terms of a male benefactor, for her καλοκἀγαθία**,** ἐκτενεία**,** φιλοδοξία.[490] The paradox of the individualising rhetoric of these late Hellenistic decrees is precisely that they are only 'individualising'; they do not actually present biographical or idiosyncratic portraits of their honorands, and instead only those of

[487] *I.Sestos* 1 ll. 86-92.
[488] E.g. *SEG* 33.1039 ll. 49-51 (Archippe); for Priene see below; funerals and burial in the gymnasium: Chiricat (2005), Fröhlich (2013) 230-232, 259-274 (the only certain 1st-century Anatolian cases of burial are Artemidoros of Knidos and Kallikrates of Aphrodisias).
[489] Wörrle (1995) 244.
[490] *SEG* 33.1036 ll. 4-8, 13-15, 33.1037 ll. 3-7, 9-11, 33.1041 ll. 9-10.

communitarian automata, like Athenopolis of Priene (in extreme cases), where the distinction between deeds and the virtues they represent is effaced.

The point of presenting the honorand as an exemplar of gymnasial education, then, was not to create distance between citizens, but actually to attempt to bridge the gulf between the elite and non-elite – to say, in effect, that elitism is attainable by others. The late Hellenistic Prienian benefactors were still intended to serve as ἀπόδειγματα of their piety and goodwill to the community.[491] All this is not to suggest that this elitist colouring, framed around the gymnasium, did not ultimately lead to a more family-based conception of ethical virtuosity (for which see chapter 5); it is only to emphasise that the origins of this process should not be located, as Gauthier's model would suggest, in the 'depoliticisation' of civic communities. The fact that late 2nd-century elitism continued to be presented rhetorically as the products of gymnasial training suggests that the rise of elite citizens was a function of dynamics inherent to these civic communities themselves; that we can trace fairly well an individualising rhetorical 'trend' in the late 2nd and 1st centuries BCE must reflect the fact that civic authorities and their decree-drafters – perhaps at the behest of the honorands themselves, although this cannot be proved – continued to feel compelled to engage with this individualising rhetoric. Late Hellenistic citizens were 'super-citizens', not successors to Hellenistic kings external to the *poleis*.

Intellectual *paideia* and competing gymnasialising honours at Klaros and Metropolis

The supercharging of the gymnasial ethics underpinning public honorific decrees is further reflected in the increasingly elitist character of gymnasial training. One manifestation of this is praise for contributions towards intellectual education and cultural attainment in decrees

[491] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 28-30, 65 ll. 34-36, 71 ll. 57-58, even to the *neoi*.

for gymnasial officials in the post-133 period, as a supplement to the traditional regime of physical training.[492] So Diodoros of Ephesos encouraged in the youth a φιλοπονία that was both corporeal and spiritual.[493] Chrysippos, a *paidonomos* at Iasos, rendered the *paides* more zealous for μαθήματα, even holding contests in literature, reading, calligraphy, and φιλομαθία.[494] One beneficiary of this training was a certain Melanion, a 1st-century ephebarch who was lauded for his φιλομαθία, having progressed beyond the learning appropriate to this age to engage even in philosophical study.[495] The Pergamene gymnasiarchs are found hosting visiting lecturers and holding contests in μαθήματα.[496] The provision of special teachers becomes the special object of euergetism by the 1st century. At Eretria, the gymnasiarchs Mantidoros and Elpinikos respectively procured a Homeric *philologos* and a rhetor;[497] at Priene, Zosimos sought to accord equal attention to both physical and intellectual training, and hired a grammarian for the youth, whose purpose was the lofty one of fostering their souls towards 'virtue and humane feeling'.[498] By this time, this sort of generosity may have come to be normalised to the point that the gymnasiarch Chares of obscure Phrygian Themisonion could be praised offhand for overseeing the *paideia* of the youth.[499]

What this rhetorical emphasis on intellectual and philosophical education suggests is the increasingly nuanced ways in which inter-city competition around gymnasia was

[492] The Athenian *ephebeia* featured philosophical lectures from at least 122/121: *IG* II/III^2 1006 ll. 19-20, with Scholz (2004) 112 and Burckhardt (2004) 203-205.
[493] *I.Ephesos* 6 ll. 15-19; Menas of Sestos likewise encouraged the souls (ψυχαί) of the youth towards courage and ethical virtue: *I.Sestos* 1 ll. 70-72; cf. *Syll.*^{3} 656 ll. 19-20, where the Teian ambassadors Megathumos and Amymon were praised for undergoing ψυχικὴν καὶ σωματικὴν κακοπαθίαν (c. 150).
[494] *I.Mylasa* 909 ll. 5-6, 18-19.
[495] *I.Iasos* 98 ll.13-19; cf. Gray (2012) 240-243.
[496] Agias and Athenaios' visiting lecturers: *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 379 n. 2 ll. 13-17, *MDAI(A)* 35 (1910) 401 n. 1b l. 8; M[---]'s contests in μαθήματα *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 375 n. 1 ll. 12-14.
[497] *IG* XII.9 235 ll. 9-13, *IG* XII.9 234 ll. 8-9.
[498] *I.Priene2014* 68 ll. 74-77; see Gray (2012) 243-245. Note a late 2nd-century list of Spartan ephors in the lower gymnasium: *I.Priene2014* 322.
[499] Michel, *Recueil* 544 ll. 15-16; note also *IG* XII.9 904 ll. 3-4, *paideia* seen as sum of gymnasial affairs at Chalkis (c. 100).

developing.[500] The chronological coincidence with the onset of Roman domination over Achaia and Asia implies that this was in part an ideological response to Roman rule. It had already been important to re-consider what good citizenship meant in the decades after Apameia, especially as the rhetorical expertise of elite citizens as diplomats and intermediaries, as we saw in chapter 1, became more crucial to inter-state relations; the high place accorded to ambassadors in the Roman period exacerbated this process. Cities therefore became keener to demonstrate the all-rounded training of their citizens. Traditional physical training continued to be central well into the 1st century,[501] but was also complemented by an ideal of the citizen as an elite communicator. By the mid-1st century, intellectual *paideia* suffused the honorific profile of citizens, some even melding this with official ambassadorial duties: at Pergamon, a number of athletes and even a philosopher were honoured for services to the community at the gymnasium.[502] The process by which this came about, however, was one shaped by the pressure to exhibit such elite communicators through public honorific acts. Part of the surge in euergetic behaviour in the late 2nd century BCE can therefore be attributed to the convergence of gymnasia with civic identities in the late Hellenistic period, and the competitive interactivity between cities that resulted.

This is well exemplified in the Klarian decrees for Menippos and Polemaios, whose ambassadorial contacts with Roman authorities we examined in chapter 2. Contemporary to the Pergamene gymnasiarchs, Apollonios of Metropolis, and Menas of Sestos, the portraits

[500] Rhetorical emphasis does not undercut the fact, of course, that intellectual *paideia* at gymnasia was a mainstay across the Hellenistic period: Gauthier (1995) 3-7, and Scholz (2004) 104-124. Notably, public honours for philosophers only emerge around 200: e.g. *IG* VII 2849 (Haliartos), and *IG* XII.6.1.128 (Samos); cf. Haake (2007) 280-285.

[501] Continued provision of oil for training: Fröhlich (2009) 58-72 and Curty (2015) 263-280; gymnasiarchs continue to be praised for providing contests across this period. The contests for εὐταξία, φιλοπονία, and εὐεξία: Crowther (1991); they are notably absent from Athenian evidence.

[502] Mathys, *Architekturstiftungen* Gy 32-37; the philosopher Apollophanes and athlete Hippolochos (Gy 32-33) served as ambassadors to Rome. See also *SEG* 63.1333 ll. 7-21, honours for the accomplished athlete M. Antonius Idagras, who represented Xanthos before the triumvirs, with Ma (2014) 160.

of both men highlight their immersion in the full gamut of gymnasial *paideia*. Polemaios had 'nurtured his soul in the finest disciplines and trained his body through customary physical exercise', and further travelled to Rhodes to study rhetoric, believing it noble not only to adorn his fatherland through bodily exertions, but also through 'leadership of common affairs through word and political deed'.[503] Menippos also travelled to Athens, furnishing an 'outstanding model of his lifestyle and the education he received there'.[504] Throughout, we find phrases characteristic of gymnasialising rhetoric, in their leaving no opportunity for zealousness unexploited,[505] comporting themselves in a community-minded way,[506] or surpassing themselves.[507] It is in the most public moments of their careers, however, that this gymnasial virtue is at its most abstract: so Menippos, after restoring concord to the city, manifested 'his continual deep-seated predilection (διάληψις) for the good',[508] while Polemaios' embassies to Rome were venues for revealing the full range of his gymnasial upbringing, in 'accepting all danger on account of all, facing this danger on the people's account, on land and sea, with his body, soul, and all his livelihood', and obtaining from the Senate a testament 'conforming to the constancy of his being'.[509]

The style of the Klarian decrees is particularly elevated, even by the standards of its late Hellenistic contemporaries. It may nevertheless be fruitful to compare it to the Metropolitans' decree for Apollonios, alluded to several times earlier already. There we find a similar gymnasial focus, but the rhetorical presentation of Apollonios is less ornate, less detailed, and less inclined to present his deeds as abstractions. His foreign travels are vaguely alluded to as movements 'in foreign lands' (ἐπὶ ξένης). There is arguably a distinctly

[503] *SEG* 39.1243i ll. 1-7, 16-28.
[504] *SEG* 39.1244i ll. 1-10.
[505] *SEG* 39.1244i ll. 13-14, iii ll. 1-5, *SEG* 39.1243ii ll. 4-5, 9-10, iv ll. 48-50.
[506] *SEG* 39.1244i ll. 10-11, ii ll. 22-24, *SEG* 39.1243i ll. 11-13, iii ll. 52-58.
[507] *SEG* 39.1244ii ll. 27-28.
[508] *SEG* 39.1244ii ll. 22-24.
[509] *SEG* 39.1243ii ll. 20-24, 31-33.

greater effort in the Klarian decrees to emphasise the fullness of their honorands' gymnasial profile. These differences may not just be happenstance results of rhetorical style. Relations between the two communities were not smooth throughout the 2nd century, and indeed in all three decrees there are hints of continuing conflict, and even violent confrontation.[510] This played out also at the ideological level, where the Kolophonians may have increasingly felt pressure to present an influential local citizen to its neighbours, in the same way that Metropolis could boast of Apollonios. The similarity of the honorific monuments of Apollonios and the Klarians, separated by less than two decades, is relevant here. The decrees for all three were inscribed on monumental bases bearing their statues, a combination that is relatively rare. The Klarians' statues, however, were boldly and starkly differentiated by being further erected on columns set on their statue-bases.[511] The honours for Menippos and Polemaios may therefore have been conceived in conscious emulation of, and sought to outdo, the honorific monument for Apollonios, and actively and competitively drew parallels between their connections to Roman power and Apollonios' sacrificial service in 132 BCE. Where, for example, Apollonios had embodied εὐταξία at Thyateira, Polemaios held firm to his ὑπόστασις before the Senate itself.

If this reading holds, it would shed some light on the way that the advent of Roman rule served to galvanise the elevation in rhetorical style, and dogged adherence to gymnasial virtues, that comes to predominate in honorific rhetoric from the late 2nd century onwards.

[510] Apollonios: *I.Metropolis* 1b ll. 14-17 (embassies concerning disputes with neighbouring cities over land); Menippos: *SEG* 39.1244i ll. 50-54, ii ll. 1-7, mentioning the Metropolitans' seizing Kolophonians (ἀνδρολήψιον); Robert and Robert (1989) 89-90 see the two sections as two disputes with Metropolis; for ἀνδρολήψιον, Lehmann (2003). Polemaios: *SEG* 39.1243ii ll. 33-37, and 34-35 for ἐφόδου μεθ' ὅπλων; although unnamed, the language suggests these were civic militiamen. These disputes are likely to have concerned the plain north of Mt Galesion (modern Alamandağ) including the territory around Prepelaion, which Menippos secured for Kolophon (*SEG* 39.1244i ll. 23, 36-37); cf. Robert and Robert (1989) 89.

[511] The only earlier Hellenistic example of a statue-base for a civic benefactor inscribed with the decree is *I.Magnesia* 92 (early 2nd century); cf. Forster (2018) 258, and n. 42. Interestingly, Menippos' honours had been initially designated as a statue and stele, and were only upgraded to a columnar statue through his initiative; the design was replicated for Polemaios: *SEG* 39.1244iii ll. 43-48, 39.1243v ll. 43-48, with Robert and Robert (1989) 103-104; the situation is more complicated than implied by Ma (2013) 59-60.

In short, contact with Rome represented a new avenue for the expression of pre-existing inter-city tensions. Metropolis and Klaros offer particularly direct witnesses to this, because their honoured citizens were so directly engaged with Roman power. For all the reality of the threats to Kolophon's civic status, and the gravity of Menippos and Polemaios' missions, it may well be that their insistent engagement with Roman authorities derived also from local pressure to compete with regional non-Klarian elite citizens like Apollonios. Some further sense of this can be gleaned from the fact that their local benefactions had a distinctly 'international' character, not obviously related to political crises to the city, which may have specifically highlighted Klaros' regional profile before a neighbour like Metropolis. As *agonothetai*, both men stimulated international participation at the Klaria festival: Menippos invited both Greeks and barbarians,[512] while Polemaios called on 'all humankind'.[513] Competition between the two is likely to have been a factor here: notably, while Menippos hosted the governor Q. Mucius,[514] Polemaios not only hosted visiting Romans, but also travelling artists and Kretan ambassadors.[515] The result of this 'competitive internationalism' was that gymnasial virtues could be conceived as universal virtues, so that Polemaios was 'humane' (ἀνθρωπίνως) towards refugees to the city, and thereby that this humanity towards debtors was conceived as being in conformity with the city's ethical character.[516]

'Competitive internationalism' therefore formed one strain of local inter-citizen euergetic interaction emerging from the civic incorporation of gymnasia across the 2nd century; it was not the only kind. At Priene, we find inter-citizen rivalry emerging out of

[512] *SEG* 39.1244ii ll. 29-33.
[513] *SEG* 39.1243iv ll. 40-45, 50-53; trans-Hellenic participation a result of expanding the Klaria's participants: Flashar (1999) 427; this was unusual for panhellenic festivals: Parker (2004) 16-17.
[514] *SEG* 39.1244ii ll. 42-46.
[515] *SEG* 39.1243iv ll. 15-23.
[516] *SEG* 39.1243iii ll. 25-38; see also Gray (2013) 155-157.

dynamics reminiscent of what we have seen already at Pergamon, Metropolis and Klaros, but the effects on local political culture are arguably clearer.

Civic honour and divine service at late Hellenistic Priene: Moschion's *stephanephoria*

Alongside promoting gymnasia, some communities were further concerned to enhance the vividness of their local gods. At the relatively modest Priene, which presents a counterpoint to powerful Pergamon, leading citizens did so through prestigious liturgies like the *stephanephoria* and *agonothesia*, the epigraphic traces of which reflect socio-economic developments at Priene, as well as the broader context of inter-city competition around local cults, that underscores the intensification of euergetic behaviour in the late Hellenistic period. One figure in particular stands out, whose career serves as a point of departure for considering these themes: Moschion son of Kydimos.

The brother of the Athenopolis encountered earlier, Moschion was Priene's leading statesman in the mid-2nd century. His honorific decree is the longest of the series inscribed on the west and east walls of the North Hall;[517] 200 of its 400 lines are decipherable, and it is without surprise that the majority of these consist of accounts of his personal generosity towards the city: eighty-seven are occupied by donations of grain and money to the city (ll. 31-117), thirty-nine by foreign embassies, often sponsored by himself (ll. 25-30, 152-174, 223-232), and some fifty-nine by his year as *stephanephoros* (ll. 253-311); the remainder describe other functions where personal donation was less significant.[518] Moschion has held a central place in the history of late Hellenistic euergetism, in Asia Minor and beyond. For Gauthier, he was the archetypal new-style benefactor acting outside civic frameworks, and

[517] *I.Priene2014* 64.
[518] Military leadership in an unknown context, although including the contribution of two minas (ll. 250-252), and *antigrapheus* and garrison-commander (ll. 209-223).

dispensing generosity as a citizen successor to royal euergetism.[519] This is allegedly the impression from the opening lines (ll. 14-23):

> '…Since Moschion son of Kydimos has been a fine and good man from his earliest years, and has lived piously towards the gods, and reverently towards his parents, those living with him in positions of familiarity and trust, and all other citizens, and has contributed to the fatherland in a just and zealous manner worthy of the virtue and renown of his ancestors, bearing the favour of the gods, as has been thoroughly evidenced throughout his whole life, and the goodwill of his fellow-citizens and inhabitants on account of his fair deeds…'

As we have seen, however, this presentation of a 'lifetime' benefactor should be seen in terms of the ethics of the gymnasium: there is no reason why the reverence he displayed towards his parents, seen alongside his broader goodwill to his coevals and citizens, does not belong more within this web of ideas, than to, say, the model of royal beneficence, where kings like Seleukos II had also been praised for their reverence to their relatives.[520] The inherent problem with likening the rhetoric of civic euergetism to that of kings, as Gauthier implicitly does, is ultimately that we need to see both within civic frameworks – kings had also been embedded within the moral universe of the *polis*, as individuals respectful of their forebears, and pious to the gods. To this extent, the rhetorical similarities between the euergetism of Moschion and 'royal euergetism' reveal parallels, but these should serve as an instigation to investigate the specificity of Moschion's euergetic behaviour, and not as an explanation in itself. The problem is legitimate, because Moschion himself is somewhat anomalous at Priene – none of the other decrees is as lengthy, or include, for instance, extensive accounts of grain and monetary donations, apparently made outside civic frameworks, and hence a sign of the 'depoliticisation' of civic life. It will be suggested later that, on the whole, there is less evidence for such 'depoliticisation' than usually thought,

[519] Gauthier (1985) 58-59, 73-74, also Hamon (2007) 95-96.
[520] *OGIS* 229 ll. 5-7; cf. Gauthier (1985) 58 n. 14.

even if there is reason to believe socio-economic changes were taking place across the 2nd century. Nor did Moschion initiate anything like 'dynastic' or 'king-like' rule at Priene: rather, what evidence we have suggests instead an increasingly competitive politics around honorific status over the following half-century.

In thinking about what he and his Prienian successors were doing, one approach is to examine their acts on their own terms. We might start therefore by noticing that the inscriptions captioning Moschion's several honorific statues commemorated him for his virtue, goodwill, nobility of spirit, and generosity, but also, crucially, his piety (εὐσέβεια) to the gods.[521] This is a virtue that is highlighted in the opening lines of his decree, and is closely associated with the divine favour (εὐμένεια) he manifested in his deeds. Both piety and divine favour recur throughout the series of late Hellenistic decrees,[522] and must be read together with the predominant focus in these decrees on the city's liturgies most closely associated with her patron deities Zeus and Athena – namely, the *stephanephoria* and *agonothesia*.[523] About a third of the surviving portions of Moschion's decree, which otherwise details activity over several decades, describes his year as *stephanephoros*. The same is true of the decree for his contemporary Heroides.[524] About half of Krates' decree deals with his *agonothesia* and *stephanephoria*;[525] a similar ratio is found in Herakleitos' decree for an unnamed liturgy, possibly a *stephanephoria*.[526] By the second quarter of the 1st century we even find individual decrees specifically outlining the benefactions of Zosimos as gymnasiarch and *stephanephoros*.[527]

[521] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 326-328.
[522] *I.Priene2014* 65 ll. 34-35, 138, 168-169, 217-218, 254; 66 ll. 6, 16; 69 l. 69; 71 ll. 63, 65; 72 l. 33.
[523] For these liturgies at Priene, Fröhlich (2005) 233-249.
[524] *I.Priene2014* 65 ll. 170-223, roughly 60 of 160 decipherable lines; ll. 1-30, 224-278 are the opening and honouring clauses; ll. 31-47 are fragmentary, but seem to describe sacrifices made during some kind of liturgy.
[525] *I.Priene2014* 67 ll. 167-278.
[526] *I.Priene2014* 71 ll. 28-47.
[527] *I.Priene2014* 68-69.

The prominence of the *stephanephoria* is relatively unsurprising. The bearing of the crown of Zeus Olympios represented the pinnacle of the Prienian career,[528] and was costly enough that it was not held every year: as at Miletos, it was occasionally assumed by a god or tribal hero.[529] It was nevertheless the object of intense competition; in the period roughly 150-85, at least twenty-four different *stephanephoroi* are known, while only in six years was it held by a god or hero.[530] A summary of Moschion's *stephanephoria*, c. 130 BCE, reveals the high visibility that would be accorded to the holder of the post. On his first day of office, he adorned the sanctuaries and altars of the city with crowns and sacrifices, and invited various population groups of the city (sons of the fallen, citizens, *paroikoi*, *xenoi*, freedmen, and house-slaves) to a distribution of sweet-wine (*glykismos*).[531] Bull-sacrifices were made to Zeus Olympios, Hera, Athena Polias, and Pan Arogos, the meat from which was distributed to the citizens (ll. 259-262). Over the year, he made distributions of wine, sweet-wine, and an eighth of a *medimnos* of grain to individual citizens, *paroikoi* and probably also *xenoi* (ll. 272-276). The crowning moment was the Panathenaia festival, at which he led a bull worthy of Athena, and demonstrated his 'piety towards the gods' (ll. 281-283). This account reveals a 'template' for generosity at the *stephanephoria* centred on three moments: the first day sacrifices, activities throughout the year, and the Panathenaia. It is also nonetheless important to remember the charged emotionality of Moschion's tenure in particular. In the invocation of Pan the 'Helper' – elsewhere unattested at Priene – and the inclusion of 'sons of the fallen' (ll. 258-261) allusion is made to a period of upheaval,

[528] Although a liturgy in a technical sense, it was not ranged alongside more 'normal' liturgies, and is not found, for instance, among the liturgies for which exemption may be granted in *I.Priene2014* 144.
[529] *I.Priene2014* 22 l. 1, 31 l. 1, 65 l. 141, 30 l. 1, 64 ll. 31, 51, 63-64, 79, 89.
[530] Alongside Moschion, Heroides, and Krates, *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 68, 213; 65 ll. 53, 141, 142-143, 255-256; 66 l. 1; 67 ll. 17-18, 19, 123, 143, 167-168, 201 (last three are the same man, Akrisios), 212; 71 l. 12; 72 ll. 1, 12; 77 l. 5; 85 l. 6; 93 l.1; 135 l. 2; 144 ll. 34-35; 324 l. 1. Divine or heroic *stephanephoroi*: *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 31, 51, 63-64, 79, 89; 65 l. 141. Zosimos' decrees provide five individuals (including himself), depending on when in the period after 85 one dates him: 68 l. 1, 20-21, 30-31; 69 l. 10; 70 l. 1.
[531] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 255-259.

perhaps the war against Aristonikos, or the earthquake of the 130s.[532] The high place accorded to Moschion's piety, and the 'salvation' of Priene, were undoubtedly rhetorical responses to these events, but must also be seen against two persistent features of Prienian life in the post-Apameian decades. The first is heightening socio-economic inequality between citizen and non-citizen groups, and the second the concern to assert the international visibility of Priene's gods within a competitive post-Apameian western Anatolian context. We take these points in turn.

Wealthier citizens, debased *paroikoi*

Moschion's distribution of grain during his *stephanephoria* would have evoked the many earlier such distributions he had made to the city.[533] Two main categories are discernible, in the advancing of money, and the provision of grain, either through sale or the advancement of money towards its purchase. At least eight different years are described. Of the six occasions involving grain, five involve the sale or gift of grain, and only once is money advanced specifically for its purchase; the fact that in most of these cases grain itself was supplied, and not merely the *money* towards grain, strongly suggests the ready grain supplies of Moschion's family estate. This seems to differ from similar acts of citizen benefactors in the 3rd century, who do provide money towards grain-funds, but only rarely supply grain from their own estates.[534]

The extent to which this reflects a genuine change in the circumstances of landowning in western Asia Minor between, say, the late 4th to early 3rd and mid-2nd

[532] Note that Moschion's honours were publicly announced as being for the sake of the 'salvation and benefaction of the people' (ll. 339-340).
[533] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 31-117.
[534] *I.Erythrai* 28 ll. 20-29, 36-41 (donates money thrice, and sells grain only once), with Robert, *BE* 1984 363 (Polykritos not corn-dealer, by landowner), and *IG* XII.6 11 ll. 36-49 (Boulagoras of Samos).

centuries, is difficult to tell. A seductive argument of P. Thonemann, however, is that Moschion's late Hellenistic situation is the result of the gradual incorporation of royal land into civic territory through grants to royal *philoi*,[535] which allowed citizen families to amass land holdings over time.[536] It is important to emphasise here, however, that such incorporation of royal land by citizens did not necessarily mean it became external to civic control, like the land of royal *philoi*, as Thonemann's argument implies. At Priene itself, the honours for the early 3rd-century Seleukid official Larichos are instructive.[537] While in earlier honours for an unknown benefaction he received only the privilege of ἀτέλεια τοῦ σώματος, immunity from property-tax,[538] the honours he received after a later donation of royal land to the city – land which he had been previously granted by Antiochos I – are more specific: ἀτέλεια for specific subsets of his property, encompassing cattle and slaves both on civic land and his own estates, his ἴδια κτήματα.[539] That is, Larichos' property was regarded as encompassing both 'public' and 'private' land. In the late 2nd century, however, the citizens Moschion and Heroides both also received ἀτέλεια τοῦ σώματος,[540] but we find no such distinction between 'public' and 'private': this would suggest that their estates, broad as they may have become, continued to be conceptualised as *polis*-land, and in theory fully subjectable to fiscal exaction by the city.

What is more difficult to ascertain, if this argument holds, is the extent to which this may have resulted in greater wealth inequality within citizen ranks. Insofar as our evidence for monetary sums of benefactions and land-prices over the 3rd and 2nd centuries serve as

[535] E.g. Antiochos I's gift of land to Aristodikos of Assos, *I.Ilion* 33.
[536] Thonemann (2011a) 248-249. The dispositions of the peace of Apameia in 188 may have provided further impetus to this process.
[537] *I.Priene2014* 29-31 with Gauthier (1980a) 45-47. Another figure may be Megabyzos of Ephesos, honoured in the late 4th century with the right to buy Prienian land (*I.Priene2014* 16 ll. 12-14).
[538] *I.Priene2014* 29 ll. 5-6. Ἀτέλεια τοῦ σώματος refers to a tax on property, and not exemption from military service or income tax: Gauthier (1991) 55-68.
[539] *I.Priene2014* 30 ll. 5-7.
[540] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 324-325, 65 ll. 250-251; the privilege is otherwise well-attested at Priene: *I.Priene2014* 19 l. 36, 29 ll. 5-6, 32 l. 11, 33 l. 5, 45 ll. 5-6, 48 l. 6, 93 l. 8, 144 l. 6, 145 l. 2.

some measure of this, we do not actually find that wealth *per capita*, across western Asia Minor and its islands, was necessarily dramatically higher in the late 2nd-century moment epitomised by Moschion. His monetary donations (including those for grain) listed above amount to 11,358 drachmas; these were also made over eight years, and often together with his brother.[541] That Athenopolis, moreover, is known to have bought the priesthood of Dionysos Phleos for 12,002 drachmas, just two drachmas more than the advertised price, may be an indication that this was the upper limit of his purchasing power.[542] Elsewhere, the donations of benefactors after the mid-2nd century do not exceed more than a few talents.[543] This is striking, because sums for benefactions from the 3rd century are closely comparable: in fact, sums at the higher end, like Diodotos' 33,400 drachmas towards Halikarnassos' gymnasium (early 3rd BCE), or the 60,000 drachmas of Eudemos and his brothers (c. 200), compare well with those of Moschion and Athenopolis.[544] Furthermore, figures for land-prices across these two centuries do not seem to exceed the 10,000 drachmas mark, although this is admittedly flimsy evidence.[545] Of course, these publicly visible sums may only have been a part of 'total' elite fortunes. Archippe of Kyme, for instance, donated 11,000 drachmas, as well as unknown sums towards the *bouleuterion*, over her career.[546] As

[541] The second highest monetary sums attested at Priene are the donations of a 1st-century *stephanephoros* of 4500 and 1600 drachmas towards contests and sacrifices: *I.Priene2014* 72 ll. 5, 16-17.
[542] *I.Priene2014* 144 ll. 35-38, and 24-30 (immunity from all civic liturgies for those who pay at least 12,000 drachmas); for the contractual exchange here, Gray (2015) 169. The only more expensive priesthood is from Kos, at 19,800 drachmas: *IG* XII.4 325b l. 30 (75 BCE).
[543] Kraton of Teos gave the 10,500 drachmas to the Attalistai (*CIG* 3069 ll. 23-24); Kritolaos of Amorgos donated 2000 drachmas for his son's posthumous cult (*IG* XII.7 515 l. 8); Menippos of Klaros built a door for Apollo's shrine worth around a talent (*SEG* 39.1244ii ll. 25-26); Hermias donated 15,000 drachmas towards sacrifices for Athena Ilias (*I.Ilion* 52 ll. 6, 15).
[544] *McCabe Halikarnassos* 6 and *Syll.*[3] 577/*Milet* I.3 145 ll. 4-5; Polythrous' gymnasium fund (3rd century BCE) amounted to 33,000 drachmas: *Syll.*[3] 578 ll. 6-7; Polykritos of Erythrai furnished a talent towards the grain fund: *I.Erythrai* 28 ll. 40-41; Boulagoras of Samos paid the same for honours to Ptolemy III: *IG* XII.6 11 ll. 35-36.
[545] At Magnesia around 300 BCE plots, sized between 20 and 83 *schonoi*, sold between 2000 and 5000 drachmas: *I.Magnesia* 8, with Thonemann (2011a) 243-248; the land-leases from Mylasa and environs (various dated from the late 3rd to late 2nd centuries, cf. now Van Bremen (2018) 19-22) show figures ranging from 1190 drachmas to 10,000 drachmas, with most spanning 3000-8000 drachmas: Pernin (2014) 440-441. For further evidence, Broughton (1938) 687-690.
[546] Distributions to the people of 270 drachmas and 640 drachmas, and a posthumous donation of 10,000 drachmas: *SEG* 33.1036 ll. 22, 24, 33.1037 ll. 17-19, 33.1039 ll. 51-52, 68; these are only rough figures, as the

a woman, however, this is likely to have constituted only a fraction of her family's wealth.[547] Nonetheless, all this need not affect the main suggestion here, that Moschion is unlikely to have been overwhelmingly richer than fellow elite citizens, and thus that internal inequalities within citizen bodies are unlikely to have been the dominant factor in the emergence of late 2nd-century citizen benefactors like him. What we may rather be observing, although only speculatively advanced here, is the increase in *aggregate* citizen wealth over the 2nd century. This does not preclude, of course, that by the early 1st century – propelled in part by powerful Roman *imperatores* and ambitious Italian *negotiatores* – greater hierarchies within citizen bodies did emerge.[548]

Priene's small population, perhaps not exceeding 1000 male citizens at a time, imposed limits on significant inter-citizen economic inequality.[549] Instead, rising citizen wealth may have exerted a greater impact on relations with non-citizens, particularly the *paroikoi*, whom Moschion invited to his distributions.[550] In the early 3rd century, the inhabitants dwelling in the plain around Priene were known as the Pedieis ('plain-dwellers');[551] by the late 2nd century, however, this term had given way to the more general *paroikoi*.[552] What this semantic shift may indicate is that Priene's dwellers-around now encompassed indigenous populations beyond its plains, perhaps including those in the

sums are given in both staters (probably referring to cistophori) and Attic-weight drachmas; the *bouleuterion*: *SEG* 33.1037 l. 15.

[547] Van Bremen (1996) 256-257.

[548] Chairemon of Nysa, for instance, supplied 60,000 modii of grain for the Roman army in the Mithridatic war, ten times (!) Moschion's total monetary donations: *I.Nysa* 411 l. 8; his son Pythodoros and contemporary Hieron of Laodikeia both possessed at least 2000 talents: Strabo 14.1.42, 12.8.16; in the 60s BCE Asklepiades of Akmoneia could furnish a payment of 206,000 drachmas on behalf of the city: Cic. *Flac.* 34-38.

[549] Population estimate: Kah (2014) 150-156 and 162-164 for Prienian house-sizes, with Rumscheid (2010) 120-122.

[550] The following draws from the insights of Ando (2018), and shares the views of Beck (2015) 384-385.

[551] *I.Priene2014* 2 l. 6, 4c ll. 2-3, 16 ll. 14-15. This seems to have included also non-Prienian Greek citizens, such as Magnesians: Thonemann (2012) 33-35.

[552] Sugliano (2001) 317. There is no clear evidence that a group specifically definable as the *paroikoi* existed before the 2nd century: the earliest indication is the use of the verb παροικεῖν in a fragmentary letter of Lysimachos (?) (*I.Priene2014* 4 l. 7); cf. Bertrand (2005) 46-47. *I.Priene2014* 28 l. 20 (early 3rd century BCE) mentions οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας, citizen and non-citizen inhabitants in the territory; cf. Kah (2012a) 55 n. 18, 56-57.

region of the Anaitis contested with Samos, for example. The aggrandisement of civic land through royal grants is likely to have played some role here. This process, crucial to the growth of citizen wealth, may also have had the consequence of effectively generalising *paroikoi* as a slave-worker force, as indigenous populations belonging earlier to *laoi basilikoi* came into civic control. Already in the 3rd century the workers of Larichos' royal estates were classified as slaves,[553] while by the mid-2nd century there is some evidence that Priene's non-citizen inhabitants were regarded as a slave-like workforce: an inscription relating to Ariarathes V's siege of Priene (150s BCE) mentions that he plundered much property and led away many slaves (σώματα),[554] while Polybios' account of that event summarises the Prienians' losses as being primarily of 'slaves and cattle'.[555] By the late 2nd century, then, it is possible that a majority of *paroikoi* were economically, as well as already politically, subordinate to Priene's citizenry. Whether or not this resulted in tension, mutual suspicion, or even hostility, we cannot tell. Moschion's inclusion of them at his *stephanephoria* as part of his 'salvation' of the city, however, would imply some sort of conciliatory, symbolic significance. In any case, his political successors continued to do so into the 1st century.[556]

Nor was Priene the only place where tensions around this sort of economic subordination may have taken place. It has been argued that *paroikoi* in the Hellenistic period refer primarily to civic equivalents of old royal *basilikoi laoi*,[557] and this may have

[553] *I.Priene2014* 30 ll. 5-7, Thonemann (2011a) 248, 251.
[554] *I.Priene2014* 11b ll. 2-3.
[555] Polyb. 33.6.7 with Kreißig (1977) 24-25. It may be significant here that late 2nd-century benefactions are careful to specifically include house-slaves, *oiketai*, thus presumably excluding slave-workers on estates, δοῦλοι or σώματα: *I.Priene2014* 64 l. 259, 65 ll. 179, 194, 72 l. 13, 84 l. 4; δοῦλοι are found first in Krates' decree in the early 80s, and then only in Zosimos' second decree: *I.Priene2014* 67 l. 239, 69 ll. 39, 56, 83.
[556] *I.Priene2014* 41 l. 7, 64 ll. 258, 276, 65 ll. 178, 193-194, 67 l. 240, 71 l. 41, 68 l. 80, 69 ll. 38-39, 43, 77, 82-83, 72 l. 13 also mention *katoikoi* (always following *paroikoi*). Another grouping attested is 'those inhabiting the city and territory', οἱ πολῖται καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες τήν τε πόλιν καὶ τὴν χώραν, as a group distinct from the citizens, which would denote both citizen and non-citizen populations: *I.Priene2014* 42 l. 17, 55 ll. 14-15, 67 l. 182, 71 l. 31, 72 l. 18, 394 l. 5.
[557] Gagliardi (2009-2010) 309-322. The situation outside Asia Minor, and hence significance of *paroikoi* in places without traditions of incorporating royal land, like the Aegean islands, may have been different: Gauthier, *BE* 1998 107.

been the case across the region, beyond Priene. At Kolophon, a 'city of slaves' was the scene of violence at this time, and may have comprised a settlement of slave-workers of land owned by Kolophonian citizens.[558] The '*paroikoi* and slaves' seem to have formed in the early 1st century BCE a general term of reference for the subject non-citizens of Aphrodisias, as opposed to its citizenry;[559] moreover, the Ephesians granted citizenship to *paroikoi* (and other non-citizen, non-servile groups) during the first Mithridatic war.[560] Like the Pergamenes' grant of citizenship to *paroikoi* this was an emergency measure, but one which may also have served to more clearly distinguish an increasingly serf-like population from 'free' non-citizens.[561] In any case, the inclusion of non-citizens at public benefactions is increasingly common from the 2nd century onwards, at Amorgos' Athena Itonia festival,[562] at Klaros in Menippos' and Polemaios' invitations of resident foreigners and non-citizens (*isoteleis* and *metoikoi*) to distributions,[563] and at Kyme, where Archippe included the *katoikoi* in her distributions.[564]

These examples do suggest the emergence of more socially differentiated civic populations in the late Hellenistic period, perhaps in response to the same sort of dynamics observable at Priene, in the rise of aggregate citizen wealth. As well as being the result of local dynamics, however, it is perhaps also useful to think about the inclusion of non-citizens in public generosity as the product of a broader, regional development. It coincides with the civic incorporation of gymnasia in the 2nd century, as we have seen, but almost never intersects with it: we find very little evidence, in fact, of non-citizens being included in

[558] *SEG* 39.1243ii l. 36; this follows Ferrary (1991) 559 more than Robert and Robert (1989) 37-38, for whom this would allude to Aristonikos' Heliopolis (Strabo 14.1.38).
[559] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 8.3b l. 2.
[560] *OGIS* 338 ll. 20-26, *I.Ephesos* 8 ll. 43-48.
[561] It is this distinction that Mithridates VI may have sought to upend when he declared the citizenship of free non-citizens, but also freedom to slaves, across Asia: App. *Mith.* 48.
[562] *IG* XII.7 33 ll. 11-14, Suppl. 330 ll. 10-13.
[563] *SEG* 39.1244ii ll. 33-41 (at the Klaria), 39.1243iv ll. 24-34 (at his wedding).
[564] *SEG* 33.1036 ll. 20-30, 33.1037 ll. 16-20, 33.1039 ll. 56-59.

gymnasial distributions.[565] The only group other than local citizens which are found across gymnasiarchal decrees are *xenoi*, citizens of foreign *poleis*.[566] Non-citizens are conspicuously absent in the decrees for the Pergamene gymnasiarchs. Acts like those during Moschion's *stephanephoria*, in including non-citizens in distributions, but thereby also sharpening social distinctions between citizens and non-citizens, were therefore contemporary to efforts at many communities to shore up the exclusivity of citizenship through gymnasia (including at Priene; see the end of the chapter). As with the proliferation of gymnasial euergetism, however, such inclusivity of non-citizen groups was also a public-facing phenomenon that bolstered local pride before an international audience. This leads us, then, to the second major factor underpinning Moschion's piety, in the need to uphold the regional visibility of Priene's local cults. We now consider a broader western Anatolian ideological interest in emphasising and embellishing the 'manifestness' of local gods, which had impacts at other cities in generating competitive behaviour between citizens, before returning to the example of Priene.

Honours for gods, honours for men: divine manifestness and euergetic inflation

In describing Moschion's *stephanephoria* as having been 'manifest',[567] the Prienians were not claiming anything more than what many Greek cities had done in the earlier Hellenistic period, and would do after. They were, however, engaging with a rhetoric around divine manifestness that was increasingly prominent in western Anatolia in the decades after 188

[565] This is also the case with feasts in gymnasia: Mango (2004) 293-296 for documentation.
[566] Menas of Sestos: *I.Sestos* 1 ll. 66-67, 73-74, 84-85; Elpinikos of Eretria *IG* XII.9 234 ll. 24-32 (also includes visiting Romans); Diomedes of Tenos: *IG* XII.5 818 ll. 9-13; Chares of Themisonion: Michel, *Recueil* 544 ll. 16-21; cf. Gauthier (1982) 229-231. Only one case is known of euergetic oil-provision to *paroikoi* and metics (alongside *xenoi*), a statue-base for Leontiades of Mylasa in the late 2nd century: *SEG* 54.1101 ll. 1-3, 10-13. At Priene by the early 1st century, however, we do find *paroikoi* as ephebes: *I.Priene2014* 41 l. 7, 69 l. 43, with Kah (2012) 59-60.
[567] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 284-285.

in particular, and which had material consequences for the euergetic behaviour and honorific standing of local citizens.[568]

As many communities found themselves in new positions of political freedom under a supreme but distant Roman power, the divine manifestness of local gods presented an obvious mental framework through which to project civic identity and agency. The end of Seleukid overlordship changed the ideological status of kings, and local gods could assume a more predominant place. Indeed, it is mainly after 188 that Seleukid and Anatolian kings (although not the Attalids) call themselves 'manifest' (ἐπιφανής), perhaps as a way to symbolically compensate for the levelling effect of Roman hegemony in diminishing the disparity between royal and civic authority.[569] In any case, cities in western Anatolia in turn increasingly emphasised the visibility of their gods, with a number of communities, both free and non-free, involved in embellishing their temples from roughly 188-100 – Eumenes' Great Altar at Pergamon being a notable royal example, but part of a broader civic trend.[570] More tellingly, at least forty communities across the Aegean and western Asia Minor minted silver coinage in the period 170-140 that presented hyper-real portraits of local gods, with obverses presenting a sideways profile of the god, and reverses either a full body-length depiction of the cult-statue or a characteristic symbol of that deity.[571] This was an unusual localising change in numismatic iconography – silver coinage had previously been

[568] For the wider civic culture of Hellenistic epiphany, traceable already to the first Gallic invasions of the early 3rd century: Platt (2011) 147-151.
[569] Only Ptolemy V before 188 (196), and then Antiochos IV, Antiochos VI, Seleukos VI, Nikomedes II and Ariarathes VI: Platt (2011) 141-143, Meadows (2018) 308-310; also cf. *SEG* 30.1073 l. 3 (Rome at Chios, 180s), *I.Pergamon* 248 ll. 48-52 (Zeus Sabazios manifests himself to Attalos III).
[570] Ἐπιφάνεια on Pergamon's Great Altar: Platt (2011) 136-140; Athena at Aigai: Sezgin (2012) 85; Leto/Apollo/Artemis at Xanthos: De Courtils (2001) 217-219; Zeus Isotimos at Alabanda: Vitr. *De arch.* 3.2.6, with Hoepfner (1990) 31 and Akkan et al. (2016) 309-310; Hekate at Lagina: Van Bremen (2010) 483-503; Apollo Karneios at Knidos: Love (1973) 421-424, with *I.Knidos* 165-168; Apollo Klarios in the time of Menippos and Polemaios: De la Genière (1992) 203-204 and Ferrary and Verger (1999) 817-819; for Alexandria Troas and Olymos see below.
[571] For this numismatic iconographic change, Matthaei (2013) 18-92, Thonemann (2015) 56-65, Meadows (2018); the 'wreathed' coinages, Le Rider (2001), Psoma (2013) 266-275, De Callataÿ (2013) 232-236.

dominated by the portrait of Alexander the Great – and marks a shift towards emphasising the power of civic patron-deities.[572]

The individuals behind this iconographic change remain obscure to us, beyond some surviving names of mint-magistrates. The one insight into the ideological dynamics underpinning it, however, is that of the Sestians' decree for Menas, which tellingly praises him for minting a local type on bronze coins, and describes this as an act of piety – that is, coinage in the 120s was conceived as integral to promoting divine visibility.[573] While he had not done so as an act of spontaneous generosity, the very fact that minting was praiseworthy reflects the competitive euergetic dynamism that the widespread interest in honouring local deities in the post-Apameian period, now made more urgent by the increasingly large number of autonomous communities who sought to claim a place on the international scene, generated among elite citizens at a micro-regional level. In the Troad, for example, Alexandria Troas actively promoted its sanctuary of Apollo Smintheus, building a monumental pseudo-dipteral temple around 150, and minting lavish civic silvers presenting the god and his cult-statue; the types closely resemble those of the *koinon* centred on the older and more venerable Ilion.[574] It is likely in response to this growing Alexandrian confidence that an Ilian notable Hermias, the 'priest of all gods', donated 15,000 drachmas towards the embellishment of the procession and sacrificial rites at the festival of the Ilieia.[575]

The honour paid to the gods by cities also generated honours for citizens, thereby foreshadowing phenomena that we find at a more extensive scale with the early imperial

[572] As noted by Psoma (2013) 294, Meadows (2018) 308; for earlier Hellenistic 'civic Alexanders': Ashton (2012) 192-193, Thonemann (2015) 51-53, Meadows (2019) 82-85.
[573] *I.Sestos* 1 ll. 43-49. As Robert (1973) 49-53 notes, this minting was a matter of civic diligence, and not of personal generosity.
[574] Temple: Bingöl (1990) 50 and Özgünel (2003) 284; coinage: Ellis-Evans (2016) 146-149, (2019) 46-55. Two other Troadic cities with similarly assertive silver issues in the mid-2nd and early 1st centuries, most likely also in competition with the *koinon* (and each other), were Parion and Lampsakos: Ellis-Evans (2020).
[575] *I.Ilion* 52, ll. 16-32 for the procession.

cult, which formed 'euergetic space' for local notables, as we will see in chapter 4. Some of these dynamics can be fleshed out in Karia, in Priene's vicinity, where competition between large and small *poleis* resulted in individuals obtaining honorific distinction for services to their gods. At the small community of Olymos, the temple to Leto was the focal point of civic building activity in the mid-century, in commemoration of the 'great epiphanies' of the goddess, as Olymos sought to assert local agency within a *sympoliteia* increasingly dominated by the larger Mylasa (and in which Olymos would ultimately lose out).[576] The leading figure in these efforts, Phaidros son of Moschion (priest of the *daimones agathoi* of the Parembordeoi), was honoured twice, and at least once with a statue.[577] At neighbouring Stratonikeia, one observes the opposite dynamic, with the priest Leon of Stratonikeia conducting embassies to neighbouring villages to enhance the influence of Zeus Karios and render his sacrifices 'ever more manifest',[578] and receiving a statue for doing so – an honour even Philip V had been denied.[579] Finally, noteworthy are the activities of Poseidonios of Bargylia, a contemporary of Moschion of Priene, who worked hard to raise the stature of his small home-city, proposing a stephanephoric law to enhance the visibility of Apollo's shrine,[580] arbitrating between the powerhouses Rhodes and Stratonikeia at Bargylia itself,[581] and further proposing a number of laws regulating the cult to Artemis Kindyas after the goddess had made herself manifest during the war against Aristonikos.[582] An important feature of these regulations is that the *metoikoi* – Bargylia's equivalent of *paroikoi* – were not only made the recipients of distributions, but invited to actively participate in the

[576] *SEG* 39.1135-1137; *SEG* 39.1135 ll. 4-5 for the epiphanies; ll. 18-21 indicates shortage of money and urgency about the project. Regulations limiting priesthoods only to Olymians: *I.Mylasa* 861 ll. 11-13; Olymian identity seems to have been fully suppressed by the Roman period: Reger (2004) 164-168.
[577] *I.Mylasa* 869, 870; he was also a member of the land-purchasing committees in the Olymian land-lease documents: Van Bremen (2018) 23-28.
[578] See chapter 1; more manifest sacrifices: *I.Stratonikeia* 7 ll. 3-7.
[579] *I.Stratonikeia* 3 ll. 8-12.
[580] *SEG* 44.867a ll. 7-9.
[581] *SEG* 44.867c.
[582] *I.Iasos* 613 (l. 4 for divine epiphanies), *SEG* 45.1508a, 1508b (l. 3), Blümel (2000) 91 (ll. 11-12 for epiphanies), with Gauthier, *BE* 1997 541 for dating.

sacrifices themselves by helping to rear the sacrificial bulls and partaking of the sacrificial meat and procession.[583] This sort of active inclusivity of non-citizens is unparalleled, and may reflect Poseidonios' project of differentiating Bargylia from similar acts at a Priene or Kyme: if so, it would suggest how the competitive inter-city honouring of local gods also generated innovative behaviour among competing elite citizens who sought their own honour through such civic piety.

It is time, then, to return to Priene, a 'small' *polis*, flanked to the north and south by powerful neighbours, Magnesia and Miletos, with whom it competed in honouring its local gods in the post-Apameian decades. Both had already honoured their local deities – Artemis Leukophryene at Magnesia, and Apollo of Didyma – with monumental temples and panhellenic festivals by 188, having been members of an earlier late 3rd-century (in 208 and 218-206) wave of festival-creation in Asia Minor,[584] and continued to embellish their cults in the 2nd century.[585] Against this backdrop of vigorous cultural politics, Priene competed with Miletos, Magnesia and Herakleia in minting individualising portraits of local deities,[586] and notably embarked on a major revamp of its built landscape.[587] It is quite plausibly also in the post-Apameian decades that its local festival of the Panathenaia was established on a

[583] Blümel (2000) 91 ll. 12-19, *SEG* 45.1508b ll. 5-6, 9-22. *Metoikoi* as *paroikoi*: Deshours (2010) 272.
[584] Around 200, other festivals also gained panhellenic status, at Klaros, Knidos (Artemis Hyakinthotrophia), Rhodes (Halieia), Kyzikos (Soteria): Deshours (2010) 76-77 and Parker (2004) 20-21. Magnesia's *asylia* campaign: Rigsby (1996) 179-279 and Platt (2011) 152-154.
[585] Construction work on the Didymeion: Weis (1983) 73-75; the last building accounts inscriptions (*I.Didyma* 45-47) date to c. 100 BCE; the 5th-century law on the Molpoi was also re-inscribed in the late 2nd century: *Milet* I.3 123, Deshours (2010) 276-291; at Magnesia, the temple of Artemis at Magnesia likely dates to the period 220-190: Vitr. *De arch.* 3.2.6, with Kreeb (1990) 104-109 and *SEG* 40.999; the Eisiteria festival, established around that time, was revised in the late 2nd century: *I.Magnesia* 100a-b, cf. Dunand (1978) 201-202 and Deshours (2010) 205; the cult of Zeus Sosipolis was also regulated in the 180s: *I.Magnesia* 98, for whose lower dating, Errington (1989).
[586] Matthaei (2013) 87-90.
[587] A monumental altar for the sanctuary of Athena from around 200 is followed by construction work at the temple of Demeter, the south stoa of the sanctuary of Athena (including the terrace-wall beneath it), and in the agora the temple of Asklepios, the North Hall, market-gate, and the colonnades of its eastern and southern flanks; on the city's southern edge, the stadium stoa and lower gymnasium culminating around 150: Rumscheid (1994) 42-47, (2002) 78, and Raeck (2006) 318-324. For the agora, Von Kienlin (1998/1999) 241-255.

new footing as a penteteric event like the Leukophryeneia and Didymeia.[588] Indeed, the very fact that the decrees for late Hellenistic Prienians would be inscribed on the east and west walls of the monumental North Hall in the agora was arguably a conscious evocation of the similar practice at Magnesia, where the cult regulations concerning the Eisitheria were also set up on the western wall of the southern stoa in the agora abutting the sanctuary of Artemis in the late 2nd century.[589] The inscription of honorific decrees on monumental facades is otherwise rare, attested only at Iasos.[590] Moreover, the North Hall was likely the scene of cultic activity, being located just below the sanctuary of Athena (a flight of steps connected it to the East Gate Street leading to the sanctuary);[591] in the 1st century it was even known as the 'Sacred Stoa'.[592] This monumental parallelism was arguably a conscious choice that aimed to highlight the role of Priene's citizenry in contributing towards the manifestness of their local gods, in the same way the Magnesians' inscription of their cult regulations in their agora served to emphasise the power of Artemis. In a sense, the ideology of civic contribution *was* Priene's conception of divine 'manifestness'.[593] Over the late Hellenistic period c. 130-70 BCE, this sacral element to euergetic behaviour proved consuming, with twenty-three of forty-one known honorific decrees (some albeit just fragments) inscribed on the east and west walls of the North Hall.[594] These forty-one decrees are many more than

[588] First attested under Lysimachos (*I.Priene2014* 2 ll. 25-26), it is next heard of under Krates in the 1st century BCE as a penteteric festival, attended by visiting *theoroi*: *I.Priene2014* 67 l. 168; it is listed among other panhellenic festivals (Heraia, Didymeia) on a contemporaneous athlete's commemorative stele: Robert (1940-1965) 9.73-77; the mid-2nd-century monumentalisation around the sanctuary of Athena (south stoa, terrace-wall) may be related.
[589] *I.Magnesia* 100b ll. 17-21.
[590] Fabiani and Nafissi (2013) 40-59; all are honours for 4th- and 3rd-century foreign benefactors.
[591] Von Kienlin (2004) 129, against Rumscheid (1999) 24-25, that the Sacred Stoa was contracted out by the sanctuary to shopkeepers.
[592] *I.Priene2014* 69 l. 59.
[593] Note also that other citizen benefactors in the 2nd century are occasionally praised for making their cities 'manifest', sometimes without clear associations to a specific cult: Eirenias of Miletos: *Milet* VI.3 1039i ll. 2-4; Aristomenes of Samos: *IG* XII.6 13 l. 6; Archippe of Kyme: *SEG* 33.1036 ll. 16-17, 33.1037 ll. 11-12. 33.1039 l. 25, Polemaios of Klaros: *SEG* 39.1243v ll. 3-8.
[594] *I.Priene2014* 63-85 (North Hall), 48-49, 56-60 (agora), 41-42 (sanctuary of Athena), 87-95 (fragments of uncertain provenance dating from 2nd to 1st BCE).

the mere fourteen decrees for citizens known in the period 330-200.[595] The fact that a number of these honoured the tenure of key civic liturgies focussed on the administration of its cults, above all the *stephanephoria* and *agonothesia*,[596] does seem to suggest that the Prienians' concern to embellish their cults of Zeus and Athena generated consistently competitive interest among its citizenry, and consequently heightened honorific activity.

These premier liturgies gained in importance as Priene grew more assertive, being closely connected with the running of the penteteric Panathenaia festival, and the most prominent moments of the city's ritual year. Moschion's contemporary Heroides was even appointed ambassador to Ariarathes VI in his year as *stephanephoros*.[597] The inclusion of non-citizen groups in public distributions was therefore primal – the more so as it is these inhabitants of Priene's territory who likely bore the brunt of the increasingly tense disputes the city endured with its larger neighbours Magnesia and Miletos.[598] The need for regional visibility, then, forms a further motivation – alongside the socio-economic factors outlined above – for the concern for social inclusivity. Indeed, such inclusivity comes to form a focus for euergetic generosity, and from Moschion to Zosimos a gradual elevation in the stakes around this is traceable, across both *stephanephoriai* and *agonothesiai*. Where Moschion had included *paroikoi*, *xenoi*, freedmen and house-slaves at his opening sweet-wine distribution, and handed out sacrificial meat to citizens only, Heroides further invited the children of the *paroikoi* to his opening day distribution, and also handed out meat to the *paroikoi* and *xenoi*.[599] By 100 an anonymous *stephanephoros* could be praised almost as a

[595] *I.Priene2014* 19-26, 28, 32-36.
[596] Also *neopoies*: *I.Priene2014* 84 l. 7.
[597] *I.Priene2014* 65 ll. 171-175.
[598] These disputes may have encouraged the movement of such non-citizen inhabitants between different civic territories: note that such inhabitants (οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν [ἑ|κ]ατέ[ρ]ᾳ τῶν πόλεων) were granted immunity from taxes for transporting goods between the territories of Magnesia and Miletos in their treaty of the 180s: *Milet* I.3 148 ll. 54-58; this related to goods on personal estates (εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν), and hence probably not commercial commodities; cf. Carrera (2014). This may have encouraged *paroikoi* to turn their interests to Priene's larger neighbours, to its economic disadvantage.
[599] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 257-259, 65 ll. 179-182.

matter of course for having feasted the citizens, their children, the inhabitants of the city and its territory (i.e. *paroikoi* and *katoikoi*), their children, and *xenoi*.[600] In the 90s Krates as *agonothetes* distributed meat to citizens, non-citizens, and *theoroi*, doctors, anointers, athletic trainers, and ephebes attending the Panathenaia, and held sacrifices on behalf of citizens and non-citizens;[601] another *agonothetes* held a dinner for the citizens, *katoikoi*, *paroikoi*, as well as house-slaves.[602] By the time of Zosimos in the 70s BCE, the stakes had risen to new heights: his opening-day featured not only a *glykismos*, but also a lunch (ἀκράτισμα) at his own house, including slaves, foreigners, *paides* and ephebes, and a dinner in the North Hall.[603] Other elements represent unprecedented innovations, like the provision of a pantomime during the opening-day feast, and throughout the year of a washing-basin and oil for all citizens, *paroikoi*, *katoikoi*, *xenoi*, Romans, and their house-slaves (ll. 64-67, 73-78), performances by a singer, choral-singer and kitharode, and distribution of meat from sacrifices to Zeus Keraunios to the citizens, *paroikoi*, *katoikoi*, *xenoi*, Romans, and slaves (ll. 81-84). Concurrent to this euergetism directed at non-citizens is the heightening of benefactions for citizens across this period: Moschion donated an eighth of a medimnos of grain to each citizen in his *stephanephoria*, which was then overshadowed by Heroides' distribution of half a medimnos – four times the amount.[604] In the 1st century, Herakleitos further distributed spelt porridge to the citizens, probably during his *stephanephoria*.[605] The special treatment of magistrates and councillors also becomes standard fare: Heroides distributed sacrificial meat to them at the Panathenaia (Moschion had not),[606] while several decades later in the time of Kraton, Herakleitos and Zosimos, it had become customary to

[600] *I.Priene2014* 55 ll. 12-16.
[601] *I.Priene2014* 67 ll. 173-176, 180-182.
[602] *I.Priene2014* 72 l. 9, 12-13.
[603] *I.Priene2014* 69 ll. 53-59. For Zosimos dating to the 70s, see Ferrary (2000b) 178-179.
[604] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 273-274, 65 ll. 213-214.
[605] *I.Priene2014* 71 ll. 33.
[606] *I.Priene* 65 ll. 218-219.

host them to dinner at the Bianteion (a shrine to Bias the philosopher).[607] Krates even hosted the city's magistrates at his home.[608]

What this survey suggests is that public generosity continued to conform to precedents set by one's political predecessors. In the gradual elevation of benefactions, in including more groups, or qualitatively enhancing gifts (e.g. Heroides' grain, Zosimos' artistes), a stepwise movement is discernible, the product of intensifying negotiation between elite citizens and an approving or disapproving public. One sign is the greater frequency of promise-making by the 1st century, which explains the increasingly lavish form that benefactions could take, like the prizes of 'Korinthian workmanship' of an anonymous *agonothetes*.[609] Zosimos' decree actually makes the effort to recite his electoral promise, which had even been made in writing (ἐνγράφως), suggesting that such promise-making had come to be regularised by this point.[610] More notable still, some part of this practice had been formalised in legislation: thus, his donation of a phiale to Zeus Olympios was made out of a promise 'in accordance with the stephanephoric law'.[611] This formalisation at Priene represents the later stages of a larger process by which civic magistrates, and not only non-office-holding citizens, increasingly made public promises from the 2nd century onwards;[612] in the late 2nd century we first find similar laws obliging office-holders to dedicate offerings after office at Bargylia – the institution of this being one of the achievements of Poseidonios son of Menandros.[613] It is not coincidental that it is in the lifetime of Zosimos that Herakleia on the Latmos – a neighbouring city – changed its lifetime priesthood of Athena Latmia,

[607] *I.Priene2014* 67 l. 245, 71 ll. 34-35, 69 ll. 87-88.
[608] *I.Priene2014* 67 ll. 190-193.
[609] *I.Priene2014* 72 l. 4; also *I.Priene2014* 41 ll. 4-6, for a Dioskourides (possibly *stephanephoros*) who promised an Euboic mina of sacrificial beef – perhaps implying special Euboian cattle? – to gymnasium-goers.
[610] *I.Priene2014* 69 ll. 37-45; see also *I.Priene2014* 72 l. 4.
[611] *I.Priene2014* 69 ll. 91-92.
[612] The earliest promises by office-holders attested at Iasos: *I.Iasos* 161 and 162 (the *agonothetes* and *stephanephoros* Kydias c. 193 BCE), cf. Dmitriev (2005b) 39-45.
[613] *SEG* 44.867a ll. 10-12: *stephanephoroi* to dedicate a silver phiale 100 Alexandrian drachmas in weight to Apollo and people; see also *I.Mylasa* 301 ll. 7-18 (also of the late 2nd century), demanding that honorands of the Hyarbesytoi dedicate a drinking vessel of 100 Alexandrian drachmas to Zeus Hyarbesytos.

previously obtained at sale, to an annual post, to which only those judged the most excellent in their descent and upbringing would be elected.[614]

It is in assembly-contexts of contestation and negotiation that we should also envisage, for instance, the many gifts of grain and money made by Moschion in the period roughly 160-130, seemingly in times of dearth, and outside institutional frameworks.[615] The apparent neediness is most likely due to Priene's high expenditure during its contemporaneous monumentalising phase.[616] Moreover, many of the donations represent regular figures of 100 or 1000 drachmas,[617] and were made before assemblies (ll. 44, 52-53) often as part of *proeisphorai* (ll. 34, 53, 56, 78, 95), where they would have competed with claims made by other potential donors.[618] Overall, only two of twelve donations were pure gifts, while seven of the nine monetary donations were interest-free loans –[619] this is not, then, the picture of a 'big-man' benefactor lording over, and keen to exploit, his community, but one whose generosity constantly required public approbation, and faced potential curtailment. Thus, although he helped to fulfill earlier 'royal promises' towards the lower gymnasium's construction that had fallen short, he was hardly a successor to the kings: two separate contributions were necessary, clearly insufficient in themselves to complete the project.[620] Similarly, while he personally covered the costs of his many embassies, this was not for lack of civic funds, which he at every stage publicly rejected;[621] he actually accepted civic money for his longest embassy to Egypt and Arabia, and only covered the extraneous

[614] *SEG* 40.956 ll. 13-14, with Dignas (2002) 266-271.
[615] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 31-117.
[616] Two of his eight donations specifically relate to a public debt possibly arising from this expenditure (*I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 90-91, 103-104); for public debt as an indication of high borrowing activity, Müller (2011) 357-358.
[617] Only once is an unusually specific sum provided, of 2158 Alexandreian drachmas, 4 obols: *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 107-109.
[618] *Proeisphorai* similar to *epidoseis*: Helly (1971) 19-25, and Robert and Robert (1983) 1.222-223; see also Migeotte (1984) 292-297 and n. 133. Other donors: *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 50-52 (ἐκ προεισφορῶν).
[619] Pure gifts: *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 58, 63-67; of the money donations one is defined as a loan (ll. 109-111, εὐχρήστησεν), and another as security on a loan (ll. 89-97), suggesting the others were given interest-free.
[620] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 34-39, 111-117; 111-115 for anonymous royal promises; this view follows Kah (2014) 159-160 against the idea of Moschion as a royal successor in Gauthier (1985) 55-56 and Fröhlich (2005) 234.
[621] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 152-174.

costs that were accrued.[622] In these cases, and in the donations to the gymnasium, we should imagine compelling pressures not to over-donate. The same goes for other Prienian instances of self-funded embassies, which must indicate a negotiated and contested outcome before an assembly: so, while both Moschion and Heroides travelled to M. Perperna's victory parade at Pergamon, only the latter seems to have been allowed to cover the costs of the embassy himself.[623]

The overall point, then, is that the euergetism of Priene's late Hellenistic citizens was underpinned by a dynamic and complex framework of negotiation between wealthy citizens and the still-robust civic institutions and pressures generated by assembly politics. At a broader level, this situation can be seen as a result of the overall increase in citizen wealth, as suggested above: the deeds of a Moschion, Heroides, or Krates were unusual for their magnificence, but arguably form only the tips of an euergetic iceberg, as the sheer number of decrees suggests. This is not to deny that significant change in political culture was happening, but only that it is misleading to characterise this change as a 'depoliticisation' of civic life. It is important to remember that the stepwise qualitative elevation in benefactions was accompanied by a stepwise increase in honorific visibility, and particularly in statue-honours: Moschion received two statues, Heroides three, Herakleitos four, and Zosimos in the 70s an astounding twelve.[624] At the same time, single statues seem to have become regular for lesser honorands.[625] Statue-inflation was also a region-wide phenomenon, as we have seen at Pergamon and Klaros. By the mid-1st century Iollas of Sardeis could receive

[622] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 163-174.
[623] Other embassies paid by ambassadors: *I.Priene2014* 65 ll. 94, 106; 85 l. 8; 75 l. 34; 78 l. 4; for the embassy to Perperna, compare *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 230-232 and 65 ll. 91-94.
[624] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 316-318, 65 ll. 239-240, 71 ll. 3-4 (with restorations by Blümel and Merkelbach), 68 ll. 4-5, 69 ll. 5-6, 70 ll. 3-4; note Apollodoros son of Poseidonios received two statues around 190: *I.Priene2014* 229-230, with Raeck (1995).
[625] *I.Priene2014* 48 ll. 1-5 (Aristippos), 66 l. 3 (Menedemos), 56 ll. 10-11 (Thrasyboulos son of Demetrios), 42 ll. 7-8 (Thrasyboulos son of Thrasyboulos), and two unknown honorands 92 l. 11, 72 l. 34; 93 ll. 5-6 (Isodemos) awards two statues; statue-saturation in Priene's 1st-century agora: Ma (2013) 133, 142-148, 292-293.

fourteen statues.[626] Statue-inflation symbolises the increasingly contractual character of political culture, framed around eternalising monuments, and not only ritual acts like crowning, or lifetime privileges – the notionally everlasting character of statues meant they were intended to establish 'lifetime' contracts between citizen and community. Thus, another well-attested honour at Priene was the public funeral.[627] A quality that is praised almost exclusively only from the 2nd century onwards is that of ἐπισημασία – 'high distinction',[628] from which ever greater pressure to complete benefactions would ensue. At the assemblies honouring Menippos and Polemaios, for instance, both men were even made to publicly promise to do their utmost for the city in the future to come.[629] At Kyme Archippe was honoured with a colossal statue crowned by the *demos* for building the *bouleuterion*, and 'lifetime' honours in a public funeral, and prayers at a time of illness;[630] she had promised a posthumous gift of two estates towards a temple and altar of Homonoia, and stoas and workshops, but seems to have been pressured to release one during her lifetime.[631] What honorific inflation seems to reflect, then, is an extension of the individualising gymnasial ethic explored in the earlier half of this chapter – a way to recompense and perpetuate the exemplary character of civic generosity by ensuring lifelong constancy of character. This dynamic tension between growing elite power and communitarian constraint shaped Priene's political culture in the period c. 150-70, and was even enacted in the physical space and topography of the late Hellenistic agora, where the elevated North Hall provided a vantage-point for the *demos* over a theatre-like – one might even say *palaistra*-

[626] *I.Sardis* 27 ll. 3-6.
[627] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 344-376; 65 ll. 263-278; 67 ll. 292-297; 69 ll. 110-116; 71 ll. 70-78; 42 ll. 9-12; 48 ll. 8-12; 57 ll. 12-18.
[628] E.g. Menippos: *SEG* 39.1244i ll. 6-7, ii l. 32; see Robert and Robert (1989) 68 n. 20, Van Bremen (2010) 499, and Thonemann (2003) 98 n. 14.
[629] *SEG* 39.1244iii ll. 13-15, *SEG* 39.1243v ll. 11-18.
[630] *SEG* 33.1038.
[631] *SEG* 33.1041 ll. 2-14, with Van Bremen (1996) 15-16.

like – space, where the distributions and funerals of their elite citizens were held, and where their statues lined the Westtorstraße.[632]

Elitist politics and the demise of peer-polity representation

The Prienian case therefore exemplifies the boundedness of elite status to communal pressures and expectations, and builds on the earlier survey of Pergamon and its post-133 gymnasiarchs. I have suggested that the power of civic notables continued to be shaped by the pressures and aspirations of civic populations at large, themselves shaped by anxieties around civic political identities and citizen status in the post-Apameian period, and exacerbated by growing socio-economic divisions between citizen and non-citizen populations, all of which encouraged a concern to promote gymnasia and local cults through euergetic outlay. Elite status was still publicly determined at assemblies, and indeed increasingly formalised through promise-making and laws about office-holding; the result was the inflation of local benefactions, and correspondingly of honours.

It is worth highlighting in conclusion here that this concentration of '*patris*-focussed' interaction between citizens and their cities marks a real change in the epigraphic visibility of civic honours over the 2nd century, both in the region and the Hellenistic world generally. Crudely put, we tend to find more evidence for what we might call '*polis*-focussed' honours, honours reflecting exchanges between cities, represented in genres like decrees of *proxenia*, decrees affirming *asylia*, and, especially in the period 250-150, decrees for foreign judges, before 150; after 150, '*polis*-focussed' honours drop off, practically disappearing in the 1st century BCE, and never fully revive in the imperial period.[633] '*Patris*-focussed' decrees for

[632] Bielfeldt (2012) 98-108.
[633] For this general decline in epigraphic evidence for 'peer-polity' interactions: Mack (2015) 234-243, 254-269; for foreign judges specifically: Crowther (2007) 54.

local citizens, by contrast, become more prevalent, and it is through these that we learn of inter-city exchanges, in the *theoriai* of Moschion, Heroides and Polemaios, the arbitration of Poseidonios of Bargylia between Stratonikeia and Rhodes, the numerous embassies of a 1st-century Prienian notable, spanning Alexandria Troas to Alabanda, or those of Iatrokles of Mylasa, who 'benefited many cities'.[634] In our evidence for foreign judges, a turning-point is the decree for Heliodoros of Sardeis (c. 188-150), which praises his services in foreign courts sent by the city.[635] Also from around 150 are Koan decrees for *dikastagogoi*, where we find that the work of connecting to other cities for the purposes of local litigation seems even to have become an arena for local euergetic display.[636] Of course, this need not mean that inter-city, 'peer-polity' mobility happened less, or became less meaningful: the gradual disappearance of foreign judge decrees, for instance, does not signify the end of the institution of appealing to foreign judges.[637]

Rather, we are dealing with a change in the way such interactions were represented in the late Hellenistic period. One reason may be that the intensification of euergetic interactions within communities, spurred on precisely by inter-city competitiveness after the withdrawal of Seleukid power, led to an increasingly elite-centred way of relating to other cities. It may not be coincidence that the majority of *Ehrentafeln* inscriptions, which list honours for single individuals conferred by different communities, come from the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE.[638] Such collective honouring undoubtedly reflects attempts to constrain powerful elites,[639] but equally reveal how elite power was shaping civic self-presentation: this was now less shaped by the image of jointly conversant, equipollent communities of the

[634] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 152-155, 159-163; 65 ll. 52-60; *SEG* 39.1243i ll. 28-44; *SEG* 44.867c; *I.Priene2014* 75; *I.Mylasa* 109 ll. 10-11.
[635] *SEG* 39.1286, with Hamon (2012b) 213-217.
[636] *IG* XII.4 57 ll. 10-13, 58 ll. 22-25, 59 ll. 26-28 for paying for the visit of the judges, and giving out games at attendant festivals; for standardised *dikastagogoi* decrees, Gauthier, *BE* 1999 405.
[637] Crowther (2007) 57-59.
[638] For the texts, Thonemann (2011a) 237 n. 118, Boulay (2012) 73-75, Ma (2013) 33 n. 117.
[639] Ma (2003) 32-33.

early Hellenistic period, where cities actually honoured each other in name, than by that of civic leaders who mediated such interactions. Thus, the Mylasans inscribed the 'praises of Sibilos', summaries of the honours decreed him by Halikarnassos, Myndos, Hydissos, Keramos, and Tabai, thereby displaying their place in the regional network of *poleis*; the effect would have been different had they instead inscribed the many 'travelling' decrees commemorating the goodwill between these different communities.[640] Indeed, Sibilos' honours reflect the sort of honorific inflation seen locally at Priene – he received multiple statues from some of the cities – and part of the point of such summary presentation was to highlight this. Moreover, the tight, region-specific (here Karia-centered) network they reflect, doubtless suggestive of Mylasa's own territorial ambitions at the time, should be seen as specific to the later 2nd and 1st centuries, as paralleled also by honours for two anonymous Alabandans,[641] and later such collective posthumous honorific monuments of the 1st centuries BCE and CE (see chapter 5). While earlier pre-133 collections of honours like those for Nikomedes of Kos or Kassandros of Alexandria Troas tend to exhibit the exceptionally widespread, panhellenic connections of the honorand,[642] in the Roman period we seem to find a more cellularised picture of local power, and the impression that elites were mapping the range of their interactions onto Roman provincial geography.

The emergence of late Hellenistic elitism should therefore be analysed not only in terms of a zero-sum contest over institutional control, between civic agency and elite domination, but also as an active component in the dynamics between cities. The surging interest in gymnasia and local divine manifestness in this period, the product of community decisions which in turn generated elitist behaviour, as has been emphasised here, also abetted the entrenchment of elite authority, and indeed may have come to depend on it. Elite

[640] *I.Mylasa* 401, with Savalli-Lestrade (2012) 54-55; 'travelling' decrees: Ma (2003) 19-20.
[641] *I.Nordkarien* 214 (Karian communities), 215 (Karian cities except for Miletos, Parion); see also Polykles of Rhodes, honoured after the Mithridatic war by several communities in the Rhodian *peraia*: Maiuri, *NS* 18.
[642] Nikomedes: *IG* XII.4 129-130 (late 4th century); Kassandros: *Syll.*[3] 653b, *I.Alexandreia Troas* 5 (c. 165).

ambassadors like a Sibilos served as communicators of ideological interests between cities, leading to a certain degree of convergence about what gymnasia should be like, or how best cults should be honoured. By the early 1st century, the legitimacy accruing to such elite citizens through decades-long honorific inflation may have allowed them to single-handedly shape the public identities of their communities. In the aftermath of the first Mithridatic war it is precisely at Pergamon and Priene that we find two gymnasiarchs whose terms reflect this tendency – Diodoros Pasparos and Zosimos. Both restored gymnasia that had fallen into ruin, displayed their lavishness with dispensing oil, and received major honours that exceeded the status conferred on earlier Pergamenians and Prienians – Diodoros even received cultic honour, while Zosimos was awarded four of his ultimately twelve statues for his gymnasiarchy.[643] Their gymnasiarchies, however, also incorporated further elements that reflect increasingly individualised views of civic identity. Diodoros' services emphasised the re-invigoration of Pergamene tradition, in holding rites for the Kabeiroi, the local hero Aristonidas, Pergamon's major deities Athena Nikephoros and Asklepios, and even the cult to the Attalid kings; he also conducted the Nikephoria.[644] At Priene, Zosimos' gymnasiarchy reflects a greater openness to innovation, in the introduction of new contests (some obscure, like the σκιλλομαχία and καλλιοπλία),[645] and a concern to expand social inclusivity, in the provision of oil to non-citizen attendees to *panegyreis*, of bathing facilities to the *paroikoi*, *katoikoi*, foreigners and Romans during feast-days, and of heating in the gymnasium over

[643] Zosimos revived the old organisation (σύστεμα) of the *neoi*: *I.Priene2014* 70 ll. 17-18; his honours: *I.Priene2014* 68 ll. 131-146; Diodoros rebuilt a dilapidated gymnasium: *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 6α ll. 15-23, 6δ ll. 61-62; his cultic honours featured an honorific exedra with a cult-statue enthroned alongside Herakles and Hermes: *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 6α ll. 30-53; he also received an *aidios aristeios* crown and two other statues: *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 3 ll. 6-18. Both distributed aromatised oil: *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 1 ll. 37-38, 40-41, 2 ll. 21-23; *I.Priene2014* 68 ll. 63-64.

[644] *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 1 ll. 5-29, 39, 46-48, 50-51, 6ζ ll. 16-19; some of the Attalid statues may have been restorations: Von Den Hoff (2018) 255-266. Nikephoria: *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 3 ll. 10-11, 6α ll. 49-50, 4 ll. 4-5.

[645] *I.Priene2014* 68 ll. 73-77, 81-85, 92-93 110-111. For the σκιλλομαχία, see Riaño Rufilanchas (2000); for the καλλιοπλία, Kah (2004) 66.

winter, thereby opening it to those normally forbidden from entering.[646] At Pergamon, Diodoros Pasparos seems to have extended largesse at feasts and sacrifices only to foreign citizens or visiting Romans at most.[647] Both dossiers therefore reflect increasingly personalised views of civic identity. Diodoros' extensive programme for Pergamon was the result of his own honorific status, having already received major cult after returning from Rome – cult that, as we saw in chapter 2, rooted him in Pergamene life – and being himself a son of one of the post-133 gymnasiarchs, Herodes, to whom he paid honour as gymnasiarch.[648] Zosimos' innovations and concern for the non-citizen, on the other hand, reflect his own background as the descendant of a resident Roman family (his full name being Sextus Aemilius Zosimos), and the self-consciousness of the need to over-compensate for his outsider status with memorable, if unconventional, benefactions.[649] Both gymnasiarchies certainly took place in a period of political and economic difficulty, and reflect local idiosyncrasies specific to the different cultural environments at Pergamon and Priene. They were arguably also carried out, however, in dialogue with one another – it is not impossible that Zosimos was known to Diodoros, and vice versa. Strikingly, both held major civic festivals – the Nikephoria and Panthenaia – during their terms, reflecting a region-wide, elite-driven conception of the gymnasium as a generalised site for displaying civic ideology;[650] it is this recognition of the central role of elite knowledge in shaping civic identity that may explain how the Prienians permitted Zosimos, a resident Roman, to actually hold the gymnasiarchy at all, having only recently acquired Prienian citizenship.

[646] *I.Priene2014* 68 ll. 62-66, 87-92, 77-81, 96-102.
[647] *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 1 ll. 10-15, 17-19.
[648] Himself an earlier high-achieving gymnasiarch: Mathys, *Architekturstiftungen* Gy 14; Sacrifices, games, and annual crowning at his statue led by Diodoros: *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 2 ll. 18-21; 3 ll. 19-20.
[649] Zosimos more likely the descendant of an Italian immigrant to Priene than a freedman of an Italian resident: Kah (2012) 62-63, Blümel in *I.Priene2014* p. 183, and Kuhn (2017a) 10-11.
[650] Diodoros was honoured with a statue solely for holding the Nikephoria: *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 4; Zosimos' Panathenaia: *I.Priene2014* 68 ll. 106-116; that he was gymnasiarch while conducting it was anomalous: Fröhlich (2005) 244-245.

In a sense, then, this was elite-driven localism, the culmination of the increasingly wide berth that cities granted to civic leaders in the decades c. 160-70. Overall, Roman rule seems to have intensified trends dating to 188. In the decades after Diodoros and Zosimos, this wide berth arguably underpinned phenomena like the super-ambassadors who represented their cities before Roman generals, even to the point of detaching themselves from their cities. Therein lies a paradox of late Hellenistic elitism, bound as it continued to be to community norms and the need for communal approbation: namely, that it gradually altered the functions of such communal institutions precisely through this civic consciousness, with super-ambassadors being 'too good' at their ambassadorial role, or in the hyper-gymnasiarchal services of Diodoros and Zosimos. In the early empire this would lead, as we explore in the final chapters, to the inclusion of elitist elements into the discourse of civic honour, and a gradual dilution of the exemplary function of civic honour, which was closely bound to the gymnasium-based ideals that had formed the leitmotif of the late Hellenistic period. To appreciate more fully how this happened, however, it is necessary now to resume the narrative that had been left off at the end of chapter 2, and consider how the onset of the principate and attendant concretisation of a Roman world impinged on local honorific systems, and created new frameworks for elite euergetic behaviour.

Chapter 4: The emperor and elite honourability between city, province and empire 29 BCE-98 CE

Sometime in the mid-1st century CE, the siblings Attalos and Tatas fulfilled the dying wish of their father, Hermogenes Attalos, by erecting an honorific statue for L. Antonius Zenon at Apollonia Salbake.[651] Zenon was the descendant of a family of 'super-ambassadors': in his veins ran the blood of Polemon I, king of Pontos, and Chairemon of Nysa, hero of the Mithridatic war.[652] Unlike some of his other relatives, he had pursued a largely city-based career, assuming the functions of mint-magistrate and four-times civic priest at Laodikeia on the Lykos, as bronze coins reveal.[653] This statue-base, however, emphasised career achievements that reflect a more firmly 'Roman' trajectory of the sort largely unimaginable a century earlier. Its Apollonian, and not Laodikeian, provenance seems to suggest a notable of regional and even provincial standing, and this is only further affirmed by the offices that it details: a military tribunate of the *legio XII Fulminata* and a high-priesthood of Asia (ll. 3-4, 8-10).[654] Most striking, however, is the attention placed on a third achievement, sandwiched between these two roles (ll. 4-7): his possession of the royal purple (βασιλικὴ πορφυραφορία) that had currency 'across the known world' (διὰ τῆς οἰκουμένης).

[651] *SEG* 37.855: Λούκιον Ἀντώνιον Μάρκου Ἀντω[νί]|ου Πολέμωνος υἱὸν Ζήνωνα μ[έ]|γαν ἀριστῆ, χιλιαρχήσαντα λεγ[ιῶ]|νος ιβ΄ Κεραυνοφόρου, τετειμ[η]|μένον ὑπὸ τοῦ θεῶν ἐνφαν[εσ]|τάτου Σεβαστοῦ βασιλικῇ διὰ τῆς | οἰκουμένης πορφυραφορίᾳ καὶ | ἀρχιερατεύσαντα Αὐτοκράτο|ρος Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ ἐν | τῇ Ἀσίᾳ· vacat | τὴν ἀνάστασιν ποιησαμέν[ων] | Ἀττάλου καὶ Τατας τῶν Ἑρμ[ο]|γένους τέκνων ἐκ διαθή|κης Ἑρμογένους Ἀττάλου | πατρὸς ἰδίου διὰ τὰς ἀπ' αὐ|τοῦ εἰς ἑαυτοὺς εὐεργεσία[ς].
[652] For an account of his family and stemma, Thonemann (2004).
[653] *RPC* I 2912-2916.
[654] Other honorific statue-bases are known from Herakleia (*La Carie* 54), only mentioning his tribunate and high-priesthood, and Amisos (*IGR* III 1436); the latter comprises fragments of a long text corresponding in part to the Apollonian base. *Legio XII Fulminata* was based around Syria and Egypt in the Augustan period: Ceylan and Ritti (1987) 80-81, with ns. 6-7.

This phrase evokes Zenon's royal ancestry, while simultaneously revealing that he only held the title, but not the powers, of a king.[655] Crucially, this was an honour conferred on him by the 'most manifest god, Augustus'. Two of his three accomplishments (royal purple, and high-priesthood of the imperial cult) therefore derive their honour-worthiness directly from the authority of the *princeps*. More broadly, we observe the emperor's role as a metonym for the 'Roman world', as the ultimate source of indices of prestige that derive from frameworks beyond the city: the tribunate reflects service in the Roman military commanded by Augustus, but also a disparate 'Roman office' in itself, while the high-priesthood of Asia represents a function that originated in civic perceptions around how the emperor should be conceptually integrated into local honour-worlds. The very ordering of Zenon's achievements – tribunate, imperial purple, high-priesthood – moreover reflects a concern to order his achievements within an honorific hierarchy spanning outer-world to *polis*-world, thereby justifying the unusual and rare titles that he is granted, of the 'great and best' (ll. 2-3).[656]

Certainly, as the scion of perhaps the most prominent and powerful elite family of Asia, Zenon was not just *any* civic notable. His statue-base from Apollonia does, however, exemplify the sorts of honorific discourse that were generated by the creation of the principate, insofar as the onset of monarchical rule affected the way that cities related to the ruling power through euergetic ideology. In the following pages it will be suggested that, in the period spanning broadly Augustus to Nerva, the authority of the emperor furnished a focal point that is not found under the Republic, the late Attalids, or even the Seleukids. We do not find long career-decrees outlining ambassadorial contacts with hegemonic rulers, nor extraordinary honours, like cult, for civic heroes who comprised local avatars of Roman

[655] Ceylan and Ritti (1987) 96; it is unlikely that the royal purple here refers (so Pleket in *SEG* 37.855) to the purple of the high-priesthood of Asia: Thonemann (2004) 145 n. 6.
[656] Ἀριστεύς as honorific title: Robert (1940-1965) 11-12.573-576.

patrons, such as we encountered in chapter 2. Ambassadors are still crucial figures under the emperors, but their activities were increasingly bound up with imperial cult, and the challenges around asserting civic identity at the regional and provincial scale. The first part of this chapter suggests that the euergetism of the emperors was not simply a new form of individual Roman euergetism, but rather formed a sort of meta-euergetism: imperial cult created a platform on which the euergetism of local elites could play out. The second part examines how this happened in more concrete terms, by entrenching a firmer sense of hierarchy within civic honorific status, encouraging the creation and conferral of honorific titles, and thereby greater integration into the Roman empire that enfolded the cities of Asia.

Imperial cult as meta-honour

In 9 BCE, just two decades after first establishing cult to Octavian, the *koinon* of Asia decreed to accept the proposal of the governor Paulus Fabius Maximus that the birthday of Augustus be declared the first day of the year.[657] While this measure in itself had precedents in Hellenistic ruler-cult, the imagery deployed in conceptualising Augustus' power is new:[658]

> '…Since the Providence arranging our lives has mobilised all its effort and zeal, and has adorned the most perfect good for our livelihoods in bringing about Augustus, whom she has filled with all virtue pertaining to the benefaction of mankind, thereby providing one who has both ended war and embellished peace, as a god to us and our descendants in her place; born into such (virtue), Caesar has exceeded the hopes of those anticipating (benefactions) with his good deeds, and has not only surpassed in his goodness those who came before him, but also left no hope to those to come that they may be compared to him…'

[657] For the inception of imperial cult in Asia in 29 BCE, Deininger (1965) 16-19, Friesen (1993) 7-15, Witulski (2007) 9-25, Madsen (2016).
[658] *I.Priene2014* 14 ll. 32-39; cf. Witulski (2007) 25-32. Hellenistic ruler-cult precedents: Savalli-Lestrade (2010) 76-82, Heller (2014) 226-227; for novelty of the language, however, Price (1984) 54-57.

The striking feature of these opening lines (of a notionally honorific decree for the emperor) is the grammatical focalisation on πρόνοια, through whom the world has now been endowed with its Augustus, its pacifier, saviour, and god. This indirectness seems to reflect a period when the *koinon*'s leaders were grappling with the problem of conceptualising the divinity of the *princeps*. In earlier decrees of Mytilene and Chios of 29 and 26 BCE, Augustus is presented as an equal, or even better, to the gods.[659] Here, however, Augustus' divinity represents the work of a Stoicising Providence, in whose stead he had been sent.[660] This providential Augustus is also the figure presented in another *koinon* decree commemorating Gaius Caesar's assumption of the *toga virilis*, where Augustus is described as the product of eternal and undying nature, and the saviour of mankind in general;[661] around this time, the Sardians claimed that 'all men' rejoiced and offered prayers in unison on behalf of Augustus' children.[662] In the time of Caligula, the notion of the emperor as a divine saviour of humanity is taken to new extremes. For the Assians, the news of his accession brought about the hope of a most pleasant era for all humanity,[663] while the Kyzikenes describe Caligula as a divine autocrat in their decree for Antonia Tryphaina and her sons, who had been appointed client-kings in 37 CE: he is the 'New Sun' who would enhance the glory of these new kings inasmuch as they received their realms from a god; between these kings and Caligula, moreover, lay a gulf as vast as that between day and night, immortality and mortality.[664]

These excerpts represent what has been described as 'the rhetoric of imperial majesty', a largely cosmic, universalising conception of euergetic capability superseding

[659] Mytilene: *IG* XII.2 58b ll. 4-6; Chios: *I.Olympia* 53 l. 4, with Jones (2015) 105-121 for the Chian, and not Koan, provenance of the stone.
[660] *I.Priene2014* 14 l. 35: ἀνθ' ἑατῆς.
[661] *GIBM* 894 ll. 2-8.
[662] *I.Sardis* 8 ll. 8-9.
[663] *I.Assos* 26 ll. 5-9.
[664] *IGR* IV 145 ll. 1-10.

anything achievable by human benefactors.[665] A similar tone can be found in public documents from Egypt in the reigns of Claudius and Nero,[666] and the honours for Nero passed by Akraiphia in Boiotia.[667] This sort of rhetoric was therefore not confined to Asia Minor, although it is likely that it originated there, as the seat of the first known provincial cults to the emperor in Asia and Bithynia.[668] What the grandiloquence around imperial status signifies is a quite unprecedented conception of imperial power. No Seleukid or Attalid king had been addressed with rhetoric that so starkly characterised the cosmic origins of their power – none were representatives of Providence, like Augustus, for instance. Pompey and Caesar were sometimes described as saviours on land and sea, or of the human race, but these instances are piecemeal, and hardly match up to the scale of the cult offered to Octavian.[669] Likewise, while provincial cults to governors like Mucius Scaevola had existed previously, these had been highly anomalous, had not conceived of the honorand in the same cosmic terms, and had not fundamentally reoriented local cultic landscapes. With the honours for Octavian, however, not only was a temple built specifically for cult at Pergamon, and a priesthood established, but local communities, too, imitated the provincial example and set up their own local shrines and temples, often assimilating civic gods with the emperor.[670] Much of this seems to have happened, moreover, within just the first three decades of the principate. By the calendar decree of 9 BCE, it could be assumed that the *conventus* cities of Asia each possessed a Kaisareion.[671] The cult to the *princeps* was on a

[665] Buraselis (2017).
[666] Kokkinia (2012) 499-507.
[667] *IG* VII 2713 ll. 27-46.
[668] In Greece, the first federal imperial cults (as opposed to individual civic cults) are only attested in the early 1st century CE: Kantirea (2007) 190-193; the earliest federal cult in the west at Lugdunum dates to 12 BCE: Fishwick (1987) 97-102.
[669] Pompey described as overseer of land and sea: *SEG* 46.1565 (Ilion), *IG* XII.2 202 (Mytilene), *SEG* 49.1509 (Klaros), *I.Miletoupolis* 24; Caesar as saviour of human life: *I.Ephesos* 251; this is the only statue-base where he is called a god.
[670] For civic imperial cults and assimilation to local gods, Frija (2012a) 113-167 and (2012b).
[671] *I.Priene2014* 14 ll. 64-67. Early civic temples built within the first three decades are known at Ephesos, Miletos, Priene, Sardeis, Tralleis, and Mylasa: Price (1984) 254, 257-258, 259, 260, 262.

fundamentally larger and more extensive scale than before, even if the actual phenomenon of cult itself was not new. This is in part because it is the first such cult which seems to have been the result of active negotiation by both the honorand and the honouring *koinon*. Cassius Dio's account shows that two cults had been agreed upon, by which resident Romans would pay homage to Roma and Julius Caesar at Ephesos, while Greeks were permitted to honour Octavian himself at Pergamon.[672] The fact that the former cult seems to have been fairly short-lived, and soon replaced by cults simply to 'Augustus and Roma', suggests local adjustment of the *princeps*' instructions.[673] The cosmic, supra-divine characterisation of imperial power therefore aimed not only at capturing the reality of the pan-Mediterranean character of Octavian's authority, but also the fact that the institution of imperial cult could be conceived as a 'benefaction' conferred by him: as the result of negotiation between him and Asia's cities, it formed the first clear moment when the Roman power was actively engaged in nurturing an euergetic profile in the region, beyond the terms set by local communities alone. The unprecedented stature of Augustus as a quasi-providential being reflects the *koinon*'s rhetorical reciprocation of this.

At the same time, it is crucial to note continuities. Cult to Octavian/Augustus essentially formed the culmination and combination of two longstanding approaches to honouring Romans in the period 188-29, in honours for Roma and the Romans as a universalising power, and honours for individual Romans. By simultaneously personifying and universalising Roman power, imperial cult resolved the problem of addressing Rome faced by local communities: it provided a focus, where this focus had been lacking, and where it had been necessary to lay emphasis on euergetic relationships with civic ambassadors, or short-term Roman benefactors. Honouring the *princeps* was, to this extent, a return to the autocratic charismatic rule of the Seleukid king, only that this cult was now

[672] For the negotiated character of the *koinon*'s cult: Campanile (2001), Edelmann-Singer (2015) 86-89.
[673] Cass. Dio 51.20.6-8, with Friesen (1993) 11 and Scherrer (2007) 66-70.

far more extensively organised and structured around a provincial framework, and also thereby replayed the intrusiveness of Attalid royal ideology, only that this intrusive model was assimilated at the same time to a universal ruling power.

It also served to diminish the potential intermediary role of non-*princeps* Romans. Honours for Roman officials certainly continue, as in the late Republic, but reflect honorific statuses attested at the level of civic notables, and never approach anything like the stature of the *princeps*. Multiple honours for governors by different cities actually seem to have been more common than in the Republic, but this arguably reflects the more established provincial framework of gubernatorial duties, with a number of individuals honoured by multiple cities (as anticipated by a few examples in the late Republic), than truly province-level honours. Only three examples of honours by the *koinon* are known, but none reflect anything like the imperial cult.[674] Moreover, honours for legates, quaestors and prefects, for instance, diminish dramatically in the imperial period.[675] This relative predominance of gubernatorial honours may suggest a process of regularisation, whereby honours largely responded to office-holding in itself, and not necessarily specific benefactions. We would expect more examples of non-governor honorands if the latter were the case: statues may thus have become the privilege of finishing governors. Regularisation is somewhat corroborated by the titles accorded such Roman honorands, with the most common being εὐεργέτης; σωτήρ and the designation πάτρων grow rarer.[676] The decline of πατρωνεία,

[674] Fifty-eight honorific statue-bases for thirty governors (not including those for family members) from Augustus to Nerva: Erkelenz (2003) 255-258, compared to twelve statue-bases for eleven individuals from 133-29; the only multiple honorand is Lucullus, at Andros and Klaros: Erkelenz (2003) 254, Jordan (2019) 332-333; *koinon* honours for governors: *I.Priene2014* 14 (Paulus Fabius Maximus, 9 BCE), *AvP* VIII.3 19 (L. Calpurnius Piso, late 1st BCE), *I.Smyrna* 591 (M. Aefulanus, 54-68 CE).

[675] Sources in Erkelenz (2003) 281-283, 289-290, 305-307. Numbers of known honours for legates, quaestors, and prefects respectively from 133-29 BCE: twenty-two, sixteen, six; from 29 BCE-98 CE: five, two, three. Conversely, a new 'genre' in the imperial period is constituted by honours for personal representatives of the emperor, like procurators and *legati* and *quaestores Augusti*: Erkelenz (2003) 296, 303, 311-312, accounting for some sixteen texts from Augustus to Nerva; for Vedius Pollio, Kirbihler (2017).

[676] Overall, twenty-eight of sixty-eight statue-bases for Roman honorands (thirty-four including procurators and *quaestores Augusti*) are granted the title εὐεργέτης from 29 BCE to 98 CE, as compared to thirty-two of fifty-six from 133-29 BCE; σωτήρ for governors: four of fifty-eight (three of twelve from 133-29 BCE); for legates, quaestors and prefects: one of ten (nine of forty-four); πάτρων for governors: sixteen of fifty-eight,

indeed, suggests a weakening of the significance of individual Roman euergetism in the early imperial period.[677] What these developments in non-imperial Roman honours do reflect, however, is an increasingly firm sense of honorific hierarchy: many of these statues for governors, after all, inhabited monumental landscapes shared with statues for emperors.[678] Such emperor-statues could replay themes from imperial cult, captioned with inscriptions that expressed the transcendental, universal character of the *princeps*' role,[679] while many actually simply present the sheer name and magisterial offices encompassed by imperial power, 'titles' that distinguished them visibly from the designations for provincial officials.[680] It is emperors, moreover, who more frequently bear the highest civic titles of saviour, and even founder.[681] In this regard, the only example of an imperial-era governor honoured as founder, Sextus Appuleius, reflects honorific 'correption', as Appuleius was the nephew of Augustus.[682] What the onset of the principate seems to have done, then, in comparison to pre-existing Roman euergetism, was not to eliminate honours for Romans other than the emperor, but rather to introduce honorific hierarchy and status-distinctions.

---

nine from reign of Augustus (five of twelve); for legates, quaestors and prefects: three of ten (eighteen of forty-four).

[677] Eilers (2002) 162-165, 172-181.

[678] For statues to emperors from Asia to the Flavian period, above all Højte (2005) 255-260 ns. 159-187 (Augustus), 281-286 ns. 110-141 (Tiberius), 291-293 ns. 19-25 (Caligula), 311-316 ns. 109-141 (Claudius), 325-328 ns. 38-53 (Nero), 338-340 ns. 56-66 (Vespasian), 351-352 ns. 51-59 (Titus), 358-364 ns. 36-60 (Domitian).

[679] Statues praising emperors as universal benefactors – Augustus: *I.Pergamon* 381 and 383 (both as overseer of all land and sea), *IGR* IV 311 (Pergamon, as greatest benefactor and founder); Tiberius: *IG* XII.2 206 (Mytilene, as benefactor of the known world and most manifest founder), 541 (Eresos, saviour of known world), 542 (probably Tiberius, benefactor (?) of known world and human race); Vespasian: *IG* XII.2 543 (benefactor of the known world); Titus: *I.Iasos* 602 (Bargylia, saviour and benefactor of the known world); Domitian: *I.Rhod.Per* 607 (saviour and benefactor of all men).

[680] Some illustrative examples are offered here. Augustus: *I.Iasos* 601, *La Carie* 16 (Tabai); Tiberius: *I.Priene2014* 215 (by the Ionian *koinon*), *I.Smyrna* 618, *I.Stratonikeia* 1512; Caligula: *I.Sardis* II 331-332; Claudius: *IG* XII.4 1172 (Kos), *TAM* V.2 1359 (Magnesia on the Sipylos), *SEG* 49.1631 (Philadelphia), *I.Sardis* 39, *I.Tralleis* 37-39 *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.515; Nero: *IG* XII.4 1145 (Kos), *I.Pergamon* 394; Vespasian: *MAMA* VI 177, *I.Magnesia* 167; Titus: *IG* XII.4 1164 (Kos), *I.Stratonikeia* 1007, *IGR* IV 1559 (Teos); Domitian: *I.Rhod.Per.* 157.

[681] Augustus: *I.Knidos* 42 (saviour and founder), *IG* XII.6 1205 (Korassiai, saviour and founder), *IG* XII.4 1157 (Kos, founder and benefactor), *IGR* IV 314 (Amisos, saviour and benefactor); for Tiberius, see below, but also *IG* XII.2 205 (Mytilene, for sponsoring local mysteries (?)), *IG* XII Suppl. 59 (Mytilene, benefactor and saviour), *I.Ilion* 89 (kinsman, saviour, benefactor), Claudius: *IG* XII.6 (Samos, new founder, probably after an earthquake), *IG* XII.4 1160 (Kos, saviour and benefactor), *Tit.Cal.* 144 (saviour and benefactor); Domitian: *IG* XII.1 994 (Brykous, saviour and benefactor), *I.Priene2014* 219 (founder).

[682] *SEG* 49.1514.

What, however, was the euergetism of the *princeps*? What benefactions did emperors carry out? The evidence here is sparser than might be anticipated.[683] Direct dedications of buildings or public works funded by imperial money, as indicated by inscriptions presenting the emperor in the nominative alone, are rare in the pre-Hadrianic period. A number of such acts cluster at Ephesos, under Augustus and Nero, who delimited the Artemision's boundaries and dedicated aqueducts; Augustus is also attested as a benefactor at Ilion, Stratonikeia, Pergamon, and Metropolis.[684] Ephesos as provincial capital and the reign of Augustus aside, however, we find scant epigraphic trace of such benefaction. Claudius rebuilt the temple of Dionysos at Samos after an earthquake, and built the Letoon at Xanthos;[685] in other examples under Vespasian, Titus, and Trajan it is not clear that imperial money was the only source of the benefaction.[686] The major sphere of euergetism distinctly monopolised by the *princeps*, however, was earthquake-relief, as with Claudius at Samos. A number of cases are known across the imperial period overall, for which emperors received honours as founders, and even had cities renamed after them.[687] The best documented example is Tiberius' grant of funds, and remission of tax, to twelve cities of Lydia, and to Kibyra, after earthquakes in 17 and 23 CE; for this he was honoured with titles of founder, and even monumental statues at Rome and Puteoli.[688] Earthquakes, however,

[683] Evidence here derives from Winter (1996) 306-318, 323-326, 338-346, although not the conclusions, which overly emphasise imperial initiative. For imperial building generally, Mitchell (1987).
[684] Augustus at Ephesos: *I.Ephesos* 1522-1523 (boundary-wall of Artemision), 401 (*aqua Iulia*), 402 (*aqua Throessitica*) *I.Ephesos* 459 (paving of road using funds of Artemision from the judgement, κρίσις of the emperor); Nero: *SEG* 34.1122 (aqueduct to Kaystros valley). Augustus outside Ephesos: *I.Ephesos* 3409 (unknown benefaction), *I.Pergamon* 216b (dedication to Athena?), *I.Ilion* 84 (unknown benefaction), *I.Stratonikeia* 511 (gate to temple of Hekate?).
[685] *IG* XII.6 483, *F.Xanthos VII* 11.
[686] Vespasian builds baths: *TAM* II.2 396 (Patara), 651 (Kadyanada), 652 (a temple at Kandyanda?), all with indications of civic funds; at Miletos, Titus built a nymphaion: *Milet* I.5 1; Trajan, the Sacred Way: *I.Didyma* 56, with the work overseen by governors and legates.
[687] For instances and sources, see Conti (2008) 374-378 and Robert (1978) 401-408.
[688] Tac. *Ann.* 2.47, 4.13.1; Tiberius as founder at Mostene and Aigai: Herrmann (1995) 28, *OGIS* 471; also probably at Kyme, *I.Kyme* 21; at Kibyra: *I.Kibyra* 3. The 13 cities (including Kibyra) honoured Tiberius jointly at Sardeis: *I.Sardis* 9, with Herrmann (1995) 26-29; the civic cult for Tiberius at Sardeis extended into the 2nd century CE: *I.Sardis* 47. Colossal statue of Tiberius at Rome: *BNJ* 257 F 36.13 (Phlegon of Tralleis), and a copy in Puteoli: *CIL* X.1 1624. For the title of founder denoting political refoundation, and not merely the fact of donating funds, Pont (2007) 540-543.

were irregular occurrences, and should be fitted into the picture that has been sketched here, of sparse and infrequent imperial involvement in local euergetic activity.[689] This relative indifference is a function of the sheer fact that emperors before Hadrian were rarely physically present in the region, but also of the practicalities of governance, with authority increasingly devolved onto local actors. At the same time, honorific responses to such benefactions, in titles like founder or statues, should not only be seen as isolated reactions to specific events, but also as part of a broader ideology of imperial power framed ultimately by the provincial cult. It is striking, for instance, that the joint decision of the cities of Lydia and Kibyra to honour Tiberius for his earthquake-relief drew specifically on the notion of collective honouring, framed by the province, for its legitimacy – their base at Puteoli also features Ephesos, whose assistance was probably necessary for accomplishing the honour.[690] It has further been persuasively argued that the thirteen cities involved formed the '*koinon* of the thirteen cities' attested at Sardeis. While traditionally identified with the Ionian *koinon*, it more likely comprises an association centred on a collective cult to Tiberius, patterned on the provincial imperial cult, whose foundation may even reflect Sardeis' attempt to compensate for its failure, at the hands of Smyrna, to obtain the right to a second provincial cult-temple in 26 CE.[691]

The generosity of the emperor, even if only directed at individual cities, was therefore closely associated with, and mobilised, gratitude at a trans-local level. This is because imperial euergetism was not only a matter between emperor and city, but would also have invoked the links between city and province. Tax-concessions, for instance, formed a major part of Tiberius' response to the Lydian cities and Kibyra after their earthquakes, as it did in similar responses of Augustus and Claudius: cities were now fiscally

[689] Imperial euergetism around earthquakes may also have been shaped by personal favoritism: Jones (2014).
[690] *CIL* X.1 1624, Weisser (2008) 133-134.
[691] Hallmannsecker (2020) 14-22.

integrated into a provincial framework in a more intensive manner than under the Attalid or Seleukid periods, so that earthquakes materially affected imperial revenues, and demanded the sort of direct imperial attention that is rare under Hellenistic kings.[692] It is significant, moreover, that the dispute around the location of the second cult-temple raged over three years, between Tiberius' initial grant of permission to the *koinon* in 23 CE and the final contest between Pergamon, Miletos, Smyrna and Sardeis in 26 CE, revealing an increasingly heated debate over, and hence firmer conception of, provincial primacy among Asia's leading cities.[693] Imperial approval therefore generated inter-city rivalry, and would set a pattern discernible also in the third and fourth cult-temples at Miletos in 40 and Ephesos under Domitian,[694] and ultimately throughout the high empire, when competition over *neokoros* status would reach a fever pitch.[695] This startling aspect of provincial competition must be seen as a major change from the post-Apameian era, when Roman power had been conceptualised either as a general universalising force, or in terms of highly localised honours for individual Romans. With the principate, such euergetic energy was now directed to a figure who combined these two aspects. In a sense, the scale had simply shifted, with the province as a whole now functioning as an honouring body, paying homage to an individual Roman who surpassed all other potential benefactors in power and means. In practice, this resulted in the imperial cult forming a euergetic 'space' in itself, a locus for discussion about honours due to the emperor, in which the multiplicity of voices was key. The very unity of the *princeps*' power encouraged this multiplicity. The competition between Asia's cities in 26 CE forms only the uppermost dimensions to this: it is important

[692] Augustus: Cass. Dio 54.30.3 (paid a year of Asia's taxes from his own pocket in 12 BCE), Claudius: Tac. *Ann.* 12.58.2 (remitted tribute of Apameia in 53). For Hellenistic kings and earthquakes, Jones (1990) 521-522; the responses of local citizens to earthquakes of course form a longstanding theme over both Hellenistic and imperial periods: Robert (1978) 401-408 and Jones (2015) 102-105 on *IG* XII.2 58, of Lesbos, from the earthquake of 26 BCE.
[693] Tac. *Ann.* 4.15, 55-56, with Campanile (1998).
[694] Miletos: Cass. Dio 59.28.1 and *I.Didyma* 148; Ephesos: Friesen (1993) 29-49.
[695] Heller (2006) 179-197, 210-237, 241-282.

now to consider how this multiplicity was also manifested within elite euergetic discourse, beginning with the honorific representation of ambassadorial services to the Roman power, which well reflects the changes brought about by the principate and imperial cult.

The *princeps* as 'euergetic space' I: embassies to the emperor

The character of imperial cult as 'euergetic space' is precisely detectable in the calendar decree, the product itself of the unusual addition to gubernatorial activity in the reign of Augustus, that one of the honour-worthy services of a governor now consisted in proposing honours for the emperor. More remarkably, this was the winning contribution to a province-wide competition, decreed some nearly two decades earlier, promising the award of a *koinon* crown for anyone who could think of the best honours for Augustus.[696] That is to say, the interests and euergetic ambitions of individuals continued to shape the character of 'imperial cult' even after the initial institution of cult in 29. Well before the second cult-temple was granted to Smyrna, in fact, cities and notables had been vying to set up local civic imperial cult-temples of their own. Soon after 29, Mytilene set up a cult to Augustus of its own under the leadership of Potamon, replete with its own temple, games, birthday sacrifices, and an oath made specifically to Augustus. The decree would be boldly conveyed to and displayed at cities of the empire (Actium, Brundisium, Tarraco, Massalia, Antioch), and also, pointedly, at the provincial cult-temple at Pergamon.[697] By the early 1st century CE, this sort of shrine-building had become a central component of publicly generous behaviour. Another citizen benefactor from Eresos erected a shrine to the sons of Augustus in the agora, and another to Livia Augusta at a prominent location in the city; another temple was built at the

[696] *I.Priene2014* 14 ll. 41-43.
[697] *IG* XII.2 58a ll. 6-7, 12-14, 15-17; cf. Dimopoulou (2017) 407. A dedication of Potamon to Augustus is also known: *IG* XII.2 272.

harbour in honour of the divine Augustus, and even a fourth, perhaps at Pergamon itself, in order 'to leave a witness to the rest of the province of his piety towards the god'.[698]

This nascent inter-city competition around imperial cult was a function of the *koinon*'s role in solidifying a sense of the 'province'. As was suggested in chapter 2, one way of conceptualising the *koinon*'s consolidation over the decades after 85 BCE is as a means of delimiting the horizons of the civic elite, in the face of the new opportunities offered by powerful *imperatores*: the province offered an outlet for trans-local ambition, while limiting this to a still largely regional ambit. The introduction of provincial imperial cult in this sense served to reify this, in essentially embedding the imperial 'centre', that is the *princeps*, in a regional setting. Service to the imperial cult could then form a new type of 'ambassadorial' contact, by which leading citizens obtained distinction outside their cities, but were still fundamentally tied to Asia. A telling figure in this regard is G. Julius Epikrates, one of the leading members of the resistance to Labienus in 39, for which he received Roman citizenship from Octavian.[699] He was later also ambassador to Augustus, before whom he pleaded for the *asylia* of the temple of Apollo Didymeus, control of reclaimed land in the Maeander Valley, and tax-immunity for Didyma and its offshore islands.[700] Remarkably, Epikrates is even described as a 'friend' of Augustus (φίλον [---]ον γενόμενον).[701] It is unlikely, however, that we should imagine he enjoyed the sort of intimacy to Augustus possible between elite citizens and powerful Romans in the late Republic: his was a career that would be entrenched firmly in Asia, as one of the first high-priests of the imperial cult, lifetime high-priest of the Ionian *koinon*, gymnasiarch and

[698] *IG* XII Suppl. 124 ll. 15-26, with Robert (1969-1990) 7.575 for line 24: κατεσκεύασεν δὲ ναῦον τῷ Σεβα[στῷ θ]εῷ Καίσαρι καὶ ἐπὶ [Περγάμω (?)], although see Kajava (2002) 92 n. 17.
[699] Ferrary (2005) 58-61.
[700] *SEG* 44.938 ll. 4-8, with Herrmann (1994) 210-215.
[701] *SEG* 44.938 l. 3; Herrmann (1994) 210 n. 26 suggests [καὶ οἰκεῖ]ον or [πατρῷ]ον, on the basis of Epikrates' grandfather's friendship with Caesar.

agonothetes; he also contributed to Miletos' local cult of the emperor.[702] By 5 BCE, the high-priesthood had become an annually elected function of the *koinon*, and thus the object of heightening competition.[703]

This increasingly provincial scope must be interpreted alongside the changing dynamics around ambassadorial activity, and the euergetic ideals associated with it. Over the early imperial period, c. 29 BCE to 100 CE, we encounter fewer figures in the vein of the late Republican civic ambassadors who assumed genuinely intermediary roles between their cities, sometimes even becoming 'super-ambassadors', like Menippos of Klaros, Diodoros Pasparos, or Theopompos of Knidos, as detailed in chapter 2. More common, instead, are civic ambassadors like Epikrates, or, as we will see later, Menogenes of Sardeis: local notables whose ambitions were largely confined to Asia, who maintained ambassadorial contacts with the ruling power, but never seriously considered re-orienting their careers around the emperor, rather than their own cities. This is not to say that embassies could no longer have existential significance; crises still occurred requiring adroit diplomatic mediators, like Chairemon of Tralleis, after an earthquake struck the city in 26/25, or Hermagoras of Rhodes, who obtained letters from the emperor Titus confirming civic privileges that had been threatened in recent decades.[704] Yet the structural regularity of such crisis-moments – in the harsh indemnities, rampant piracy, military exactions, or conflicts with *publicani* (eliminated in 48 at any rate) that had marked the half-century after the first Mithridatic war – seems overall to have decreased under the early empire. Existential threats like inter-city disputes, complaints about corrupt governors, and political rights (as with Hermagoras of Rhodes) certainly continue to propel ambassadorial activity

[702] *SEG* 44.938 ll. 8-16, *SEG* 44.940b ll. 18-20.
[703] As seen in the stele of Menogenes: *I.Sardis* 8, on which, see below; cf. Campanile (1994) 17.
[704] Chairemon: Jones (2011); Hermagoras: *IG* XII.1 58 ll. 13-15, with Tac. *Ann*. 12.58, Suet. *Claud*. 25.3, *Ner*. 7.2, *Vesp.* 8.4 for the historical context, with Fernoux (2017) 100-102.

in the principate;[705] with the onset of relative peace, however, it is unlikely that their overall scale and severity were as great as in the 1st century BCE.

A number of honorific inscriptions do nonetheless praise honorands for embassies to Roman authorities in the period 29 BCE to 100 CE. Such praiseworthy embassies, which will here be designated 'ambassadorial euergetism', do reveal that major civic privileges were still the subject of diplomatic contact. Of the thirty-six cases that survive in sufficient detail ten (including those of Chairemon and Hermagoras) reveal the objectives and achievements of the embassy, of which eight concern major political privileges or crises: confirmation of *asylia*-status, fiscal immunity, civic freedom, earthquake-relief, and the resolution of local legal disputes.[706] The two remaining cases, however, reveal new dynamics specific to the principate, being embassies concerning the honours due to Gaius Caesar at Sardeis on news of his ascension to manhood, and the fortune of an imperial freedman at Stratonikeia.[707] Even the two instances of *asylia* grants which were obtained by Meniskos and Ti. Claudius Elaibares for Apollo Didymeus and Artemis Pergaia respectively (alongside other civic rights), although hearkening to a long-established Hellenistic practice, reflect a new pattern of diplomatic interaction: both embassies have been cogently identified with the large-scale missions of Asia's cities to the Senate in 22 CE, at which some cities had the inviolable statuses of their temples confirmed, and limits were imposed on the creation of new such statuses.[708] Elaibares' inscription mentions only that he travelled 'to Rome', while Meniskos' only that he had 'served as ambassador to the emperor'. No

[705] Millar (1977) 410-447; see also the surpassing collection and discussion of material in Ziethen (1994), and now Claudon (2015).
[706] Evidence has been gathered from Claudon (2015) and Habicht (2002). Apart from Epikrates, Chairemon, and Hermagoras already mentioned: *I.Didyma* 107 (*asylia* of Apollo Didymeus and civic privileges), *I.Perge* 58 (*asylia* of Artemis Pergaia and civic privileges), *SEG* 40.668 ll. 9-12 (documents on civic privileges, Lindos); *I.Kibyra* 41 ll. 3-4, 10-13 (a local crisis over a grain cartel), *I.Stratonikeia* 220 (freedom of the city).
[707] *I.Sardis* 8 ll. 6-38, *I.Stratonikeia* 631.
[708] Tac. *Ann.* 3.60-63, with Rigsby (1996) 584. For Meniskos, *I.Didyma* 107 ll. 9-13, with Haussoulier (1902) 264-271 and Fontenrose (1988) 21; the Milesians appear at *Ann.* 3.63.3. Elaibares: *I.Perge* 58 ll. 14-19, and Jones (1999a) 13-15, *contra* Şahin (1995) 18-19, who identifies the *asylia* with a grant under Domitian.

mention, however, is made of the Senate. Most likely, Meniskos did indeed interact with both Senate and Tiberius, who would likely have presided over the proceedings;[709] what is noteworthy is that the event was remembered solely as the result of interaction with the emperor, who had now subsumed local civic notions of what 'Roman power' constituted.

Indeed, the 'embassy to Rome' seems to have become, in the period 29 BCE to c. 100 CE, practically synonymous with contact with the emperor or emperors. Of our thirty-six instances of ambassadorial euergetism thirty are described as being addressed to the emperor or emperors alone: so, for example, Ti. Claudius Kleonymos of Kos 'served as ambassador on many occasions to the emperors on account of his fatherland',[710] while the other six describe generic embassies 'to Rome' (εἰς Ῥώμην).[711] Moreover, 'embassies to Rome' constitute just about the only publicly praised forms of ambassadorial activity – only eight other instances are known where the honorand was praised for 'embassies' alone, whose addressee or import is left entirely unmentioned.[712] Of course, as euergetic rhetoric, caution must be applied: the dominance of the emperor as recipient does not mean that embassies only ever met the emperor. It is clear that, from the 1st to 3rd centuries CE, civic embassies continued to be heard by the Senate, and indeed continued to be sent to governors and local provincial authorities.[713] These receive less attention in the public language of praise, however, with imperial-era instances of ambassadorial euergetism directed at the Senate or senatorial officials invariably also mentioning the emperor, who is typically placed at the head of such descriptions.[714] It is certainly also the case that the cult of the Senate does

[709] As argued by Talbert (1984) 420-421.
[710] *Syll.*[3] 805 ll. 7-10.
[711] *TAM* II 261 l. 9, *I.Laodikeia am Lykos* 82 l. 11, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.306i l. 12, *I.Stratonikeia* 1024 l. 10, *IGR* IV 555 l. 14, *I.Stratonikeia* 631 l. 4.
[712] A number come from Aphrodisias: *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.612 l. 6, 4.101 l. 3, 11.508i l. 5, 12.308 l. 15, 12.413 l. 9, 12.207 l. 7, and also *I.Didyma* 312 l. 12, *I.Lindos* 449 l. 9.
[713] Talbert (1984) 411-425.
[714] Maiuri, *NS* 462 ll. 13-16 (L. Nonius Aristodamos, Kos), *I.Kibyra* 75 ll. 1-7 (unknown), *SEG* 40.668 ll. 9-12 (T. Flavius Aglochartos, Rhodes), *IG* XII.1 58 ll. 3-11 (Hermagoras, Rhodes), *I.Ephesos* 781 ll. 1-2 (unknown), 2069 ll. 10-13 (Gn. Pompeius Hermippos), 728 ll. 10-12, 18-21 (P. Vedius Antoninus); there are

emerge in the early empire, as coins of several cities attest.[715] This arguably forms less an attempt to reify the 'senatorial' character of Asia, however, than a further means of conceptualising the authority of the emperor, with whose cult it was explicitly linked: thus, the Smyrnaians' second provincial cult-temple was dedicated jointly to Tiberius, Livia and the Senate.[716]

This fixation on the emperor as the notional summit of ambassadorial achievement reflects the perception, but also undoubtedly the reality, that the competitive environment of the late Republic was at an end. Where multiple powerful patrons and senatorial interests had dominated the attention of civic ambassadors, necessitating the formation of robust personal friendships and a certain degree of technical ambassadorial specialisation, the centrality of the emperor simplified the stakes and complexities of the political environment. Indeed, a feature of the decline of civic patronage in the east is not only that it becomes less common, but that emperors do not actually replace senators as patrons: the power of the *princeps* was clearly regarded as something quite different, and beyond, traditional senatorial institutions.[717] The end of competitive senatorial politics meant that civic ambassadors faced less competition from Roman civic patrons, and conversely diminished the opportunities for radical advancement beyond civic horizons, such as reflected in the careers of those who had relied on close ties with leading *imperatores* in the late Republic, like Theophanes of Mytilene, Theopompos of Knidos, or Anaxenor of Magnesia. The long-term consequence of this reduction in the structural complexity of Roman authority, resulting in the gradual subordination of senatorial influence to that of the emperor, coupled with the generally more peaceful conditions under the early empire, was that the

further only six instances honouring embassies to provincial officials (ἡγεμόνες) alone, as cited by Habicht (2002) 15-16 for examples from Kyzikos, Olbia, Syedra, Xanthos and Chersonesos.

[715] For cults to the Senate, Robert, *BE* 1954 n. 54, Robert (1967), Erskine (1997) 27-28.

[716] So Gauthier, *BE* 1998 n. 116.

[717] Note Eilers (2002) 170 and Appendix 5: members of the imperial family were sometimes patrons, but this practice dies out after Augustus.

ambassadorial metier may have become less specialised, and therefore was honoured in less spectacular ways than in the 1st century BCE. We do not find, for example, individual decrees or statues specifically commemorating ambassadorial services, and certainly none of the 'super-ambassadorial' honours, like cult or titles of founder (e.g. Diodoros Pasparos, Theophanes of Mytilene, Mithridates of Pergamon). Instead, embassies are typically praised alongside other civic offices, and form a generalised part of a civic career: thus, Aristeas of Iasos in the 1st century CE was '*stephanephoros*, gymnasiarch of the elders, ambassador on his own account to the hegemon Rome on behalf of the city, five-times general, *agoranomos*, and completed all other offices and functions'.[718]

That is to say, our early imperial evidence for ambassadorial euergetism seems to suggest that ambassadorial contact between cities and Roman power was increasingly normalised and regularised. In the early 2nd century, Plutarch would write of embassies to the emperor as a standard liturgical obligation of the aspiring politician.[719] This was in part due to the very centrality of imperial power, that generated new forms of ambassadorial interaction. We can only guess what an ambassador like Aristeas of Iasos did when he went to Rome ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος,[720] but the fact that the majority, twenty-six, of the thirty-six instances of such Rome-focussed ambassadorial euergetism do not actually specify the aim of these embassies, suggesting instead that the very fact of travelling to the emperor at all was praise-worthy in itself, does seem to reflect a degree of regularity.[721]

This apparent regularity is arguably a function of imperial cult, to return to the point made at the beginning of this section. Where embassies in the Republic had mainly been the

[718] *I.Iasos* 87 ll. 2-9.
[719] *Prae. ger. reip.* 10 (*Mor.* 805a-b) and *De exil*. 8 (*Mor.* 602c).
[720] *I.Didyma* 272 ll. 22-23, 299, ll. 1-2, 300 ll. 4-5, *I.Laodikeia am Lykos* 82 l. 11, Maiuri, *NS* 462 ll. 14-15, *Syll*.[3] 805 ll. 8-9, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 4.101 ll. 3-4, 12.105 l. 9, *I.Iasos* 87 l. 5.
[721] Only nine of 26 actually specify motivation as ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος: *I.Didyma* 272 ll. 22-23, 299, ll. 1-2, 300 ll. 4-5, *I.Laodikeia am Lykos* 82 l. 11, Maiuri, *NS* 462 ll. 14-15, *Syll*.[3] 805 ll. 8-9, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 4.101 ll. 3-4, 12.105 l. 9, *I.Iasos* 87 l. 5; the others provide no details at all.

results of crises and local problems, embassies in the early principate could be generated by events in the life-cycle of the imperial family. The despatching of gifts and greetings at imperial accession would be institutionalised, for instance, in the *aurum coronarium*.[722] Some embassies may even have come to consist primarily in the exchanging of gifts – in the performance, before the person of the *princeps*, of the rituals that were conducted vicariously at home through cult. The people of Byzantion, for instance, were accustomed by 110 CE to send an embassy every year to the emperor purely, it would seem, to convey their goodwill.[723] An earlier sense of this euergetic, even 'cultic', function of civic embassies can be gleaned from the Assians' record of the greetings they conveyed to Caligula on his accession in 37,[724] at which the city despatched an embassy solely for the purpose of 'meeting and celebrating with him, and entreating him to maintain the city in his memory and protection, just as he had promised to our city when he first arrived in the province with his father Germanicus' (ll. 13-17). This exhortation was concretely affirmed through oath-taking, where the Assians swore to remain loyal to Caligula by Zeus Soter, Athena Parthenos, and the divine Augustus, and made sacrifices to Jupiter Capitolinus (ll. 18-33).[725] While we do not hear of 'concrete' discussion about matters like civic privileges, this should not deflect our attention from the significant point that a major function of the embassy was precisely to enact the sort of euergetic rituals the Assians performed at home.

One factor behind the apparent regularity of embassies to the emperor should therefore be their role as an appendage to imperial cult – as a replaying, in a sense, of the established practice in Hellenistic honouring, by which a foreign benefactor was made aware of the honours conferred, and encouraged to remain true to them. With imperial cult, however, which was ensconced in a provincial framework, more was arguably at stake than

[722] Rowe (2002) 142-143; for *aurum coronarium*, Millar (1977) 140-144, 410-418.
[723] Plin. *Ep*. 10.43.1.
[724] *I.Assos* 26.
[725] For oath-taking in the principate generally, Hermann (1968).

the goodwill of the emperor alone. Indeed, 'cultic' embassies to the emperor may be interpreted as a further manifestation of the 'euergetic space' generated by imperial honour. The fact that the Assians made specific allusion to the visit of Germanicus in 18 CE when urging Caligula to maintain his beneficent attitude, for instance, had a double and complementary significance: it evoked on the one hand the city's longstanding closeness and loyalty to Caligula, but did so, moreover, by inflating the significance of his visit, which was presented as the 'first' moment at which he had entered the province, with the fact of the province emphasised. Thus, line 16 reads: ἐπιβὰς πρώτως τῆι ἐπαρχείαι τῆς ἡμετέρας πόλεως, 'when he first entered our city in the province (of Asia)'.[726] The slightly forced character of this evocation of Caligula's visit emerges from the realisation that he would have only been about six years old when he accompanied his father – the 'promise' he made is more likely to have been pronounced by Germanicus.[727] A likely further dimension to the Assians' proud record of their embassy, therefore, is that it was directed at a provincial audience – in travelling to Caligula, they were reinforcing and perpetuating a close personal relationship with the divine ruler of the world which, they could claim, ran deeper than was the case for other cities in Asia.

We do not know if the Assians augmented their local imperial cult on the occasion of Caligula's accession, or how this bold claim to primacy in the province stood with the *koinon*. About four decades earlier, however, it was a similar 'cultic' embassy to Rome that raised questions about the place of Sardeis in the provincial cultic network, and it is this embassy and the honorific exchanges that subsequently took place, centred on the Sardian ambassador Menogenes, that we now briefly consider.

[726] For ἐπιβάς with a genitive of direction, and τῆι ἐπαρχείαι as locative dative, Merkelbach in *I.Assos* p. 56.
[727] Merkelbach in *I.Assos* pp. 57-58; for Germanicus' voyage, Tac. *Ann.* 2.54.

Provincialising the ambassador: Menogenes of Sardeis

The activities of Menogenes in the years 6/5 to 2/1 BCE are known from twelve letters and decrees, inscribed on a marble stele which would have stood in the sanctuary of Artemis at Sardeis; the honorific formula in the triangular pediment crowning the stele presents it as a monument to the honours conferred on him by the *koinon* of Asia and the people and *gerousia* of Sardeis.[728] The most notable aspect of the dossier is its extremely compressed chronological range. The first document (**I**, ll. 6-21) comprises a decree of Sardeis, passed on the receipt of news of Gaius Caesar's assumption of the *toga virilis* in early 5 BCE: the day of the assumption is declared sacred, sacrifices are to be made, the people to wear wreaths, and a cult-statue to be erected in the civic temple of Augustus; the day on which the city received the information would also be celebrated with sacrifices and wreath-wearing (ll. 9-15). An embassy would be despatched to inform Augustus of this resolution, led by Menogenes and another notable, Iollas son of Metrodoros (ll. 20-21). The next five documents (**II-VI**) outline the honorific responses to this embassy of 5 BCE: a letter of Augustus commending Menogenes and Iollas (ll. 22-27), and four decrees honouring Menogenes, two each of the Sardian *demos* and *gerousia*, of September to late 5 BCE (ll. 23-74). We learn from the next document (**VII**), a letter of Charinos the high-priest informing Sardeis of the *koinon*'s honours for Menogenes, and dating also to late 5 BCE, that Menogenes had served as *ekdikos* of the *koinon* in the year 6/5.[729] The following three documents, a letter and two honorific decrees of the *koinon*, show that he held this position two more times (**VIII-X**, ll. 83-119), the first iteration being in either 5/4 or 4/3 BCE, and

[728] Buckler and Robinson (1914), later *I.Sardis* 8, with ll. 1-5 for the pediment.
[729] Buckler and Robinson dated Menogenes' first year as *ekdikos* to the following year 5/4, cf. (1914) 338, but this cannot stand for various internal reasons, not least that document **IV** from late 5 BCE explicitly honours him for having been *ekdikos* in the year preceding (ll. 40, 51); I hope to discuss the problem more fully elsewhere.

the second probably in the year 3/2 BCE.[730] The last two decrees on the stele, of the Sardian council enacting honours for Menogenes and his son in response to the *koinon* decree **X**, probably date to late 2 or early 1 BCE (**XI-XII**, ll. 120-139).

Menogenes' career is thus presented as one that was seemingly generated near-single-handedly by a 'cultic' embassy to the emperor: the first half of the stele alone, documents **I** to **VII**, concern the response to Gaius Caesar's assumption of manhood in 5 BCE. It is important to notice, but difficult to appreciate, just how radically new this must have been. This was the celebration not only of a life-event of a hegemonic ruler, not unknown in the Hellenistic period, but that of his *adopted son and heir*, which is virtually unparalleled. The most striking feature of this major event, however, is that it seems to have been a purely Sardian initiative. From the letter of the high-priest Charinos (**VII**) we know that Menogenes actually served in that very year as *ekdikos* of the *koinon*, and indeed another aspect of the mission conveying congratulations to Augustus is that he would speak to the emperor on matters pertaining in common 'to Asia and the city' (ll. 19-20). Charinos' letter praises Menogenes for his 'goodwill, and pure and advantageous holding of the office' (ll. 78-79), and seems to focus only on his administrative duties,[731] with no mention of his embassy to Rome, and most importantly, of the congratulations the Sardians sought to convey to Augustus and Gaius Caesar. Indeed, it is only from the Sardian perspective, in the decrees of its *demos* and *gerousia*, that Menogenes' mission is also described as having been made 'on behalf of the Greeks (i.e. the *koinon*)':[732] this is not to suggest that Charinos was not acknowledging this ambassadorial function of Menogenes as *ekdikos* – which would

[730] Document **VIII** reports honours for Menogenes, without specific mention of office, and is followed by a *koinon* decree honouring him for his second term as *ekdikos* (**IX**): we cannot be sure if these date to the same year, or two consecutive years. But they at least predate 2 BCE, as neither document includes the title of *pater patriae* for Augustus, which the Senate conferred on him early that year, and which appears first only in document **X** (l. 101).
[731] *Koinon ekdikoi* as administrative officials: *I.Priene2014* 14 ll. 64-66.
[732] Only the Sardian *demos* and *gerousia* qualify the embassy as one which had been undertaken 'on account of the Greeks', ὑπέρ τε τῶν Ἑλλήνων (ll. 43, 58, 68).

certainly be made explicit in his later honours for his second and third years in the function – but only that it seems that Menogenes' role in conveying Sardeis' decree of honours for Gaius formed a quite distinct and additional purpose. We do not know how the *koinon* reacted to the news of 5 BCE, although some response is likely, given that only four years previously it had decreed to align its calendars with the birthday of Augustus. It is significant in this regard that the Sardians not only declared sacred the day of Gaius' ascension, but also the day on which the decision was made to confer honours on him (ll. 9-11, 14-15): it may be that the *koinon* had decreed honours for the day of Gaius' ascension, and that the Sardians had followed this by instituting their own honours to Gaius, and going yet further by honouring the very day of their decision to do so. This extra honour may have been consciously different to other parts of the province – Samos, for instance, decreed oath-taking, which was perhaps more in line with a centralised *koinon* initiative, and perhaps with an empire-wide sense of temporal alignment: oaths were also made, for instance, by the community of Conobaria in Spain at the same time.[733] The Sardians, however, were keen to highlight the local uniqueness of their augmented cult to Augustus and, now, Gaius.

It is likely that this further decree of local honours was tied to Menogenes' existing role as *ekdikos*, and that the occasion of the city's 'cultic' embassy to the emperor, while therefore necessarily tied to his role in the *koinon*, was perceived as an opportunity to enhance the standing of the city, both before Augustus, and within the *koinon*. It is notable that in the Sardians' decree the ambassadors' meeting with the emperor to discuss the common affairs of Asia and the city is distinguished clearly from the acts of conveying the Sardians' greetings and a copy of their decree (ll. 17-20) – that is, that only the city is

[733] Samos: *IG* XII.6 7. The mention of Augustus' consulship in b l. 10 makes the most plausible date 6/5 BCE: Herrmann (1960) 78-80 and (1968) 95-96, with González (1988) 118-120, Scharf (2003) 421-422 and Levick (2011) 249 n. 18; Conobaria: González (1988) 113. Scharf (2003) 420-421 notes, however, that the Sardians' decree makes no mention of an oath, and was probably the result of spontaneous decision rather than central direction.

accorded a primary role in the crucial work of affirming euergetic connections with the *princeps*. Of course, it is possible that Menogenes was also charged by the *koinon* with conveying congratulations on the *koinon*'s behalf, and that this was simply not mentioned by the Sardians. Reading the Sardians' statements at face-value, however, it is possible to see this apparent exclusion of the *koinon* as a reflection of uncertainty about their place in that organisation. One dynamic which may underpin their zealousness to affirm the uniqueness of their local cult may have been rivalry with Pergamon, their large neighbour to the north that had become, after 29, the major centre of honour to the emperor in Asia. It is this rivalry that may have been carried out vicariously through the one-upmanship with the *koinon* that is implied in the Sardians' measures. For one, we know that Sardeis already had its own Καισάρηα festival celebrating the imperial cult under Augustus, which may well have emulated that at Pergamon.[734] These tensions may have come to a head at the time of Gaius' ascension to manhood in 5 BCE, when the *koinon* would have held the seventh Ῥωμαῖα Σεβαστά at Pergamon.[735] It is precisely from around the turn of the common era, too, that coins from Pergamon and Sardeis present the personified *demos* of Sardeis shaking hands with or crowned by the *demos* of Pergamon, in a gesture of *homonoia*.[736] Part of Menogenes' achievement in travelling to Rome and meeting Augustus through a 'cultic' embassy, thereby establishing direct relations with the emperor, may therefore have been the acquisition of the political and symbolic legitimacy necessary to assert Sardeis' increasingly contested place in the *koinon* framework. It is significant in this regard that in the year of his third *ekdikia* Menogenes also held the 'priesthood of the Pergamenes' (ll. 126-127), which is likely to allude to the municipal, as opposed to the *koinon*'s, priesthood

[734] *IG* XII.4 938 ll. 22-23 (inscription of Augustan date).
[735] Pera (1984) 18-19.
[736] Pergamon: *RPC* I 2362; Sardeis: 2988; the magistrate named on the obverse, Mousaios, may be identifiable with the Mousaios named as one of the *strategoi* proposing honours to Gaius in 5 BCE (l. 6). See Kampmann (1996) 14-19.

of the imperial cult –[737] this was a feat important enough to the Sardians that they upgraded, in their own decree confirming his *koinon* honours, the painted shield-portrait conferred by the *koinon* into a bronze statue (l. 128).

Menogenes may thus have been regarded as something like a 'saviour' of Sardeis, in these changed circumstances. Yet 'salvation' no longer meant a privileged status *vis à vis* Rome, or externality to the provincial framework: indeed, quite the opposite. We are past the age of Polemaios and Menippos of Kolophon a century earlier. Like some of the civic heroes of the preceding generation – Epikrates of Miletos, Xenon of Thyateira, Potamon of Mytilene – Menogenes only received heroic honours at best, in a Menogeneion,[738] but not the divine cult of super-ambassadors, as a reflection of the increasing constraint imposed on honorific status by the consolidation of the *koinon* that was suggested in chapter 2. There are also, however, further developments. For one, Menogenes' honorific status was genuinely provincial in character – he received the right to erect four painted or gilt shield-portraits over these years, at a location of his choosing (ll. 79, 86, 95, 109-110, 114 (for his son)), interestingly reflecting the assumption that the *koinon* could in theory impose upon the honorific space of its constituent cities. In practice, this meant greater local consciousness of the need to translate what *koinon* honour 'meant', as we see in the conversion of his shield-portrait into a bronze statue after his third *ekdikia*. One wonders, for example, if the marble cult-statue that he received after his first embassy of 5 BCE was intended to compensate for the *koinon* honour he would receive at the same time, which had been decreed by representatives from 150 communities of Asia at the federal assembly (ll. 76-77). Moreover, this may have created hierarchies of honorific significance – note that at Sardeis Menogenes also received a marble statue after his embassy of 5 BCE (l. 48), which

[737] Buckler and Robinson (1914) 360-361.
[738] *I.Sardis* 17 ll. 14-15: [πρὸς τῷ] Μηνογενείῳ· *I.Sardis* 351 l. 12: [Μ]ην[ογεν]ειο[..] and l. 14: [Μηνο]γενείου. There is corroboration in the fact that Menogenes was honoured with a marble *agalma*, cult-statue, for his embassy in 5 BCE: *I.Sardis* 8 l. 49.

is never replicated by any of the *koinon*'s honours. Menogenes may well have chosen to set up all his *koinon* statues at Sardeis, but their inscriptions, presenting the authority of the *koinon* (ll. 80-82, 87-88, 96-98, 110-112), would have clearly distinguished him, for instance, from his earlier compatriot Iollas who had obtained a staggering fourteen statues, but all set up only at Sardeis.[739]

Secondly, and consequently, *koinon* honour implied *koinon* obligation. A striking feature of the dossier is not only the upward movement of Menogenes' honorific status, from city to *koinon*, but also the converse, of the city's increasingly ready acceptance of its provincial status through Menogenes' accomplishments. Somewhat in contrast to the disjuncture between Sardian and *koinon* decrees in 5 BCE, by Menogenes' third *ekdikia* we find the city warmly receiving and carrying out the instructions of a *koinon* decree, including those to honour his son Isidoros, who bore by this point the epithet Ἀσιανός (ll. 112-117), an appellation that consciously embodied Menogenes' sense of 'provincial' self-identity, and may have sought to replicate at the local level the dynastic succession of Gaius to Augustus.[740] This dynastic quality is further insinuated by the privilege granted to Menogenes of inscribing a stele – undoubtedly the one known to us – containing 'his own honours and those of his ancestors' (ll. 117-118). Even more striking is the replication of the *koinon*'s example at the level of intra-civic groups. As document **XII** shows, residents of the sanctuary of Zeus and Artemis even petitioned the council to allow them to erect a shield-portrait – not of Menogenes, but of Isidoros, in conscious imitation of the *koinon*'s and Sardian council's own decrees (ll. 133-139).

This apparently dynastic character reflects something of the peculiar feature of ambassadorial euergetism we have examined in this section – namely, the unusually penetrating character of the persona of the emperor, through the medium of imperial cult. In

[739] *I.Sardis* 27 ll. 3-6.
[740] Rowe (2002) 148.

the preceding paragraphs I have suggested that the structure of such honours to the emperor generated 'cultic' ambassadorial euergetism, embassies that formed an extension of imperial cult, and manifestations of the way that cult constituted 'euergetic space'. This differs from the sort of ambassadorial euergetism we encounter in the late Hellenistic period, where leading citizens served as intermediaries, and sometimes even detached themselves from their cities, thereby establishing difference and distance from, rather than closer communication with, the ruling power. The unipolarity of the *princeps*' position altered this dynamic, and enforced the need for collective honouring, and ultimately stood to reshape euergetic priorities – around the province, and even his own family, as Menogenes' example suggests.[741] Beyond imperial cult, however, the influence of the emperor was also increasingly felt in the very fabric of civic honorific discourse, at the level of local honourability and in the claims that could be made through public dedications and honorific titles. It is to these that we now turn.

The *princeps* as 'euergetic space' II: the power of a name

One place where it is possible to trace the impact of the imperial person in generating inter-elite competition through euergetism is Ilion in the Troad, from where no fewer than three statue-bases to Augustus have survived to us. Each was dedicated in different ways. Two were set up by the cities of the *koinon* of Athena Ilias around 25 BCE,[742] of which one preserves the name of Hipparchos, an Ilian member of the *koinon*'s council, who personally undertook the costs of the statue, out of 'his piety towards Augustus, his benefactor and

[741] This is a reading that therefore confers more agency on the way that imperial cult structured Menogenes' behaviour, rather than the more individualised portrait of Rowe (2002) 145-148, e.g. that his 'real genius lay in self-presentation' (147).
[742] *I.Ilion* 81-82.

saviour'.[743] This striking claim to personal connection is also made over a decade later, when another Ilian, a G. Julius Melanippides, set up a statue of Augustus, calling him 'his own guest-friend and benefactor'.[744] Two other statues to Augustus were also set up by Melanippides and his wife.[745] As a high-priest of the imperial cult and recipient of Roman citizenship, Melanippides, as compared to Hipparchos, may have been particularly keen to emphasise his connection to Augustus – perhaps enacted through a 'cultic' embassy to the *princeps* – and hence described him as 'guest-friend'. The rhetoric of claiming the emperor or members of the imperial family as one's personal (ἑαυτοῦ) benefactor can also be found in another statue of Antonia the younger by a certain Philon.[746] This may be due to the heightened interest in claiming kinship with the imperial house in the Troad, as expressed in several imperial statues of the Julio-Claudian period, and insinuated, as we have seen, in the Assians' claims to personal intimacy with Caligula.[747] At Lampsakos, furthermore, a Dionysios son of Apollonoteimos set up the *gerousia*'s statue honouring Livia Augusta as the new Demeter: while her name only occupies the first three lines of the statue-base inscription, Dionysios' offices and name take up twelve, with the latter inscribed in larger lettering.[748]

Some of these statues were certainly benefactions that resulted from acts carried out in the context of, and by priests of, the imperial cult. Those of Hipparchos or Philon, who had no obvious role within the imperial cult, suggest on the other hand a greyer realm of 'honour to the emperor', and, in a manner analogous to the exaltation of Menogenes' status at Sardeis through and within the *koinon*, reveal how such honour could constitute 'euergetic space': a sphere of activity in itself, of which that undertaken within the remit of imperial

[743] *I.Ilion* 81 ll. 9-10.
[744] *I.Ilion* 83 ll. 4-5.
[745] *I.Ilion* 85, 85a.
[746] *I.Ilion* 88 ll. 16-19.
[747] Kinship at Ilion: *I.Ilion* 87 (G. Caesar), 91 (Britannicus and Nero), and Rose (2002) 38-40.
[748] *I.Lampsakos* 11, with Tafel 3.

cult forms only the most conspicuous manifestation. While this sort of behaviour may have been heightened in the Troad, it is observable elsewhere. At Pergamon, perhaps unsurprisingly, one finds at least three different statues of Augustus, by the city and its resident Romans (with the dedicating officials carefully listed), an Euangellion, as gymnasiarch, *prytanis*, and *agonothetes*, and a priest named Charinos.[749] Yet this enhanced public visibility of benefactions made in honour of the emperor, by which the identity of the dedicator came to assume as much importance as the imperial honorand himself, is widely attested across Asia, extends into the Julio-Claudian and Flavian periods, and is the result of increasingly competitive generosity around imperial honouring. Damarchos son of Leon, for instance, set up no fewer than four statues of Tiberius at Eresos, almost as private dedications, while imperial cult-priest.[750] At Aizanoi, Dionysios and Asklepiades claimed to be the first to honour the emperor Claudius from their own funds:[751] others had clearly done so only at public cost, and they were imitated in this private expenditure by Ti. Claudius Menogenes.[752] Similarly, Nikostratos set up a statue of Vespasian ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων.[753] The implicit message in such acts of dedication, that the honour paid to the emperor redounded also on the honour of the dedicator, can be gleaned in several cases where the dedicatory inscription itself was made the place for outlining the honours that had been conferred on the dedicator. Thus, at Thyateira, the altar dedicated by Alexandros son of Apollonios to Augustus records not only the fact of his dedication, but is followed by a summary of the decree honouring him, by which he would be crowned annually with a gold crown by the *brabeutai*.[754] Likewise, at Kys in Karia Eratophanes son of Charinos honoured Claudius

[749] *I.Pergamon* 383, 384, 401; Charinos may be identical with the Charinos in Menogenes' stele (*I.Sardis* 8 l. 75). Other statues of Augustus at Pergamon: *I.Pergamon* 381, 382, *IGR* IV 311, 314.
[750] *IG* XII.2 539-542.
[751] *IGR* IV 558.
[752] *IGR* IV 559.
[753] *I.Laodikeia am Lykos* 9.
[754] *TAM* V.2 903 ll. 1-2, 13-21.

with a statue, naming the emperor and his titles in full in the first five lines, but occupying the majority of the dedicatory inscription with a litany of his own services to the city, and honours received.[755]

This local competitive generosity around imperial honouring represents a quite new phenomenon in western Asia Minor, as compared to earlier cultic honours for the Seleukids, Attalids, or even cults of Roma. Statues for such rulers were set up, of course, but rarely were multiple such statues for individual rulers set up in single communities, or the identities of individual dedicators as prominently displayed. Nor does this behaviour extend to family-members to the same extent – even when family-members were honoured more visibly, as with the late Attalids – or persist across different reigns, as it does with honours to *principes*. Moreover, emperors and their relatives not only received statues, but were also dedicatees of buildings, including public buildings of a 'secular' nature, like stoas and theatres, alongside cultic structures like temples and shrines (like those of the anonymous benefactor of Eresos above). Across the Hellenistic period only a handful of examples are known in relation to Hellenistic rulers, and it does not seem to have been an established practice – the majority of dedicatees of non-cultic buildings are still civic gods and cities themselves.[756] With the principate of Augustus, however, it becomes distinctly common, and extends well across our period and into the high empire.[757] So, for instance, Q. Lollius Philetairos dedicated stoas to Augustus and the *demos* at Assos, where the honour to Augustus even precedes that to the city.[758] We should imagine that concrete circumstances underpin this sort of dedication, such as recorded in a decree from Keramos honouring a [Di?]ophantos,

[755] *I.Nordkarien* 406 ll. 5-26.
[756] For the few examples, Von Hesberg (1994) 41-43.
[757] Some Julio-Claudian cases: *IG* XII.6 484 (stoas, Samos), *I.Ephesos* 3420 (stoas, Metropolis), *SEG* 49.1706 (stoa, Thyateira), *I.Aphrodisias2007* 4.4 (stoa), 9.112 (Sebasteion), *Milet* I.9 328 (theatre), *TAM* V.2 1398 (unknown building and pavement, Magnesia on the Sipylos), *I.Ephesos* 20 (tax-house); Flavian examples: *MAMA* VI 251 (propylon of agora, Akmoneia), *I.Laodikeia am Lykos* 15 (amphitheatre), *I.Tralleis* 146 (*peripatos*, *agoranomonion*, peristyle), *I.Perge* 56 (arch), *I.Mylasa* 504 (wells).
[758] *I.Assos* 15, and also 16 (baths to Aphrodite Julia by wife Lollia Antiochis).

who was urged by the city, after completing an embassy to Tiberius at Rome (possibly to convey the city's honours at his accession), to direct an earlier promise of money towards a two-aisled stoa which would be dedicated to the emperor.[759] At the conceptual level, the dedication to emperors of non-cultic structures like stoas may simply reflect an extension of the practice of doing so to local gods, and thereby the extent to which imperial cult was integrated into local religion. One of the further distinctive features of imperial honour, however, is that the authority vested in dedicating 'to the emperor' may have provided new grounds for legitimating public benefaction, leading to outlay that transcended civic norms, and indeed allowed otherwise marginalised social groups to come to the fore in the public sphere. We see this most strikingly at Ephesos, where in the reign of Augustus alone we find three dedications of honours to the emperor by individuals of both Ephesian and non-Ephesian background, each doing so in different ways. The gymnasiarch Herakleides Passalas, a member of a leading local family, erected a statue to Augustus as founder.[760] In 3 BCE, the imperial freedmen Mazaios and Mithridates dedicated the south gate of the Tetragonos agora to Augustus and Agrippa as their personal patrons (πατρῶνες/*patroni*) in Latin and Greek, even imitating imperial monuments by displaying their inscription in bronze letters:[761] strikingly, it is the former that is privileged, being larger in letter-size, and including the full titulature of their honorands; the Greek, while briefer and less visible, nonetheless further indicated the dedication to the city.[762] Finally, in 11 CE the Italian émigré Sextilius Pollio dedicated his stoa-basilica and aqueductal bridge to the emperor,

[759] *I.Keramos* 14 ll. 19-33, with Ziethen (1994) 213, Frija (2012a) 107 and Claudon (2015) 150; it is likely his contribution of 800/1800 drachmas (see *I.Keramos* p. 28) contributed majorly, if not single-handedly, to the stoa, as the decree was inscribed there (ll. 34-36).
[760] *I.Ephesos* 252.
[761] Rose (2005) 29, 54-55 for other early examples of inscriptions in bronze lettering: the Parthian arch at Rome (18/17 BCE) and the triumphal arch at Antioch in Pisidia (2/1 BCE).
[762] *I.Ephesos* 3006.

doing so bilingually in both cases as well;[763] in the stoa-basilica dedication, moreover, the titles of Augustus are assiduously outlined, occupying the majority of the inscription.

Over four decades, then, the honouring of Augustus provided the focus for the euergetic activity of a local notable, imperial freedmen, and a resident Roman, and arguably served to legitimate the unusual Romanising innovations of the benefactions of the latter two: Pollio's 'stoa-basilica' was a deliberate hybrid of Hellenistic and Italian genres, while the south gate represented a composite of Hellenistic propylon and Roman triumphal arch.[764] The very activity of Mazaios and Mithridates as freedmen is particularly striking, with their dedication of the gate to Augustus and Agrippa as their patrons highlighting their libertine identity,[765] while also legitimating it; the description of the dedicatees as 'their patrons', τοῖς πάτρωσι, may also plausibly have been read as 'the city's patrons'. A major phenomenon of the early imperial period is, indeed, the public presentation of individuals as imperial freedmen. The earliest and most well-studied is G. Julius Zoilos at Aphrodisias, who displayed his status as 'freedman of Caesar, the son of the divine Julius', on the architrave of the theatre, when dedicating the stage and proscenium after 29.[766] He had also earlier been *stephanephoros* ten years straight (most probably from 39-29), was already lifetime priest of Aphrodite and Eleutheria, and dedicated the temple to Aphrodite and the agora's north portico in the aftermath of Labienus' invasion.[767] Importantly, however, this freedman identity seems only to have been displayed at the peak of his career, and after Octavian's victory at Actium: earlier statue-bases and dedications from the years 39-29 show him as a mainstream late Hellenistic civic notable like Epikrates or Theopompos, in featuring titles

[763] Stoa-basilica: *SEG* 39.1210; aqueductal bridge: *I.Ephesos* 3092.
[764] Alzinger (1974) 26-37 and Von Hesberg (2002), and Burrell (2011) 72-75, respectively.
[765] We know of at least Mithridates' freedman status from an epitaph: *I.Ephesos* 851.
[766] Reynolds (1991) 15, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 8.1 and 8.5; for Zoilos' career, Smith (1993) 4-13.
[767] Chronology of Zoilos' *stephanephoriai*: Reynolds (1982) 162; dedication of temple to Aphrodite and its boundary-markers: *I.Aphrodisias2007* 1.2, 1.1 and 1.38; agora portico dedication: *I.Aphrodisias2007* 3.2 and *SEG* 54.1023, for a supplementary fragment.

like εὐεργέτης and σωτήρ,[768] and thereby likely betraying the originally free origins of Zoilos (as a non-elite Aphrodisian).[769] His post-29 self-designation on the theatre's architrave reveals, however, the cachet that was now to be had by calling oneself the freedman of Octavian Caesar.

Over the following decades, and across the 1st century CE, the explicit commemoration of this public identity as imperial freedman becomes more common: some, like Mazaios and Mithridates, or G. Julius Nikephoros (also at Ephesos), who was *prytanis* for life,[770] and donated money towards sacrifices to an unknown goddess (possibly Roma),[771] are slightly more than names; for others we possess little more than statue-bases.[772] By the later 1st century, nonetheless, imperial freedmen seem to have attained greater importance, as several examples of clearly wealthy and influential figures at Flavian and Trajanic Ephesos suggest.[773] The implied personal patronal relationship with an emperor created a space for the honourability of imperial freedmen, and this was only consolidated when such freedmen dedicated benefactions to such emperors, like Mazaios and Mithridates.[774] Moreover, the wealth and influence acquired by such freedmen through their imperial patrons could exert an influence on local euergetic dynamics, within and between cities. It is notable, for instance, that the former imperial doctor Ti. Claudius Tyrannos was

[768] Dedication of temple of Aphrodite: *I.Aphrodisias2007* 1.2 (includes titles of εὐεργέτης and σωτήρ); dedication of its boundary-markers: *I.Aphrodisias2007* 1.1 and 1.38, with Reynolds (1982) 160-161; two statue-bases: *I.Aphrodisias2007* 5.101 (praising him as priest of Aphrodite and Eleutheria) and 8.203 (name only). The reliefs of his mausoleum unsurprisingly emphasise Zoilos' personae as Aphrodisian and Roman: Smith (1993) 24-59, 66.
[769] Weaver (2004) 199-200.
[770] *I.Ephesos* 859 ll. 4-6.
[771] *I.Ephesos* 859a, with Engelmann (1990) 92-94. Line 4 mentions sacrifices at the sacred hearth, possibly indicating a connection with the *prytaneion*, to whose construction Nikephoros may have contributed: see Steskal (2010) 78-79 for evidence for an Augustan date.
[772] *IG* XII.4 873ii (G. Julius Thiasos, Kos), *I.Kaunos* 119 (Ti. Claudius Chrestos), *IGR* IV 1347 (Ti. Claudius Amethystos, as *grammateus*), *I.Perge* 35 (Ti. Claudius Plocamus, for his piety to the emperors).
[773] Flavian: *I.Ephesos* 262 (Eutaktos), *I.Ephesos* 853 (Ti. Claudius Clemens): Trajan: *I.Ephesos* 857 (Ti. Claudius Secundus), 858 (T. Flavius Epagathos). Imperial freedman euergetism was also part of a broader Mediterranean-wide trend in the 1st centuries BCE and CE discernible in North Africa, Italy, and Greece: Boulvert (1974) 216-226, Coles (2017); for Asia Minor in general, Kantirea (2016) 475-480, 486.
[774] Note also the stoa and statue of Claudius by Ti. Claudius Epagathos at Sidyma (*TAM* II 178, 184), and the shrine to Artemis Sebaste Baieane in Mysia by Ti. Claudius Halys: *IGR* IV 228, with Kantirea (2016) 476.

praised by the Magnesians in negative terms for not having 'caused trouble to anyone unworthy of the greatness of his status' (μηδένα ὑφ' αὐτοῦ παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν τοῦ καθ' ἑ|αυτὸν μεγέθους ἐπιβεβαρῆσθαι), and was honoured with tax-immunity for the workshops he built at a nearby village, perhaps alluding thereby to the economic clout he wielded in the city.[775] The most striking case, however, is the generosity of Ti. Claudius Tryphon at Laodikeia on the Lykos, who dedicated the triple-arched eastern gate to Domitian (in Greek and Latin) as part of broader building work after an earthquake in 60 CE.[776] It was consecrated by the governor Sextus Frontinus, and should be seen as part of a dialogue with Laodikeia's neighbour Hierapolis, which had also been affected by this earthquake. There, a gate was also built, which was dedicated in Latin only, and seems to have presented the governor primarily as the sole benefactor (in the nominative), and not as consecrator (in the ablative).[777] Tryphon's benefaction to Laodikeia, most likely his native city, thus seems to have contributed to its self-identity as a community independent of reliance on the provincial framework, and served to distinguish it from a neighbour and rival – so much so, in fact, that Laodikeia's pride in its self-sufficiency was recorded by Tacitus.[778] Such imperial freedmen could therefore also become useful ideological anchoring points for civic identity, as communities sought to affirm themselves within the provincial contexts that imperial power increasingly enforced on them.

---

[775] *I.Magnesia* 113 ll. 15-16. For Tyrannos' workshops: Samama (2003) 346 n. 15 (as commercial installations), Nissen (2010) 133-134 and Nutton (1992) 46 n. 123 (as clinics/surgeries). Another powerful freedman in the provinces was Akratos under Nero, notorious for stripping Asia and Achaia of their statues: Tac. *Ann.* 15.45.2, 16.23.1; Dio Chrys. *Or.* 31.149. Note also G. Julius Pelago at Stratonikeia, known from Tacitus (e.g. *Ann*. 14.59.2), whose bequest to the city was significant enough, and generated enough dispute, that a local notable was praised for going on embassy to Rome to confirm the city's control over it: *I.Stratonikeia* 631 ll. 3-6, with Robert (1937) 538-542, for his career and other epigraphic evidence (*I.Stratonikeia* 529, 1011, and *IG* XIV 714, from Naples).

[776] *I.Laodikeia am Lykos* 24a-b for the dedicatory inscriptions, Kearsley (2011) 132-138 for a discussion of the monument and its bilingualism; Frontinus' governorship is dated to 84/85 CE. See also *I.Laodikeia am Lykos* 15 and 9 (stadium and statue dedicated to Titus by Nikostratos), 13 (a water fountain was built by another freedman, Hedychrous), and 12 (dedication of a water reservoir), the last two probably under Domitian.

[777] Ritti (2006) 73-74 n. 10; for the gate, D'Andria (2010) 70-73. For the differences between the two gates, Kearsley (2011) 134-136.

[778] Tac. *Ann*. 14.27.1; for Laodikeia and Hierapolis' later rivalry, especially around aqueducts and waterworks, Lendon (2015) 140-141 and Dorl-Klingenschmid (2006).

Imperialising civic honorific titles

Tryphon's arch at Laodikeia therefore exemplifies how the honouring of the emperor gave clearer rhetorical shape to relationships between civic communities, alongside the other manifestations of the 'euergetic space' it generated, as discussed above. While the fact of inter-citizen, and inter-city, competition was hardly new to the Augustan age, imperial honour, alongside the provincial framework it entrenched, arguably further encouraged a firmer sense of status-hierarchy, which is increasingly manifested in the tendency to conceive of honorific status in titular terms. One symptom of this is the increasingly prominent place accorded to 'firstness' in language relating to honour within the *koinon*. In the early years of the provincial cult, G. Julius Xenon, one of Asia's first high-priests was designated the 'first of the Greeks',[779] while his contemporary G. Julius Epikrates of Miletos, also an early high-priest, was regarded as being among the 'first' (πρωτεύων) in Asia.[780] This rhetoric around being the 'first' in the province, in the context of imperial cult, is detectable also in the praise accorded to a Juliane in the early 1st century CE, described as the first high-priestess in Asia.[781] What is especially striking about the idea of being the 'first', especially in this latter case, is that it implies a competitive, even formalised, system of tally-keeping across the province: thus, a late 1st-century CE *prophetes* inscription from Miletos commemorates an individual who claimed to be the fifth senator in all of Asia, and the first and only from Miletos and Ionia.[782] The idea of honorific primacy was hardly new to Hellenistic honorific discourse, of course, but was arguably given further impetus by the

[779] *TAM* V.2 1098 l. 11; 'the Greeks' referring to the *koinon*: Ferrary (2001a) 20-26. Note that the two Aphrodisian ambassadors of the *koinon* in the 70s or 60s BCE were already described as being 'among the first and most honoured men' of the province: *I.Aphrodisias2007* 2.503 ll. 7-8.
[780] *SEG* 44.940a ll. 9-10.
[781] *I.Magnesia* 158 ll. 5-6.
[782] *I.Didyma* 296 ll. 6-11.

koinon, especially as *koinon*-level office-holding concretised in the early empire:[783] we have seen that the Assians boasted of the time when Caligula 'first' (πρώτως) landed in Asia.[784] It may also have encouraged honorific primacy within cities, so that while being the 'first' or 'first and only' is an attribute found already from the start of the 1st century BCE, it is only after the inauguration of the imperial cult that it becomes increasingly common.[785]

'Firstness' existed in an early imperial discursive sphere, however, that was increasingly characterised by titularisation. For Xenon of Thyateira, being the 'first of the Greeks' was tantamount to his other civic honorific titles of saviour, benefactor and founder.[786] This sort of title-accumulation, which must underpin the need to create a new category of 'firstness' at all, is a largely later Hellenistic, and indeed 1st century BCE, development. While titles like 'benefactor' had been commonplace since the classical period (primarily for foreign honorands), designations like saviour or founder, such as granted to Xenon, are not found for citizen benefactors (Hellenistic kings comprising a different category) until the mid-1st century BCE, in 'super-ambassadors' like Theophanes of Mytilene, Theopompos of Knidos, and Mithridates of Pergamon (see chapter 2). It is noteworthy here that none of the leading citizen honorands of the late 2nd century BCE were accorded titles beyond εὐεργέτης. The proliferation of individualising rhetoric generated in that period, coupled with the phenomena of honorific elevation, and the crises around honorific status emerging from the difficulties of the decades after 85 BCE, nonetheless form the contexts in which titular epithets rise in importance from around the mid-1st century: indeed, not only are traditional titles more common, but new ones created, based

[783] For instance, the regularisation of the title of provincial high-priest as ἀσιάρχης by the end of the 1st century CE was likely due to increasing inter-city competition around Ephesos' acquisition of *neokoros* status under Domitian: Campanile (1994) 18-22, 162-165, (2006) 529-530, and Edelmann-Singer (2015) 174-175, with 198-203 for *koinon* offices generally.
[784] *I.Assos* 26 l. 16.
[785] Examples from before Augustus: *I.Sardis* 22, l. 5 (with Heller (2020) 51-53), *I.Priene2014* 69 l. 14, 70 ll. 18, 24-25; after 29 BCE: *I.Assos* 16 l. 3, *MAMA* IV 151i l. 4, *I.Priene2014* 305 l. 5, *SEG* 32.1243 l. 16, *I.Assos* 26 l. 12, *I.Erythrai* 85 l. 5; the first Romans holding office at Apameia in 45/46: *IGR* IV 792.
[786] *TAM* V.2 1098 ll. 8-10.

on an expanding vocabulary around civic virtuosity, and the conversion of adjectival words of praise into personal designations.[787] A notable case is φιλόπατρις, 'fatherland-loving', clearly formed on the basis of other φιλο-compounds used as honorific adjectives, like φιλότιμος or φιλόδοξος. It is attested as an ordinary adjective in a Mylasan decree of the late 2nd or 1st century,[788] but by the mid-1st century it appears more like an honorific title on the statue-base for Iollas of Sardeis, who was praised as 'a good man and a φιλόπατρις' (ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν καὶ φιλόπατριν ὄντα).[789] The sense here is less that of a praiseworthy quality, than that of an honorific rank, approximating to εὐεργέτης. From the late 1st century BCE onwards, it is this titular quality that comes to predominate, so that we find φιλόπατρις used even as an alternative to εὐεργέτης: thus, at Aphrodisias the city 'honoured Eusebes son of Menandros son of Eunikos, φιλόπατρις'.[790] The titular force of the designation, however, emerges most clearly where it appears simply alongside an individual's name, as part of his identity. For instance, Philistes, a high-priest mentioned in Menogenes' stele, is noted as 'the son of Apollodoros, son of Apollodoros, the φιλόπατρις, the Smyrnaian'.[791] Φιλόπατρις becomes the most commonly attested φιλο-compound honorific title, but others are known from the 1st century CE onwards, like φιλογέρων,[792] φιλοπολίτης,[793] or (at Ephesos) φιλεφέσιος and φιλάρτεμις,[794] and emperor-loving titles, φιλόκαισαρ and φιλοσέβαστος, which will be addressed shortly.

[787] For the rise of titles in the mid-1st century BCE, see Heller (2020) 19-56, to which the following paragraphs are much indebted.
[788] *I.Mylasa* 106 ll. 7-8.
[789] *I.Sardis* 27 l. 6, with Heller (2020) 42-43. Earlier still, but restored, may be *I.Didyma* 231ii l. 2 (59/52).
[790] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 11.17; see also *SEG* 62.1121. Other 1st-century examples of φιλόπατρις alone: *I.Ilion* 107 ll. 4-5, *I.Smyrna* 643 ll. 5-6, *I.Magnesia* 163 l. 1, *I.Didyma* 248 l. 12, *I.Iasos* 114 l. 3, *I.Sardis* 43 l. 2, *TAM* V.2 829 ll. 4-5, *SEG* 45.1719 l. 10 (Aizanoi), *SEG* 62.1121 l. 4, 1122 l. 3 (Apollonia Mordiaion), Von Saldern (2006) 323 n. 4 l. 1, 331 n. 18 l. 3 (Blaundos), *Altertümer von Hierapolis* 39 l. 3, *SEG* 46.1655 l. 2 (Hierapolis), *La Carie* 64b l. 2, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 1.102 l. 2, 9.1 l. 1, 11.16 l. 8, 11.17 l. 5, 12.105 ll. 5-6, 12.308 l. 6, 12.905 l. 2, 13.302ii l. 7.
[791] *I.Sardis* 8 l. 90. For building dedications see e.g. Von Saldern (2006) 323 n. 4 l. 1.
[792] *IGR* IV 783 l. 5 (with φιλόπατρις).
[793] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 8.23 l. 2, 9.25 l. 1, 12.308 l. 7 (with φιλόπατρις).
[794] Φιλεφέσιος: *I.Ephesos* 1545 l. 6; φιλάρτεμις: *I.Ephesos* 27a ll. 89-90, with φιλόκαισαρ, *I.Ephesos* 27g ll. 451-452, 33 l. 16, 36a ll. 5-6, 36b ll. 5-6, 36c l. 6, 36d ll. 5-6; also 695 l. 17 (L. Herennius Peregrinus).

The emergence of new titles like φιλόπατρις must reflect the normalisation of the sort of contractual relationship between leading citizens and civic assemblies observed at late Hellenistic Priene in chapter 3. It is at an assembly that a certain Chian benefactor, for instance, was acclaimed φιλόπατρις (φιλόπατρις φωνηθείς).[795] This normalisation proceeded alongside a tendency towards the hierarchisation of honorific status, in a manner analogous to the increasing prominence of the notion of primacy. Here, it is crucial to emphasise the role of imperial honour and cult. This can be best observed in the honorific decree for L. Vaccius Labeo of Kyme, dating to the last years of Augustus' reign.[796] As gymnasiarch, he had contributed to the gymnasium and baths, donating land towards the latter, for all of which he was offered the exceptional honours that had been accorded to other leading late Hellenistic citizens – titles as founder and benefactor, statues, and even a cult-shrine and future burial in the gymnasium (ll. 5-11). The most remarkable aspect of the exchange, however, is that Labeo declined some of these honours (ll. 12-20):

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

The main interest of this description is that it survives at all. Civic honours must invariably have been contested affairs, and the fact that Labeo's refusal was inscribed may reflect in part a desire to safeguard his local standing, by publicly affirming his modesty, and forestalling any future accusations of being greedy for honours.[797] Yet this sort of public

[795] Robert (1938) 140; see also *I.Didyma* 248 l. 12: ἀποδει[χ]θεὶς φιλόπατρις.
[796] *I.Kyme* 19, between 2 BCE and 14 CE; see most recently Kuhn (2017b) 202-205.
[797] Kuhn (2017b) 214-215; note also that the inscription of the decree on a stele is specified at the end (ll. 52-54).

refusal, especially on the grounds of the incomparability of divine honours, is largely unprecedented in Hellenistic honorific epigraphy, and strongly suggests that in speaking of the honours 'fitting only for the gods and those alike them' Labeo had in mind the imperial cult, even if this is never explicitly mentioned. One conclusion to draw from this is that the honorific status of the *princeps*, by the turn of the common era, was now regarded as unchallengeable: Labeo refused because the imperial cult was now a reality, and imposed limits on elite honorific status.[798] A parallel for this sort of ambivalence towards the highest civic honours can be found in the statue-base for Chairemon of Tralleis (grandson of Chairemon of Nysa of Mithridatic war fame), which praises him for having 'conducted an embassy to the Senate and Caesar Augustus on the matter of the city's second foundation' after Tralleis was struck by an earthquake in 27 BCE.[799] Neither the honorific inscription nor accompanying epigram actually name Chairemon as founder of the city, however, but leave the issue open, with the epigram calling the honour a κτίστα χάρις, the gratitude due to a founder:[800] the syntax leaves it unclear whether this applies to him specifically, because it may also have referred to Augustus, who certainly received this title at the city.[801]

This ambiguity, dating from only a few years after the advent of imperial cult, arguably derives from uncertainty about the granting of the highest civic honours, especially where these may have implied a cultic element. While leading citizens like Diodoros Pasparos, Theophanes of Mytilene or Artemidoros of Knidos could even obtain divine honours, tied in the case of Theopompos also to the title of κτίστης, the existence of such honours for the *princeps* presented a clear position of superiority: a superiority expressed in Chairemon's epigram, which depicts him coiling around the knees of Caesar to make his

[798] Price (1984) 49, 51, and Strubbe (2004) 328-329.
[799] *SEG* 61.880a ll. 3-7.
[800] Jones (2011) 113-114 for line 13: ὡς δῖ, καὶ κτίστα τάνδ[ε φέροιτο χάριν].
[801] *I.Tralleis* 35.

case.[802] Citizens would still be called founder and saviour in the imperial period,[803] but cultic honours for citizens do largely disappear.[804] In their place public heroic honours were increasingly formalised as an honorific category, where honorands are described explicitly as ἥρως (and thus, implicitly, not θεός).[805] Three of the *koinon*'s leading figures around the time of the institution of provincial cult, the G. Julii Xenon, Epikrates, and Hybreas, all received heroic, but not divine, honours, and even then perhaps only posthumously.[806] Labeo's refusal of living cult marks a rough turning-point, reflecting a widespread perception that such cult was inappropriate for individuals other than the *princeps*, or at least had to be attenuated, as the continued willingness to grant heroic honours suggests.

At the same time, his gesture formed a creative response to the reality of imperial cult, with interesting implications for how honorific hierarchy would be defined. For one, the very refusal of honours may have consciously imitated such refusals as performed by Augustus and the Julio-Claudian imperial family;[807] that is, Labeo was also ironically *enhancing* his honourability by vaunting his modesty, and drawing on imperial precedent in doing so, in a manner comparable to the way that public benefactions increasingly drew on the emperor's name for legitimacy: it is not coincidental here that Labeo was a resident Roman, and thus likely more aware of the power of the imperial example. Moreover, this refusal, a product of the intertwining of local honourability with imperial precedent, served to validate the honours he did accept, which were still considerable: multiple statues and

[802] *SEG* 61.880b l. 3.
[803] Pont (2010) 311-320.
[804] The closest are probably the Καπιτωνεία festival honours for Gn. Vergilius Capito at Miletos in the mid-1st century CE: *I.Didyma* 278 ll. 5-6; the Βαλβίλληα of Ti. Claudius Balbillos attested at Ephesos, Smyrna and Pergamon, seem not to have honoured him as benefactor specifically, but were granted by Vespasian, and named after him as donor: Cass. Dio 65.9.2, and Frisch (1974); living cults for governors do peter out: the last known case in Asia for L. Vibius Postumus (6/9 or 112/15 CE) calls him a ἥρως, implying either posthumous, or specifically delineated 'heroic' honours: *IG* XII.6 365; cf. Thériault (2001) 92-95.
[805] Price (1984) 49-51.
[806] For the phenomenon of heroisation in the imperial period generally, Jones (2010) 48-65.
[807] Charlesworth (1939) 5-6 for comparanda (e.g. Tiberius at Gytheion, Claudius at Thasos), and Thériault (2001) 94 and Sartre (1991) 108-109 more generally; Augustus: Cass. Dio 51.19-20.1-4, Suet. *Aug.* 52.

future public burial.[808] Most notably, however, while he still retained the title of εὐεργέτης, that of κτίστης was commuted into a φιλο-compound honorific title, φιλοκύμαιος, which thereby functioned as an *alternative* honorific title to κτίστης.[809] What distinction was being made? Κτίστης would have evoked Labeo's externality to the community, as a status implying the incomparability of his benefaction; here the distinction made is that between the founder Labeo and other non-founder citizens. Φιλοκύμαιος would also have implied cleavage, but one based on the presumption that all citizens were already honourable to begin with: it signifies a higher form of civic-mindedness, 'Kyme-love', and not merely 'fatherland-love' (φιλόπατρις). The upper limit represented by Augustus, then, may be said to have commuted the strongly vertical tendency of the highest honours of the Hellenistic period, in titles like κτίστης and σωτήρ, into a more equitable inward-facing distribution of honour, that encouraged gradation and nuance.

Some sense of this can also be gained from the emergence of titles expressing filiality to the city, like 'son of the people', or 'son of the city', (υἱὸς τοῦ δήμου/τῆς πόλεως), which emerge only in the late 1st century BCE: the earliest case is the titulature of the ruler Nikias of Kos in the 30s BCE, described as υἱὸς δάμου on dedications made on his behalf.[810] From this point, however, attestations for this and the parallel formulation υἱὸς τῆς πόλεως in Asia Minor multiply across the 1st century CE;[811] the phenomenon virtually arises and flourishes only in the imperial period.[812] The female version, θυγάτηρ τοῦ δήμου/τῆς πόλεως, is also

[808] *I.Kyme* 19 ll. 24-52.
[809] *I.Kyme* 19 ll. 32-33, 38, 48, 59, with Heller (2016) 71-72.
[810] *IG* XII.4 682-711; for these see Buraselis (2000) 51-55. For such titles more generally, Canali de Rossi (2007), Giannakopoulos (2008), Van Nijf (2013) 361-365.
[811] Υἱὸς τοῦ δήμου: Canali de Rossi, *Filius* 1, 2, 4, 7, 9a-f, 11, 15-17; υἱὸς τῆς πόλεως: Canali de Rossi, *Filius* 3 (υἱὸς Ἀφροδισιέων, albeit on coins only), 6, 8, 10, 14 (υἱὸς τῆς πατρίδος) with *SEG* 62.1122 l. 3, *IGR* IV 632 ll. 5-6, *CIG* 3831a[3] ll. 3-4; *SEG* 46.1655 ll. 7-8 presents a τέκνον πόλεως. Titles expressing filiation in relation to institutions, like provinces, and civic bodies, also emerge in the imperial period: see Canali de Rossi (2007) 47-80.
[812] Laronde (2005) 158-159.

attested, albeit in smaller numbers.[813] The basic relationship expressed by such titles describing civic filiality is that of 'downward' filiality in relation to the city, which is thereby conceptualised as the 'parent' of the benefactor.[814] This notion in itself is hardly alien to the Hellenistic *polis*, and indeed can be aligned closely with the heightening of rhetoric around the gymnasium, as we saw in chapter 3, in elevating those who were exceptional precisely for subordinating themselves to the community's priorities. What is notable, however, is the relative near-absence of titles indicating the opposite, 'upward' filiality, like πατὴρ/μήτηρ τοῦ δήμου/τῆς πόλεως.[815] The imperial example may, again, account for this. The only example of the title πατὴρ τῆς πατρίδος, for instance, is that of G. Julius Xenon, the late Hellenistic grandee who was also honoured as κτίστης, σωτήρ, and εὐεργέτης;[816] the fact that this formulation is not again attested after this may be due to the addition of *pater patriae* to imperial titulature from 2 BCE onwards.[817] The creation and popularity of formulations based on 'downward' filiality, like 'son of the city', can from this standpoint be seen as a reflex of civic honorific systems, the sum of many 'Labeo-moments' across Asia's cities, which re-channelled 'downward' the possibility of 'upward' elevation in status represented earlier by late Hellenistic titles like κτίστης and σωτήρ, and now curtailed by the unilaterality of power embodied by the emperor and imperial family. The best indication of this is that 'son of the city' was predominantly conferred as a complement to φιλόπατρις,

[813] θυγάτηρ τοῦ δήμου: *IG* XII.4 1146 I l. 8 (Claudia Polla, 50-100 CE); θυγάτηρ τῆς πόλεως: *I.Stratonikeia* 174 l. 8 (late 1st CE), and *RPC* II 1012 (Domitianic).
[814] Giannakopoulos (2008) 265-268 on the ideology of filial obligation; he does not, however, offer an explanation for its emergence in the imperial period.
[815] The opposite, πατὴρ τῆς πόλεως, is far less common: only one example known from Asia Minor, of the 1st century (*TAM* III.1 83, Termessos); other instances, including female equivalents and those indicating parentage of civic institutions, amount to only nineteen cases from the Greek east across the imperial period, of a total of 154 examples of titles indicating filiation: Canali de Rossi (2007) 65-68, 72-73, 79-80, 161-180.
[816] *TAM* V.2 1098 ll. 10-11.
[817] Cf. Aug. *Res Gestae* 35, Suet. *Aug.* 58, Cass. Dio 55.10.10, Ov. *Fast*. 2.127-130; cf. Canali de Rossi (2007) 63-64, Heller (2020) 33.

and thus as part of a hierarchy of honorific statuses; only in six of seventeen instances in our period does it occur alone.[818]

Emperor-loving titles and the honours of the Roman world

To sum up so far, then, it has been suggested that the onset of the principate established the emperor as an overarching euergetic force, blending earlier conceptions of Roman universal benefaction with the individual euergetism of powerful Romans; the result is that the cult to the emperor represented 'euergetic space', which changed the dynamic of ambassadorial honourability for local notables by centring it on the provincial framework on which that cult relied; the name of the emperor further provided a new form of legitimacy for benefactions by citizen and non-citizen groups. Imperial cult also affected local honorific status, by imposing a conceptual limit, and encouraging the phenomenon of titularisation and honorific hierarchisation. In these final two sections, it is suggested that this development of honorific titles also represents a process of making the Roman world 'legible', by which the figure of the emperor and the Roman world (of which he was the most visible manifestation) were normalised within local euergetic dynamics, so that participation in the Roman imperial administration, and even aspects of Roman cultural infiltration in Asia, can be studied as functions of honorific gift-exchange.[819]

This quality of honorific titles as a means of making 'legible' the realities of power is especially observable in the new-style φιλο-compound honorific title φιλόπατρις, which conveys an attitudinal orientation towards a specific political entity, and not merely an

[818] As also observed by Heller (2010) 242-243; it is in fact the most common accompanying epithet: Canali de Rossi (2007) 223-224; it is only absent in Canali de Rossi, *Filius* 2, 6, 14, 17, and *IGR* IV 632 ll. 5-6, *CIG* 3831a[3] ll. 3-4.
[819] For the terminology of 'legibility', see Scott (1998) 1-3; although it is applied here in reference to the converse situation, of subject-states making sense of imperial power.

abstract noun (like e.g. φιλότιμος, φιλόδοξος, φιλόπονος). Importantly, the growing popularity of φιλόπατρις from the late 1st century BCE actually coincides with the emergence of φιλο-compounds relating to the emperor, in titles like φιλόκαισαρ and φιλοσέβαστος.[820] Both processes should be regarded as complementary and coextensive phenomena – that is, a notion of 'fatherland-lovingness' could only concretise when a more solid conception of 'empire', and the provincial framework, was established with the principate and imperial cult, encouraging 'emperor-lovingness'. Indeed, emperor-loving titles fairly dominate among honorific titles relating to the Roman power: we have few examples of φιλορώμαιος, and no instances of titles relating to the Senate.[821] What this seems to indicate is the perception among civic communities that the figure of the *princeps* essentially *was* the imperial state, just as, as we saw earlier, ambassadorial service to Rome in the early empire was essentially represented in honorific rhetoric as ambassadorial service to the emperor. In terms of their ideological significance as honorific designations, however, emperor-loving titles fundamentally captured a notion of 'service to the emperor', only that this was equated simultaneously with service to the city; to be 'emperor-loving' was increasingly conceived as another form of civic virtuosity.

[820] The earliest examples come from the late 1st century BCE: in the Greek east overall, a civic notable from Nikopolis, soon after 27 BCE, is called φιλοσέβαστος, *SEG* 37.526 l. 8. In Asia Minor, the earliest are *I.Ephesos* 14 l. 12, 702 l. 4, 2033 l. 2, also for φιλοσέβαστος. 1st-century CE examples for φιλόκαισαρ alone: *SEG* 4.201 l. 43 (Halikarnassos), *I.Laodikeia am Lykos* 9 l. 9, *I.Didyma* 236ci l. 4, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 1.4 l. 4, 1.5 l. 4, 1.6 l. 4, 12.803 l. 5; φιλόκαισαρ and φιλόπατρις: *I.Stratonikeia* 1024 ll. 3-4, 172 l. 4, 175 ll. 3-4, *I.Perge* 56 l. 6, 58 ll. 8-9, 60 ll. 6-7, *IG* XII.4 838 ll. 3-4 (Kos); φιλοσέβαστος alone: *MAMA* IV 161 ll. 1-2 (Apollonia Mordiaion), *SEG* 34.1103 l. 5 (Ephesos), *IG* XII.6 373 l. 3 (Samos), *SEG* 45.1719 l. 4 (Aizanoi); φιλοσέβαστος and φιλόπατρις: *I.Iasos* 84 ll. 4-5, *MAMA* IV 142 ll. 4-5 (Apollonia Mordiaion); for φιλόκαισαρ and φιλοσέβαστος together, see below. It is unclear if we should discern consistent differences in meaning between the two titles: cf. Buraselis (2000) 102-105, who sees a distinction between the 'person of the emperor' (φιλόκαισαρ) and the 'institution of the emperor' (φιλοσέβαστος). Local usage may explain why, for instance, at Perge and Panamara φιλόκαισαρ seems to have taken the place of φιλοσέβαστος.

[821] Φιλορώμαιος is rare in the imperial period, and when attested usually found alongside φιλοσέβαστος or φιλόπατρις: *McCabe Halikarnassos* 165 ll. 3-4, *SEG* 34.1067 l. 5, *SEG* 64.913 l. 4 (all relating to a Melanthios at Halikarnassos), *I.Pr(o)usias* 30 l. 3 (referring to the council), *I.Stratonikeia* 186 l. 13, 189 ll. 3-4, 1026 l. 4, 1025 ll. 2-3 (all 2nd CE). Attested alone: *I.Erythrai* 512 l. 5 (1st century CE), *I.Ephesos* 1573 l. 10, 4331 l. 7, 4332 l. 5 (all 2nd century CE), *IG* XII.4 1059 ll. 3-4, *Iscr.Cos* EV 125, 256; for G. Stertinius Xenophon, see below.

Needless to say, there is little evidence that such emperor-loving titles were granted by emperors themselves, rather than being a primarily civic phenomenon.[822] They were undoubtedly earned for a range of possible benefactions and services expressing emperor-loving attitudes, in honouring the emperor through cult and statues, or serving as ambassador to the emperor,[823] and should certainly not be seen as rewards exclusive only to service in the imperial cult.[824] More importantly, however, emperor-loving titles reflect the role of the figure of the emperor in engendering honorific legitimacy and hierarchy among the civic elite. For instance, Apollonios Elaibares of Perge (late 1st CE) was honoured as φιλόκαισαρ for various services to the city, some of which were 'emperor-loving' – a high-priesthood of the emperors, *agonothesia*, and embassies to Rome.[825] We cannot unfortunately tell which of these activities φιλόκαισαρ is specifically responding to. Whether it is doing so at all, however, the title here arguably further denotes something like a surpassing form of city-lovingness, inasmuch as it immediately precedes, in the syntax of the inscription, the two other city-loving titles Elaibares received, φιλόπατρις, and υἱὸς τῆς πόλεως. His father, moreover, seems only to have received the title of φιλόπατρις for services including embassies to Rome.[826] Indeed, at 1st-century CE Ephesos one finds a similar phenomenon in relation to φιλοσέβαστος, which could be attached to individuals honoured solely for civic functions, and not for services involving the emperor.[827] It is at the provincial capital, in fact,

[822] Veligianni (2001) 77-79, *contra* Münsterberg (1915) 315-318. For Rome- and emperor-loving titles of pro-Roman client-kings, from the early 1st century BCE: Suspène (2009) and Muccioli (2013) 268-280.
[823] Imperial cult priesthoods: *GIBM* 894 ll. 42-43; *I.Perge* 60 ll. 6-7, and probably *MAMA* IV 161 ll. 1-3; *IGR* IV 146 ll. 3-4, with 144 ll. 4-5. Statues: *I.Iasos* 602 l. 10, *I.Laodikeia am Lykos* 9 l. 9, *I.Didyma* 148 ll. 12-21; multiple services including embassies and priesthoods: *MAMA* IV 142 ll. 3-13, *I.Stratonikeia* 1024 ll. 3-4, 6-10; embassy and statue: *I.Magnesia* 156.
[824] *Pace* Veligianni (2001) 69-76; note that civic imperial priests did not invariably bear emperor-loving titles: Frija (2012a) 204-207; only 23 of some 450 priests from the 1st to 3rd centuries CE were honoured with or carried it; also cf. Heller (2017) 14-18.
[825] *I.Perge* 58; he was priest of Artemis, *demiourgos*, high-priest of the emperors, priest of imperial concord (Σεβαστὴ Ὁμονοία), *praefectus fabrum* at Rome, thrice a high-priest, *agonothetes* of the Sebastaia, thrice also an ambassador the Rome, and a donor of grain, feasts, and builder of the *bouleuterion*.
[826] *I.Perge* 23 ll. 11, 21-22; the likelihood that this Apollonios was father of Apollonios Elaibares is outlined by Jones (1999a) 13-15.
[827] E.g. *I.Ephesos* 702 (only as priest of Rome and Servilius Isauricus) and *SEG* 34.1103 (Cornelius Gamus, *boularchos*, *strategos*, *paraphylax*, *neopoios*, *dekaprotos*, twice *grammateus* of the *chrysophoroi*,

where we can trace the origins of emperor-loving titles, for it is here that our first cases of φιλοσέβαστος, for the local notables Herakleides Passalas and Hieron Aristogeiton, emerge in the late 1st century BCE.[828] Significantly, the latter displayed it as part of his titulature on a dedication of the theatre's entrance-way, made to the people alone, after serving as *prytanis*; although he most likely received it for an earlier service relating to the emperor, his designation as φιλοσέβαστος was clearly intended primarily to articulate his honorific standing within the community, effectively as a superior kind of φιλόπατρις. It may not be accidental that emperor-loving titles emerged in a context like Ephesos where local notables like Passalas competed with non-citizen benefactors for public status, perhaps as a means of highlighting their 'Ephesianness': significantly, Italian donors like Sextilius Pollio are not, at least initially, attested holding such titles.

This conceptual role of emperor-loving titles as a means of expressing a higher form of 'city-lovingness' is most obvious where an individual was honoured with both φιλόκαισαρ and φιλοσέβαστος, rare enough that it may have formed a sort of early imperial 'super-honour'.[829] Significantly, in three of the four known instances, they are also accompanied by a full complement of city-loving titles: thus, Euphemos of Magnesia, when dedicating a statue to Julia Drusilla, called himself the 'pious, Caesar-loving, emperor-loving, fatherland-loving, and a son of the city'.[830] The most dramatic case, however, is that of G. Stertinius Xenophon of Kos, for whom a dedication made on his behalf by the Kalymnians preserves the full range of titles he received at the end of his career: φιλόκαισαρ, φιλονέρων, φιλοκλαύδιος, φιλοσέβαστος, φιλορώμαιος, φιλόπατρις, δάμου υἱός, εὐσεβής,

paidonomos). Outside Ephesos, note *I.Aphrodisias2007* 1.4, 1.5, 1.6 (column dedications by Eumachos φιλόκαισαρ, for the temple of Aphrodite).
[828] *I.Ephesos* 14 l. 12 and 2033 (late 1st century BCE).
[829] Euphemos of Magnesia, *I.Magnesia* 156 ll. 11-12, Exekestos of Bargylia, *I.Iasos* 616 ll. 2-3, 602 l. 10 (reign of Titus), and M. Aeficius Optumus *IG* XII.4 638 l. 2 (Tiberian date) and G. Stertinius Xenophon (on whom see below), both of Kos. For another possible case, *I.Ephesos* 716 ll. 8-9, see Ferrary (2001c) 813 n. 48.
[830] *I.Magnesia* 156 ll. 10-13.

ἥρως, εὐεργέτας τᾶς πατρίδος.[831] The inclusion here of further titles specific to Claudius and Nero, and even 'Rome-lovingness', indicates clearly that these functioned as specific markers of status, rather than rewards for individual benefaction; these were weighty appellations that were displayed at Kos across a number of honorific inscriptions and dedications.[832]

Xenophon's arsenal of honorific titles, some highly specific, can be explained in two ways. Firstly, it is a function of a particularly competitive Koan discursive context, where a large number of individuals are attested with emperor-loving titles (two of the four cases of double φιλόκαισαρ and φιλοσέβαστος titles being Koan).[833] The titles 'Claudius-loving' and 'Nero-loving' were a means of further marking Xenophon out from other φιλοσέβαστοι.[834] At the same time, they also captured the unique career he had enjoyed, as the physician of Claudius and local benefactor to Kos' cults,[835] and a leading figure in obtaining tax-immunity for Kos in 53 CE.[836] It is striking all the same that while his career trajectory approximated somewhat to the 'super-ambassador' figure of the late Hellenistic period, Xenophon never received titles like κτίστης or σωτήρ for his ambassadorial achievements. He received heroic status, but this seems to have been less pronounced and significant than, for instance, the heroic honours for his early 'super-ambassador' compatriot Nikias (a friend

[831] *Tit.Cal.* 111 ll. 11-16.
[832] For honorific inscriptions and dedications for him and his relatives, see *IG* XII.4 712-779 (70 or so dedications made for him ὑπὲρ ὑγείας), 951-970, 1006, 1143, 1184, and *Tit.Cal.* 111, *IGR* IV 1058; for dedications by Xenophon, *IG* XII.4 644, 645, 3341, 3342.
[833] *IG* XII.4 822, 825, 838, 839, 939, 941, 999, 1030, 1055, 1058, 1062, 1148, 1156, 1159, 1162, 1166, and at Kalymnos, *Tit.Cal.* 120. *IG* XII.4 638 (M. Aeficius Optumus) presented both φιλόκαισαρ and φιλοσέβαστος; 1059 has φιλόκαισαρ and φιλορώμαιος.
[834] Similarly, at Didyma, Neon the Milesian is singled out among the other temple-builders of Caligula's provincial cult-temple, representatives from other cities of Asia and who are designated φιλοσέβαστοι, by being described as φιλογάϊος: *I.Didyma* 148 ll. 12-13, with Veligianni (2001) 68.
[835] For Xenophon's career, see Demougin (1992) 396-397 n. 487, Herzog (1922) 216-247, Sherwin-White (1978) 149-152, 283-285; Buraselis (2000) 66-110. Honoured as ἰατρός of the emperors, and ἀρχιατρός: *IG* XII.4 951 l. 9, 952 ll. 4-5, 953 l. 6, 954 ll. 4-5, 956 ll. 1-2, 1143 ll. 3-4.
[836] Tac. *Ann.* 12.61; he was probably also ambassador in 23 CE when Kos joined other cities in requesting confirmation of its right of *asylia* (the consul of 23 was G. Stertinius Maximus): Herzog (1922) 221-222 and Buraselis (2000) 76-77.

of Antony) in the mid-1st century BCE.[837] The influence of imperial honour played a role here: at Kos, only emperors were called founder or saviour.[838] Nor was Xenophon praised as φίλος of the emperor, although several letters of Claudius actually call him this;[839] instead we find the profile of a generalised, albeit surpassing, 'emperor-lover'. His honorific status thus seems to reflect a world where, even more so than in the time of Labeo at Kyme, emperor-loving titles formed the primary way in which civic pre-eminence was articulated.

Roman returns to the *patris*

This predominance of emperor-loving titles in the honorific status of Xenophon at Kos also reflects an increasingly generalised conception of the *princeps*, and should be read as part of a milieu in which symbols of Roman culture and identity were becoming more common among the civic elite, and could serve to enmesh notions of the 'emperor' with those of 'the Roman world'. It is significant that while Xenophon is praised primarily as imperial doctor, he is also invariably honoured for the Roman 'offices' he held, having been a tribune, *praefectus fabrum Romae*, and the imperial secretary *ad responsa graeca*,[840] and received Roman honours, like the *hasta pura* and a gold crown during the British campaign.[841] We should not doubt that he owed many of these offices and honours to his personal connections to Claudius, but it is important also to notice that, in the rhetoric of his inscriptions, these were described as distinct functions in the 'Roman world', and thus sources of prestige not necessarily tied to the individual power of the *princeps* alone.

[837] Where only one of the thirty dedications made on Nikias' behalf does not call him ἥρως (*IG* XII.4 682-711; the only exception is 689) only one of Xenophon's seventy such dedications actually does: *IG* XII.4 766; only four other inscriptions relating to him mention it: *Tit.Cal.* 111, *IG* XII.4 644, *IG* XII.4 953 and *PH* 93.
[838] *IG* XII.4 1157, 939 ll. 6-7 (Augustus, κτίστης), *IG* XII.4 890b l. 6 (Claudius, κτίστης and σωτήρ).
[839] *IG* XII.4 254 ll. 45-46, 75-76; note e.g. a Sulpicius Hekatios from Knidos, called a φίλος τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ: *I.Knidos* 90 l. 5, although such designations are rare even in the imperial period: Veligianni (2001) 68 n. 71.
[840] *Praefectus fabrum*: *IG* XII.4 951 ll. 10-11, 952 ll. 3-4, 953 ll. 7-8, 1143 ll. 6-8; *ab epistulis graecis*: *IG* XII.4 952 ll. 4-5, 1143 ll. 4-5; military tribunate: *IG* XII.4 951 l. 10, 953 ll. 6-7, 1143 ll. 6-7.
[841] *IG* XII.4 951 ll. 11-13, 952 ll. 1-3, and 1143 ll. 8-10.

Two main forms of such Roman 'honour' permeate the rhetoric of civic praise in the early empire. The first, and more marginal, is Roman citizenship, which was increasingly acquired by local notables from Augustus onwards, and became a feature that was proudly displayed on honorific inscriptions and dedications.[842] This is the case with Xenophon's monuments, which consistently present his *gentilicium* (Stertinius) and tribal affiliation (Cornelia). The inclusion of tribal affiliation in a number of other examples, in particular, highlights the increasingly symbolic power of citizenship.[843] Acquisition of citizenship is rarely praised in itself. In one known case, however, it is revered for its double potency, as a reflection both of imperial goodwill and connection to the Roman cultural sphere: thus, a compatriot of Xenophon had been 'honoured with the citizenship of the Roman people by the emperor Tiberius Claudius Caesar'.[844] To the extent that the majority of known examples present imperial *gentilicia*, Roman *civitas* represents a corollary to the unified ideology of monarchy, so that the epigraphic display of Roman citizenship also forms, likewise, something of a counterpart to emperor-loving titles.[845]

Similarly, offices held in the Roman world – for which citizenship would have been but a prerequisite – could function as part of an individual's honorific titulature. Also contemporary to Xenophon, an Apelles of Ephesos displayed his military rank of tribune as part of his personal identity when dedicating a building, long after he had completed his military service.[846] The involvement of local notables in Roman military and administrative

[842] Holtheide (1983) 40-84 for the diffusion of *civitas* from Augustus to Domitian.
[843] Some illustrative examples from the 1st century CE (it is unnecessary to list all of the many examples): *I.Sestos* 67 l. 3, *I.Tralleis* 75 l. 5, *I.Magnesia* 162 l. 5, *IGR* IV 1323 l. 4 (Phokaia), *LBW* 108 l. 3 (Teos), *I.Perge* 60 ll. 1-2; *SEG* 45.1719 l. (Aizanoi), *I.Sardis* 11 l. 7, *I.Nordkarien* 225 l. 4 (Alabanda). For the increasingly empire-focussed character of Roman citizenship under Augustus, Eberle (2017) 355-365.
[844] *IG* XII.4 945 ll. 4-6; note also *I.Didyma* 331 l. 5 for a woman with Latin rights, and *IG* IV^2.1 84 ll. 33-34, an Epidaurian decree (Claudian date) praising T. Statilius Lamprias for receiving the 'greatest citizenship of the Romans, the one most renowned among men'.
[845] Grants by non-imperial persons do also continue, as onomastic study strongly shows: Salomies (1993) and (2001); the dominance of imperial *gentilicia* may suggest grants mediated through the governor or *koinon*: Sherwin-White (1973) 310-311.
[846] *I.Ephesos* 463; see also *I.Ephesos* 650 ll. 1-9 (2nd CE) for a Ti. Claudius Tuendianus who was the son of a three-times tribune.

service, entailing entry into the equestrian order, is by and large detectable only from the late 1st century BCE onwards.[847] While the earliest example from Asia is that of Theophanes of Mytilene, as Pompey's *praefectus fabrum*, it is only in the early years of the principate that such activity seems to have become more prevalent, and sufficiently recognised as a focal point for honorific status, such that a Menodoros of Ephesos could describe himself as the first equestrian of Asia.[848] The appeal of Roman office-holding must principally have been as a novel source of local prestige, and only secondarily as a means of entering into a career in the Roman imperial administration. It could be explicitly praised in honorific inscriptions, unlike grants of citizenship, and Roman offices held are even often listed before local achievements, emphasising their importance – such is the case with Xenophon at Kos, but also Antonius Zenon at Apollonia, as we saw at the beginning of this chapter, whose tribunate even preceded the high-priesthood of Asia in importance. At Ilion, the multiple statue-bases honouring a Sextus Julius Philon list his military prefecture before his generous gymnasiarchy.[849] In some instances, Roman offices were honoured alone, such as in the Thyateirans' statue for Julius Poseidonios, solely as χειλίαρχος Αὐγούστου,[850] or that of the Kalymnians for Ti. Claudius Philinos, the uncle of Xenophon, for his tribunate.[851]

In what sense, however, was such Roman service a 'benefaction' to the community? As a status (e.g. tribune, prefect) earned after service to Rome, it was in a sense an 'honour', a counter-gift granted by Rome. By ratifying it as a praiseworthy act the city transformed it into a 'gift', and hoped thereby to engage counter-gifts in the form of future benefactions to the *patris*. Crucially, this civic acceptance of Roman honours may thereby have encouraged counter-benefactions of a 'Roman' nature; that is, through further services that elevated

[847] Important summaries and catalogues of evidence for Anatolian integration into the equestrian order can be found in Demougin (1999) 597-612 and Devijvers (1986) 117-170; see also Davenport (2019) 285-286.
[848] *I.Ephesos* 697a.
[849] *I.Ilion* 121, 123, and probably also for 122 and 124.
[850] *TAM* V.3 1443. For the unusual specification of the emperor, Demougin (1992) 151 n. 162.
[851] *Tit.Cal.* 146.

one's city at the scale of the province, the most starkly 'Roman' element of civic life in the early empire. This seems to have been the case with a Ti. Claudius Demokrates of Magnesia, who had been a military tribune, and included this function as an honorific 'title' when erecting a statue to Nero; from this dedication, we learn that he had since sought office in the province, and had recently been elected (ἀποδεδιγμένος) to the high-priesthood of Asia.[852] While the high-priesthood of Asia would certainly form a stepping-stone to a career in the Roman imperial administration in the 2nd and 3rd centuries,[853] the province still arguably formed the major focal point for honorific status in the 1st century CE. Likewise, a Claudius Chionis of Miletos returned to Asia to serve as a *comes* to the proconsul, having enjoyed a successful equestrian career as *praefectus fabrum Romae* and military tribune.[854] The mentality underpinning such progression, by which Roman office served mainly to bolster local and provincial prestige, most likely derives from the dominance of the provincial framework in shaping civic honorific hierarchisation, as has been stressed here throughout, and explains in part the relative modesty of attested Roman careers: few sought offices beyond the tribunate,[855] while indigenous Greek senators are rare before the late 1st century CE.[856]

Honours for Roman office-holding by early imperial citizens should thus be differentiated from the honours for the services of late Attalid notables praising their goodwill to the king, or those for Roman governors or officials (see chapters 1 and 2). Where

[852] *I.Magnesia* 157b ll. 11-21, with Davenport (2019) 286. Another example of tribunate followed by high-priesthood is *IG* XII.4 951 ll. 15-16.
[853] Campanile (1994) 165-167.
[854] *I.Didyma* 272 ll. 13-18.
[855] Note also that Claudius introduced honorary tribunates: Suet. *Claud.* 25.1, with Bowie (2014) 47, Devijver (1986) 113, 148-194, and Devijver (1968) 28-34, 36. The earliest procurators are Gn. Pompeius Theophanes and Macer (although descendants of Theophanes of Mytilene): Dalla Rosa (2017) 109. Gn. Vergilius Capito and Ti. Claudius Balbillos achieved the prefecture of Egypt under Claudius and Nero: Demougin (1992) 569-571 n. 679, 447-449 n. 538; a L. Vinuleius Pataecius (probably of Alexandria Troas) was procurator under Vespasian: *I.Ilion* 105 ll. 5-9.
[856] Halfmann (1979) 71-76; see the case of the Milesian who was fifth senator in all Asia, mentioned above: *I.Didyma* 296 ll. 6–11.

those may be seen largely as responses to the acts and institutions of the ruling power, and attempts to define this power in local terms, local commemoration for the involvement of civic elites in the imperial system of the principate signifies a further stage of integration, by which the institutions and functions of the ruling power were not only described and defined, but integrated into local status-hierarchies as honorific titles, and arguably also had concrete impacts on the sorts of activity such office-holders subsequently undertook at home. As the careers of Demokrates and Chionis show, these were shaped by the provincial, 'Roman' framework. This process is complicated by the fact that some of these civic notables were themselves caught between clean distinctions of 'local' and 'imperial'. An illustrative case, with which we will end this chapter, is that of Gn. Vergilius Capito at Miletos. A descendant of an Italian immigrant family of the Augustan period, he married into the leading family of G. Julius Epikrates,[857] and seems to have pursued, up to the reign of Caligula, a career primarily confined to the province: by 40 CE, he had served thrice as provincial high-priest, and was a leading figure in the activity leading up to Miletos' acquiring the right to a third provincial cult-temple, serving as its first high-priest.[858] Under Claudius, however, he entered the equestrian service, steadily ascending through posts as tribune, *prefectus fabrum*, and even, exceptionally, a procuratorship in Asia and the prefecture of Egypt (47-52).[859]

Capito was honoured twice at Didyma at some point after this: notably, both surviving statue-bases chose to privilege his equestrian career, rather than mention any local benefactions and services, and determinedly underscore the provincial scope of his functions, even to the point of error: one describes him as both procurator of Claudius and of Asia (as well as saviour), while the other was over-anxious to note the provinces, calling

[857] *SEG* 44.938 ll. 1-2; for his ancestry, Thonemann (2011a) 252.
[858] *I.Didyma* 148 ll. 4-6; Friesen (1993) 24-26 for Caligula's motivations.
[859] For his equestrian *cursus*, Demougin (1992) 569-571 n. 679 and Ricl and Akat (2007).

him procurator of Claudius, but then 'prefect of Asia and Egypt'.[860] This absence of concrete benefactions is remarkable, insofar as he also receives the titles of benefactor and even saviour, most likely alluding to his aid during an earthquake under Claudius.[861] Moreover, the same focus on his Roman offices appears in the dedicatory inscriptions for the theatre facade and baths that he built and dedicated to Nero, both of which present him as ἔπαρχος Αἰγύπτου καὶ τῆς Ἀσίας ἐπίτροπος.[862] At the time of these benefactions, Capito had long been out of office, and thus wore these offices like honorific 'titles' in themselves, emphasising his roles within the mental map of Rome's provinces, and fixing attention on Miletos' place within the wider Roman political order and the province of Asia: it is notable that he does not identify himself as a procurator 'of the emperor' in the dedicatory inscriptions.[863]

Moreover, his benefactions arguably had a provincial, even international, and not merely local, audience: the bold monumentality of his baths, conceived as a distinct complex juxtaposed to a Greek *palaistra*, form enlarged versions, and possibly a challenge, to the only earlier known such combinations of gymnasium and baths, at Pergamon.[864] Likewise, the theatre facade, modelled on a Roman *scaenae frons*, is one of the earliest such structures attested in Asia.[865] Capito's baths, indeed, represent a prototype for the later gymnasium-baths that would sweep Asia Minor in the 2nd century CE, and which typically drew on precedents at Rome.[866] Nor was Capito alone in engaging in province-facing Romanising

[860] *SEG* 57.1109bis ll. 4-6 and mistakenly in *I.Didyma* 149 ll. 5-7; cf. Rehm, *I.Didyma* p. 149.
[861] Ricl and Akat (2007) 31, as already suggested by Robert and Robert (1983) 267; he also received an eponymous festival, the Καπιτωνεία: *I.Didyma* 278 ll. 5-6, whose date is possibly preserved in *SEG* 34.1186.
[862] *Milet* I.9 328 ll. 2-3, *Milet* VI.2 928 ll. 3-4, with McCabe in Herrmann (1986) 186-189.
[863] E.g. P. Celerius dedicated a statue to Claudius identifying himself only as procurator of Claudius and Nero: *AE* 1990 935. Note that Capito's honours at Kos while procurator present him only as procurator of the emperor: *IG* XII.4 869, with Eck (1995) 251-254.
[864] For the architectural novelty of his baths, see Tuchelt (1974), Yegül (1992) 254-256, Nielsen (1993) 1.102-103, Trümper (2015) 200-203.
[865] Altenhöfer (1986).
[866] Associated with this are benefactions of monumental fountains and nymphaea: Lendon (2015) 123-127; for gymnasium-baths, Yegül (1992) 256-313, Nielsen (1993) 1.105-111.

euergetism. At Kos, G. Stertinius Xenophon built one of the earliest purpose-built public libraries (unattached to a gymnasium) known in the Greek east, most likely patterned on the imperial libraries at Rome;[867] in following decades, the public library would become the object of status-competition among the super-elite, as the well-known examples of libraries at Ephesos, Nysa and Sagalassos in the early 2nd century show.[868] Capito and Xenophon, local notables returning to their homelands after experience of the broad Roman world beyond, were to this extent key figures in furthering the role of the provincial sphere as an arena for honorific status – hinted at already under Augustus, as we saw in the dossier of Menogenes of Sardeis – through which whole cities would come to see themselves as competing within the limits of 'Asia': in their lifetimes, cities were beginning to brandish emperor-loving titles and engage in increasingly intense competition around temple-warden status.[869] An early 2nd-century figure like G. Antius Aulus Julius Quadratus of Pergamon, who even attained the consulship, and obtained Pergamon's second provincial cult-temple under Trajan, therefore represents the most outstanding culmination of a process instigated by Capito and Xenophon.[870]

In sum, then, the Romanising features of Capito's benefactions consummate the trends that have been outlined in this chapter. The onset of monarchical power in the principate created 'euergetic space' around honour to the emperor, such as embodied in Capito's career and gymnasium-baths. This process also legitimated honorific hierarchisation, allowing for the integration of the Roman world and provincial framework through honorific titles, thereby positively encouraging counter-benefactions by individuals like Capito, who had served not only his city and province, but the Roman empire, and

[867] *IG* XII.4 3342, with Coqueugniot (2010) 45.
[868] Coqueugniot (2010) 49-52 and Pont (2010) 105-108; Celsus' library at Ephesos: Portale (2011); the library of Neon at Sagalassos: Waelkens (2015) 226-238.
[869] Civic emperor-loving titles: Veligianni (2001) 70-72, 75; *neokoros* status: Heller (2006) 241-282.
[870] For whom, Ventroux (2017a). The efflorescence of bath- and gymnasia-building from the Flavian period, for example, may be related to the competition for *neokoros* status: Pont (2010) 142-155.

sought to capture some of that experience through his local generosity. It is in this regard coincidental, but certainly also apposite, that Capito was the descendant of an Italian émigré in Asia: the very idea of 'gymnasium-baths' may here reflect the quirks of his cultural make-up. In the following chapter, we consider the involvement of such resident Romans in civic euergetism, whose social status within *poleis* was bolstered by the creation of the principate, and who arguably played a not negligible role in contributing to significant developments in ideas and ideals around public generosity, as these were increasingly associated not only with *polis*-citizenship, but the wealth and heritage of elite families also.

Chapter 5: Beyond the gymnasium: Romans, wealth and family in early imperial civic generosity and honourability

One of the notable innovations of the euergetism of the gymnasiarch Zosimos of Priene, as we saw at the end of chapter 3, was his emphasis on public bathing. In particular, he was keen to open the public bathhouse to the *paroikoi*, *katoikoi*, foreigners and resident Romans during feast-days.[871] Bathing in itself was hardly new to Hellenistic gymnasia by this time, but Zosimos' interest in promoting it as a specific benefaction is the earliest known of its kind.[872] The oil he distributed was bathing-oil (ἔλαιος and ἐπαλείμμα), not training-oil (ἀλείμμα),[873] and it would seem that he regarded it as a substance not tied to the gymnasium or gymnasiarchy alone: Zosimos would also distribute bathing-oil to these same groups when he later held the *stephanephoria*.[874] These innovations as gymnasiarch and *stephanephoros* originated in the elite-driven politics of the early 1st century BCE, which was increasingly shaped by promise-making and reciprocity before public assemblies, as suggested in chapter 3. They hint subtly at a changing attitude to the Hellenistic gymnasium, in the growing popularity of public bathing, and its close association with the evermore prominent constituency of Priene's resident Romans, of whom Zosimos was himself the most outstanding example. A key implication of his oil-distributions, that gymnasial oil – long an identifying marker of *polis*-citizenship – could be conceptualised more as bathing-oil, than as training-oil for athletic practice, is bound up with its economics: wealthy benefactors like him who controlled access to olive oil and its production could increasingly choose to distribute it in bathing contexts beyond the *palaistra* alone. By the late 1st century

[871] *I.Priene2014* 68 ll. 62-66, 87-92, 77-81.
[872] Hatzopoulos and Gauthier (1993) 82 n. 4, and Trümper (2013) 62, (2014) 221-222, (2015) 212-213.
[873] For ἐπαλείμμα and ἀλείμμα, attested in several late Hellenistic gymnasiarchal decrees, Fröhlich (2009) 70-71; oil applied for pre-bathing exercise: Yegül (2010) 14-17, Nielsen (1993) 1.142.
[874] *I.Priene2014* 69 ll. 76-78.

CE, another resident Italian at Laodikeia, Q. Pomponius Flaccus, can be found distributing oil as an *agoranomos*, and even later as a private individual, entirely outside the context of a gymnasiarchy or *stephanephoria*.[875]

This transition from gymnasial to bathing-oil symbolises the theme of this chapter, which proposes that one of the distinctive features of civic honourability in the early imperial period, from Zosimos to Flaccus, was its grounding *beyond* the gymnasium and the binding force of civic institutions and norms, and instead on the elite family-unit. This had implications for the ideological purpose and function of civic honouring. The first sections of the chapter briefly expound the early imperial transition in gymnasial oil (as hinted in Zosimos' euergetism), before considering the impact of the Roman diaspora in encouraging an emphasis on wealth as legitimation for public giving alongside, and even sometimes at the expense of, the traditional criteria of citizenship status and office-holding – that is, the criteria that gymnasia were primarily intended to preserve and perpetuate. The second half of the chapter explores the increasingly prominent place of the family-unit and familial exemplarity in public honorific rhetoric, which ultimately made the act of publicly honouring individuals less about demonstrating social replicability, the hallmark of the gymnasium, than about the commemoration of individualised careers as a reflection of familial achievement.

The rise of bathing-oil

Shortly before Zosimos' gymnasiarchy, his compatriot Krates, as *agonothetes*, had distributed sacrificial meat to various professional groups. One of these were the anointers,

[875] *I.Laodikeia am Lykos* 82 ll. 7-8, 14-15; Flaccus' lack of gymnasiarchy: Robert in Des Gagniers (1969) 268 (with ns. 1 and 4), 276.

ἀλεῖπται.[876] This is the first epigraphic evidence for their existence, and their specific inclusion in an euergetic act reflects the high regard for oil-professionals. There were good reasons for this, one of which was that gymnasial oil, and its afterlife as the waste product admixture of sweat and oil, γλοιός, was increasingly lucrative. In the Beroia gymnasiarchal law γλοιός is specially collected by an official and sold in the agora.[877] It is possible that gymnasial euergetism in the late Hellenistic gymnasium, which was coming into vogue at just the time of the law, only further generated interest in it. By the mid-1st century CE, a gymnasiarch could even sell γλοιός for 80,000 sesterces.[878] This profitability arguably underpins the interest of Zosimos in bathing as a distinct object of generosity, as an activity that entailed a larger arena for the consumption of oil, and hence for the creation of γλοιός. By the time of Pliny and Dioscorides, a clear distinction could even be made between the medicinal properties of γλοιός produced by athletic training in gymnasia alone, and γλοιός from bathing,[879] while in the Flavian period we even find the first evidence for professionals known as ἰατραλεῖπται, representing an advance on Krates' ἀλεῖπται: doctors specially trained in the medicinal use of oil.[880] The burgeoning industry in oil-waste in the late Hellenistic period, sustained by the convergence of economic interests between gymnasiarchs, γλοιός-traders, and oil-experts, therefore offers one way to think about the increasingly distinct and visible archaeological reality of bathing complexes in Roman Asia Minor from the late 1st century BCE.[881] Profitability drove the rise of bathing, and this had effects on gymnasial euergetic ideology.

[876] *I.Priene2014* 67 ll. 173-175.
[877] *SEG* 27.261b ll. 97-99, with Robert and Robert, *BE* 1978 274 p. 435. Kennell (2001) 128-133 presents the best study of the subject, to which the following is much indebted.
[878] Plin. *NH* 15.5.19, with Kennell (2001) 129.
[879] Gymnasial oil better against tumours and growths, bathing-oil against inflammation: Plin. *NH* 28.13.50-52, Dsc. 1.30.6; cf. Kennell (2001) 130-131.
[880] *AE* 1936 128 l. 10; for the emergence of ἰατραλεῖπται, Arena (2013) 135-150.
[881] For an overview, Mitchell (1993) 1.216-217; the archaeology of gymnasia and baths at Priene, Pergamon, and Miletos illustrate the transitional phase of the 1st centuries BCE and CE: Trümper (2015); also (2013) 35-36, 62 for the relative minority of public baths in the Greek world before the late Hellenistic period.

For one, honorific decrees and inscriptions centred on gymnasial service decline in number. While in the late 2nd century BCE the gymnasiarchy of the zealous Menas of Sestos could be regarded as his premier honour-worthy civic function, individual gymnasiarchal decrees and statue-bases become rare in the 1st century CE, and are replaced by brief descriptions of gymnasiarchies as part of longer career honours.[882] Moreover, none of these praises accomplishments in organising traditional ephebic *agoge* or providing athletic training or contests.[883] Instead, from the mid-1st century onwards gymnasiarchies are often qualified only by a description of the honorand's lavishness in oil-distribution.[884] Of course, this by no means signifies the end of athletic training,[885] but only that the gymnasiarchy was increasingly conceptualised primarily as an oil-distributing function. A subtle semantic shift is even discernible over the 1st century CE, by which γυμνασίαρχος/γυμνασιαρχεῖν and its cognates sometimes come to denote oil provision alone. Thus, an Asklepiades at Dorylaion (late 1st CE) was 'gymnasiarch from his own means of the free and slaves, all day-long, in vases out of tubs' (γυμνα|σίαρχος ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἐλευθέρων καὶ δούλων ἀπὸ | ἀρχομένης ἡμέρας ἕως νυκτὸς δρακτοῖς ἐκ λου|[τήρ]ων).[886] Other similar cases are known.[887]

This predominance of oil-distribution must reflect the rise of bathing. It is this which explains the evidence for oil-distribution outside of gymnasial contexts, like that of Zosimos' *stephanephoria*, that is increasingly common in the early empire. Beyond

[882] The only imperial-era stand-alone gymnasiarchial decree is *I.Kyme* 19; the following known sole-gymnasiarchal statue-base honours from c. 25 BCE to 125 CE number many fewer than their late Hellenistic counterparts: *LBW* 105, *TAM* V.2 975, *TAM* V.2 1367, *Milet* I.9 309, *I.Erythrai* 85, *I.Iasos* 114, 121, 123-124, *I.Sestos* 67 *I.Kyme* 102, *I.Tralleis* 75, Wörrle (2016) 405-406.
[883] *IGR* IV 454 ll. 10-13; also cf. *I.Iasos* 99 ll. 5-8, for a *paidonomos* who provided prizes for contests.
[884] *IGR* IV 454 ll. 6-9 (Pergamon); *TAM* V.2 1367 (Magnesia on Sipylos) ll. 3-7; *I.Tralleis* 75 ll. 6-11; *I.Erythrai* 85 ll. 3-6; *I.Nordkarien* 406 ll. 7-8; *I.Iasos* 84 ll. 7-12; *I.Iasos* 616 ll. 4-5 (Bargylia); the earliest base showing this exclusive concern with oil-provision is *MDAI(A)* 35 (1910) 468 n. 52 ll. 3-5; cf. Fröhlich (2009) 58-72 and Curty (2015) 263-280.
[885] For the continuity of gymnasial palaistral training in the imperial period, Delorme (1960) 243-250, Schuler (2004) 190, Scholz (2015) 85.
[886] *IGR* IV 522 ll. 8-11.
[887] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.308 ll. 10-12, 12.4 ll. 8-9, *I.Stratonikeia* 1033 ll. 4-6, *I.Didyma* 248 ll. 16-17, and *TAM* V.2 975 ll. 6-10; γυμνασιαρχεῖν governing accusatives: Wilhelm (1974) 132-133; for the phenomenon overall, see Fröhlich (2009) 81-82, and Quaß (1993) 320 n. 1371 for 2nd and 3rd CE Stratonikeia.

stephanephoroi, oil is also handed out by priests, secretaries, and even *agoranomoi* like Flaccus of Laodikeia.[888] Bathing further underpins the existence of Asklepiades of Dorylaion's gymnasiarchy of 'the free and slaves': other recipients of oil in gymnasiarchal euergetism of the 1st century CE include *apalaistroi*, and non-citizen groups, including even women.[889] These examples certainly constitute exceptional generosity, and strict legal distinctions between citizens and non-citizens would still have governed entry into gymnasia and baths.[890] However, they display a far greater range, especially with slaves and women, than attested in the Hellenistic gymnasial generosity, where groups beyond local and foreign citizens are practically unknown.[891] What this amounts to is a gymnasial euergetism that was increasingly untraditional, and extended beyond the core functions of the gymnasium as a locus for citizen reproduction. Indeed, it reflects evolving attitudes to gymnasia, as these became high-profile arenas for the display of wealth, even potentially at the expense of earlier ideals around *polis*-citizenship. With this in mind, it is necessary now to consider the impact of resident Romans on ideals around public generosity, many of whom may never have obtained the citizenship of their *poleis*, like Zosimos, but nevertheless figured very much as local inhabitants.

Resident Romans and civic euergetism

The eastward movement of individuals from the Italian peninsula into the Aegean and western Anatolia, drawn especially to the mercantile opportunities created by Rome's defeat

[888] *Stephanephoroi*: *I.Magnesia* 163 ll. 3-6, *TAM* V.2 1205 ll. 1-3; many honorands at Aphrodisias held both gymnasiarchy and *stephanephoria*, implying the dominance oil-provision, e.g. *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.103 l. 3, 12.5 ll. 8-10, 12.706 ll. 10-11; priests: *I.Stratonikeia* 527 ll. 7-8; an Ephesian secretary: *SEG* 39.1195 ll. 12-20; other texts describe oil-distribution in temples: *SEG* 38.1082 ll. 3-8, 8-12; *SEG* 34.1109 l. 6.
[889] *Apalaistroi*: *TAM* V.2 1367 ll. 6-7, *LBW* 105i ll. 7-9, with Hatzopoulos and Gauthier (1993) 81-82; non-citizens: *I.Ilion* 123 ll. 9-13, Wörrle (2016) 405-406 i l. 6-ii ll. 1-2, *IG* XII.3 104 ll. 8-11; women: *IGR* IV 522 ll. 14-15, with Van Bremen (1996) 70 n. 116, and 148-149, especially n. 25.
[890] For example, at early imperial Gytheion: Rizakis (2013) 553-556.
[891] Only Leontiades of Mylasa: *SEG* 54.1101 ll. 1-3, 10-13 (*paroikoi*, metics, *xenoi*).

of Perseus of Macedonia, had already been a major phenomenon before the provincialisation of Asia in 129, and continued to be so after this point.[892] Those who did settle in Asia as resident Romans do not, however, feature significantly in the benefactions of the late 2nd-century citizen benefactors.[893] Clearer evidence for their integration into public distributions as a distinct group of Ῥωμαῖοι – as opposed to merely being subsumed under *xenoi* – comes only in the 1st century: the earliest sign of this are the distributions of Zosimos, where they feature regularly. For perhaps the first time in their history, the resident Romans of Priene knew a local Roman whose benefactions spoke to them, and actively included them.[894] Romans and Italians also become increasingly visible in gymnasia from the lifetime of Zosimos onwards, both at Priene and elsewhere. Evidence for their participation in gymnasial training may date to the late 2nd century already, but is far more convincing from the mid-1st century onwards.[895] Likewise, it is from this time that more resident Romans are attested holding local office, like Zosimos,[896] and begin to appear more frequently as distinct honouring bodies: while the first examples of such honours by 'Italian businessmen', (Italici qui negotiantur/οἱ πραγματευόμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι), and later on sometimes even 'resident Romans' (οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι) may come from the early 1st century BCE,[897] they are

[892] For the Roman diaspora in the east in general, Hatzfeld (1919), Wilson (1966) 94-126, Errington (1988), Hasenohr and Müller (2002), Purcell (2005), and Eberle and Le Quéré (2017); for Asia specifically, Delplace (1977), Ferrary (2002), Kirbihler (2007) and (2016) 217-265.
[893] Exceptions are *I.Priene2014* 43 ll. 18-22 and *IG* XII.7 515 ll. 51-60, from Amorgos c. 100, where they may even have been seated in the style of the Roman *triclinium*: *IG* XII.7 515 ll. 51-60, with Gauthier (1980b) 210-218 re-editing ll. 55-58, and especially 57-58: Ῥωμαίων αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν μι[ῶν] κατὰ ἐννέα χωρὶς πα|[ρακειμ]ένων.
[894] Dioskourides, a contemporary, also distributed oil to Romans, most likely for bathing: *I.Priene2014* 41 ll. 6-8.
[895] For instance, at Pergamon in an ephebic list of 34-29 BCE: *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 388 n. 6 ll. 9-10; Roman names appear in other lists possibly dating even to the late 2nd century: Kirbihler (2007) 23 n. 29, Ventroux (2017b) 237. Romans at gymnasia at Priene and Magnesia: *I.Priene2014* 41 ll. 6-8, *I.Magnesia* 110b l. 2; at Ephesos: Kirbihler (2016) 237-238. For the phenomenon in the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE overall, Errington (1988) 148-150.
[896] *I.Ephesos* 9 ll. 22-23 (L. Iunius Salvus priest of Rome and *agonothetes* of Dionysia, 45/44), *I.Priene2014* 317 l. 7 (a Publius as *stephanephoros*, c. 20/19 BCE), *Milet* 1.3.127 ll. 23-24 (A. Popillius M. f. Rufus *stephanephoros*, 2/3 CE), *IG* XII.5 880, 881, 885, 886 (three Romans as *agoranomoi* at 1st BCE Tenos); cf. Kirbihler (2012) 136 and (2016) 89, 239-240, n. 136.
[897] Possible pre-88 cases: *I.Ephesos* 2058 with Herrmann (2002) 39-40; *SEG* 46.1577 (Skepsis); Italian immigration before 88 in general: Kirbihler (2007) 23-25, (2016) 218-221.

prominent chiefly in the post-Mithridatic war period, and especially in the 1st century CE.[898] In Phrygia they are attested even into the 2nd century.[899] They could also occupy civic spaces: thus, a contemporary of Zosimos, L. Nassius at Chios, was honoured by the resident Roman community with a statue which was set up in the exedra he had built, in a gesture that must have reinforced the sense of 'Roman' space within Chios' gymnasium.[900]

Under Augustus, moreover, Roman citizenship was increasingly detached from its spatial attachment to Rome and Italy, legitimating the presence of Roman communities in cities.[901] Resident Roman groups thereby become non-negligible quantities for ambitious citizens. The *prytanis* Kleanax of Kyme (c. 2 BCE to 2 CE) was praised for public generosity that featured Romans as a distinct group at almost every turn, alongside citizens, *paroikoi* and foreigners, in his feasts at the temple of Dionysos, the *prytaneion*, the festival of the Lark, and in the agora, during the Sebasteia.[902] Similarly, a citizen at Eresos on Lesbos, shortly after the death of Augustus, regularly handed out sweet-wine or dined the citizens, Romans, and *paroikoi*.[903] It is thus also under Augustus that euergetism centred on bathing may have become a distinct form of public generosity, just as much in response to the cultural predilections of resident Romans and Italians as to the mercantilist attractiveness of gymnasial and bathing oil-waste.[904] We begin to find benefactions of standalone bathhouses, and not only the supplying of bathing-oil or administration of baths, as with Zosimos. At Kyme, the resident Italian L. Vaccius Labeo dedicated, as gymnasiarch, a bathhouse

[898] Some illustrative examples; Italici qui negotiantur/οἱ πραγματευόμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι: *I.Ephesos* 409, *AE* 1990 938, *SEG* 34.1067, *I.Kibyra* 27-41; *TAM* V.1 687, *TAM* V.2 862, 924; *I.Sestos* 2, *I.Assos* 14; οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι/οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι: *I.Pergamon* 383, *TAM* V.3 1455, *I.Tralleis* 77, *I.Laodikeia am Lykos* 48; a number from Phrygia: *IGR* IV 675, 713, 793-794; cf. Liebenam (1900) 218-219 n. 5; Kirbihler (2007) 23-28, (2016) 224-226.
[899] Kirbihler (2007) 24 n. 39, Thonemann (2010) 169 and n. 23.
[900] *IGR* IV 1703 ll. 14-15.
[901] Eberle (2017) 355-365.
[902] *SEG* 32.1243 = Hodot (1982), with Kearsley (1994b) and *BE* 1983 323, ll. 16-18, 32-34, 36-38, 43-45.
[903] *IG* XII Suppl. 124 ll. 3-15.
[904] Italian interest in bathing: Yegül (2010) 40-65.

(βαλανῆον) to the *neoi*, setting aside money for this from his estates at the Smarageion.[905] The honorific formula for his statues clearly distinguishes this donation from his reconstruction of the gymnasium (ll. 41-43), so that it is clear we are dealing with two separate structures. Evidence for such bathhouse euergetism rises steadily from this point, culminating in the first 'gymnasium-baths' of Vergilius Capito at Miletos.[906] By contrast, private donations of bathhouses are practically unknown in the Hellenistic period.[907]

Capito's gymnasium-baths were thus the result of the combined pressures of honorific titularity (as proposed in chapter 4) and the cultural interests of Miletos' resident Roman population. Preferences for bathing, over palaistral training, also galvanised non-citizen euergetism. Notably, freedmen benefactors in the sphere of gymnasia seem to have contributed exclusively to baths and bathing, and not athletic training: thus, the imperial freedman Ti. Claudius Halys built baths at an imperial estate in Mysia, and likewise M. Ulpius Chresimos, under Nerva, built a caldarium (hence, bathing facilities) at Tralleis' gymnasium.[908] The freedman G. Stertinius Orpex contributed statues of Asklepios, Hygieia, and Hypnos to Ephesos' gymnasium – deities associated with health and bathing, and not, for instance, Herakles or Hermes, the patrons of gymnasial *paideia*.[909] This freedmen preference for bathing not only corresponds to bathing's obvious broader appeal, beyond citizen-groups,[910] but also undoubtedly its connections with commerce, and indeed its role as an outlet for expressing mercantilist wealth – close to the interests of resident Romans

[905] *I.Kyme* 19 ll. 39-41.
[906] *I.Assos* 16 ll. 4-5 (before 2 BCE), *CIG* 3080 ll. 3-5 (Teos, Augustan, for προβαλανεῖα), *I.Labraunda* 20, 65 ll. 5-10 (c. 50 CE), *I.Aphrodisias2007* 5.6 ll. 4-7 (after 70 CE, already mentions the baths of Eusebes); note also *TAM* II 168, a subscription of Augustan date for public baths, and Delorme (1960) 244-245 n. 4 and 246-247 overall.
[907] The only possible parallel is *I.Mylasa* 101 ll. 24-29 (2nd century BCE), although the honorand likely contributed here to a pre-existing public project for a bathhouse, and not a personal benefaction; cf. Trümper (2014) 213 n. 52.
[908] Halys: *IGR* IV 228, with Kantirea (2016) 476. Chresimos: *I.Tralleis* 148 ll. 5, 12-13, with Herrmann (1988).
[909] *I.Ephesos* 2113 ll. 16-18. For Orpex, *I.Ephesos* 411, 720, 2113 (with Engelmann (2004) 71), 4123.
[910] E.g. freedmen were prohibited from the gymnasium in the Beroia gymnasiarchy law: *SEG* 27.261b ll. 27-28.

and freedmen – in gymnasial contexts. Indeed, from the late 1st century BCE onwards we find striking signs of this interpenetration of commerce and gymnasia, perhaps even around activities entirely unrelated to any industry in oil-waste, in benefactions by two resident Romans: at Ephesos, a L. Mundicius dedicated workshops at a gymnasium in Ephesos,[911] while at Apollonia Rhyndakos in 40/41 CE a G. Saufeius Macer went even further, and used the money for his gymnasiarchy to build a Roman-style *macellum*.[912]

Potens of Iasos

We proceed now to consider the intersection between civic honourability and the commercial interests that must have occupied the majority of resident Roman populations. Some insight into this is offered by the benefactions of one freedman contributor to baths, Potens of Iasos, a contemporary of Capito of Miletos, whose very personality exemplifies the subliminal place of such local Romans. His contributions to Iasos were significant enough that we possess multiple epigraphic testimony to them – an architrave naming him as εὐεργέτης, a funerary monument, and a stele recording his benefactions to the Kaisareion.[913] From this last text we learn of another stele recording benefactions at baths;[914] he was likely the builder of these latter structures. His social background is unclear. Known only as 'Potens the benefactor', the lack of Roman *nomina* or even Greek names would suggest he was neither a member of the free resident Roman population, nor a Roman freedman, nor an Iasian who had obtained Roman citizenship. It is possible he was a wealthy slave-agent of a tax-collector, but the fact he would wield public honour as an εὐεργέτης

[911] *I.Ephesos* 443.
[912] *IGR* IV 1676 ll. 7-13.
[913] *I.Iasos* 253, 407, *SEG* 43.717; cf. Pont (2016) 251-252. Kantirea (2016) 479 identifies Potens' architraval dedication as part of his bath-complex.
[914] *SEG* 43.717 ll. 6-11.

argues against this. The most plausible scenario is that Potens was the Italian freedman of an Iasian citizen (the use of Latin on his funerary monument almost certainly suggests Italian origins).[915] He should thus be counted among the unusual minority of Italian individuals who gained social ascendancy not within the framework of Roman citizenship – just as many Greek notables were doing themselves – but within those of a *polis*.

Potens was clearly very rich, and most likely became so through commerce. The resulting combination of social marginality and great wealth had interesting results for the rhetorical articulation of his social standing at Iasos, as seen in the surviving stele recording his benefactions. Two aspects are notable. The first is the visibility accorded to the sheer magnitude of his wealth, in that it describes the second lost stele as recording unspecified benefactions 'to the amount of 100,000' – δαπάνην μυριάδων δέκα, separated by spaces and placed on a separate line to enhance their visual effect.[916] The currency is not even specified, even though this is likely to be denarii, like the sums for the Kaisareion benefactions. Numerical precision is also evident in the listing of his benefactions at the Kaisareion (note here the role of imperial cult in legitimating Potens' euergetism, as with other freedmen in chapter 4) – a phiale for Isis and Serapis of 90 denarii, debt-remission to the rowers of 1200 denarii, and donations of 25 denarii to each councillor on Claudius' birthdays. The second aspect is the startling emphasis on his children, who are mentioned as his co-benefactors in the earlier benefactions to the baths.[917] It would seem that Potens sought to obtain social legitimacy for his donations by highlighting familial descent and continuity, thereby creating a euergetic lineage that could not be obtained through Iasian citizenship or magistracies – none of the inscriptions indicates he held either. While the overall form of his stele's inscription is slightly unusual, being more a list of benefactions than an honorific inscription

[915] Potens as a slave: Blümel in *I.Iasos* 253, Pleket in *SEG* 43.717, *AE* 1993 1531, and Van Nijf (2009) 303-304; Potens as Italian freedman of Iasos: Pont (2016) 240.
[916] *SEG* 43.717 ll. 10-11.
[917] *SEG* 43.717 ll. 9-10.

proper, it had the seal of civic authorities, and comprised public language.[918] It is thus now necessary to elaborate on these two features – the crass role of wealth in the rhetorical presentation of Potens' generosity, and the concomitant significance of family as a legitimating argument – as symptomatic of tendencies in euergetic rhetoric arising from the activities of resident Romans.

Roman commerce and the monetarisation of civic honourability

Roman and Italian settlers to Asia brought great wealth, and generated even greater wealth when they got there. The movement of such individuals eastward, impelled by the increased monetary supply of the late 2nd century resulting from Rome's Mediterranean conquests,[919] integrated commercial wealth with landed property. While Potens may have earned his wealth through commerce, it is likely his claim to familial euergetism would have been underpinned by landed assets. Many of his predecessors in Republican Asia certainly did own land. A critical phase was the post-Mithridatic war period, as cities and notables were obliged to furnish war indemnities, and compelled to borrow from wealthy Italians: with debtors increasingly unable to repay their loans, some of these creditors gradually obtained land which had been pledged at security.[920] Local elite mortality in the Mithridatic and Civil Wars was also a factor.[921] This transferal of land-ownership to Italians and Romans was not wholesale, but undoubtedly had long-term effects in shifting the balance of economic power in their favour. The imbrication of Italian credit in Asia not only served

[918] *SEG* 43.717 ll. 3-4.
[919] Kay (2014) 87-128.
[920] Thus, Cluvius of Puteoli acquired the property of Philotas, who had been guarantor for money lent to six cities in Karia: Cic. *Fam.* 13.56; similarly, Appuleius Decianus acquired land from Lysanias of Temnos by foreclosing a debt: Cic. *Flac.* 51. See the other examples in Broughton (1934) 210-211, Mitchell (1993) 1.30, 154, Kay (2014) 139 n. 62, and Kirbihler (2016) 220-221, 230-237 overall.
[921] For instance, Mithridates killed 1500 citizens suspected of conspiracy against him, including 80 Pergamene notables: App. *Mith.* 49.

Roman landed interests; it also abetted some local notables, even at the expense of their peers. Such was Herakleides of Temnos, a witness in Flaccus' trial of 59, who had embroiled himself in Italian credit networks to obtain land in Kyme (land previously owned by an Italian Maeculonius), borrowing twice from the wealthy Sextus Stloga and the Fufii to cover his purchase. When he was unable to repay his debt to the latter, a fellow Temnian Hermippos, his guarantor, was forced to pay up.[922] Roman wealth could thus be implicated in the wealth of local notability, and indeed may have relied on the support of the latter. We know, for instance, of the positive relations between Romans and figures like G. Julius Theopompos at Knidos and Hybreas of Mylasa, both of whom were honoured by Roman clients.[923]

The influx of Italian *negotiatores* and *publicani* into Asia may thus account for the increasingly stark economic inequality within citizenries traceable over the 1st century BCE. Figures for the super-rich that we have from even the Mithridatic and post-Mithridatic war period are notably higher than for those of the late 2nd century BCE.[924] While it was suggested in chapter 3 that the civic re-appropriation of royal land gradually brought about disparities in wealth between citizen and non-citizen populations by the late 2nd century BCE, none of the highest figures for benefactions – amounting to several talents at best – come close to those we find from the late 1st century BCE. Under Augustus, M. Tullius Kratippos of Pergamon donated 100,000 drachmas in his will (benefaction unknown).[925] Sums ranging between 20,000 and up to even 400,000 drachmas are to be found over the 1st

[922] Zehnacker (1979) 167-181.
[923] Theopompos: *I.Knidos* 57, 701; Hybreas: *I.Mylasa* 535 l. 6. Earlier still, Polemaios of Klaros' generosity towards unspecified ἐργαζόμενοι may allude to relationships with *negotiatores*: *SEG* 39.1243iv ll. 5-11.
[924] Chairemon of Nysa provided grain worth around 110,000 drachmas: *I.Nysa* 411 l. 8; his son Pythodoros and contemporary Hieron of Laodikeia owned upwards of 2000 talents: Strabo 14.1.42, 12.8.16: in the 60s BCE Asklepiades of Akmoneia paid 206,000 drachmas on behalf of the city: Cic. *Flac.* 34-38.
[925] Mathys, *Architekturstiftungen* RU 1.

century CE, among which stand Potens' own benefactions.[926] At the same time, more modest sums ranging from a few hundred to 10,000 drachmas continue to be attested, and probably comprised the most common range for civic benefaction.[927] What this may suggest is a generally wealthier civic elite by the early empire, although inequality within it was rising – there were many who were as wealthy as a Moschion of Priene, but these were now also overshadowed by those of the stature of a Kratippos of Pergamon. This may actually have galvanised competition for office, as evidence from the mid-1st century BCE onwards for iteration of civic office, multiple office-holding within the same year, and shortening term-periods, would suggest.[928]

At the same time, our very evidence for this developing inequality suggests how this was shaping expectations around public giving. Concurrent with these sums of benefactions is the sheer habit of recording monetary sums of benefactions on honorific inscriptions and dedications at all. While undoubtedly already a practice found in the Hellenistic period, it is noteworthy that the sum of our evidence for this from the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE (twelve examples; see chapter 3) is smaller than the instances of such numerically expressed benefaction from the 1st century CE alone (fourteen examples).[929] Moreover, while such figures are found practically only in inscribed decrees in the Hellenistic period – as with e.g.

[926] *I.Kibyra* 41 ll. 8-9, 42a-e l. 6 (464,000 Rhodian drachmas, for feasts, loans, gymnasiarchy); *I.Stratonikeia* 662b ll. 3-4 (70,000 drachmas, theatre); *CIG* 3847p ll. 8-9 (Synaos, 20,000 denarii, *stephanephoria*); Von Saldern (2006) 323-324 n. 4 l. 1 (100,000 drachmas, temple).
[927] *I.Keramos* 14 ll. 25 (800 denarii), *I.Stratonikeia* 651 ll. 3-4 (6000 drachmas, stoas); *I.Didyma* 331 ll. 7-8 (4000 denarii, a *panegyris*); *I.Ephesos* 987 ll. 23-24 (5000 denarii, basilica); *I.Ephesos* 988 ll. 36-37 (5000 denarii, basilica); *I.Lampsakos* 12 l. 8 (1000 Attic drachmas); *I.Sardis* II 348 l. 16 (6000 denarii), *I.Stratonikeia* 144 ll. 10-11 (900 drachmas), *SEG* 6.647 l. 11 (Attaleia, 4000 denarii), *McCabe Chios* 220 l. 5 (10,000 drachmas, grain).
[928] Iteration in the 1st century BCE: *I.Sardis* 27 ll. 9-10 (five-times general), *I.Aphrodisias2007* 8.1 and 8.5 (ten-times *stephanephoros*), *I.Magnesia* 132 ll. 5-7 (thrice *stephanephoros*); in the 1st to 3rd centuries CE: Quaß (1993) 336-337 and Dmitriev (2005b) 223-228; for multiple office-holding in the same year – unprecedented in the Hellenistic period – see, from the 1st century CE: *I.Nordkarien* 406 ll. 5-10, *TAM* II 420 ll. 3-5, *TAM* V.2 1179 ll. 5-7, *IG* XII.2 243 ll. 6-9, *I.Didyma* 272 ll. 1-9; shortening terms: Dmitriev (2005b) 217-219.
[929] As well as Moschion of Priene's donations and Archippe's distributions, these are the attested Hellenistic examples in chronological order (see also chapter 3): *I.Ilion* 1 ll. 8-12; Michel, *Recueil* 456 ll. 18-19; *I.Erythrai* 28 ll. 40-41; *IG* XII.6 11 ll. 35-36; *Syll.*[3] 577/*Milet* I.3 145 ll. 4-5; *Syll.*[3] 578 ll. 6-7; *CIG* 3069 ll. 23-24; *IG* XII.7 515 l. 8; *SEG* 39.1244ii ll. 25-26; *I.Ilion* 52 ll. 6, 15.

Diodotos of Halikarnassos, Moschion of Priene or Archippe of Kyme – from the late 1st century BCE onwards they appear mainly on inscribed statue-bases, and even, exceptionally, on building dedications, like the 100,000 drachmas that G. Octavius proudly displayed on the architrave of Demeter's temple at Blaundos.[930] This reflects a change in epigraphic habit, as honours were increasingly expressed as honorific formulas on statue-bases, and not as decrees,[931] but arguably also a heightened interest in calculating and measuring benefaction in numerical terms, most likely because increased wealth meant that claims to monetary donations were a more regular feature of assembly debates and inter-elite competition. We thus find in some cases unusually precise figures, like Ti. Claudius Panykhos' 2526 denarii at Tralleis towards a grain-fund, or Tate's 2340 denarii towards the Heraklion.[932] Inscription on statue-bases commemorated the individuality of a benefaction – an important aspect of the change in epigraphic habit, as will be argued later – and suggest how rising wealth literally shaped the rhetoric of honourability. By contrast, no statue-base inscription from the Hellenistic period ever mentions the monetary sums of benefactions.

This interest in expressing benefactions in monetary form arguably underpins the tendency among civic benefactors, easily overlooked, towards making donations of monetary specie. While in the Hellenistic period money could be distributed towards specific purposes like the conducting of sacrifices, it is never handed out as a gift in itself.[933] In the early empire, however, such cash-gifts emerge; the most spectacular and well-studied example comes from the end of our period, in the distributions of G. Vibius Salutaris at Ephesos.[934] The earliest case, however, is the couple Herakleitos and Tatarion, priests of

[930] Von Saldern (2006) 323-324 n. 4 l. 1.
[931] Only *I.Keramos* 14 is a decree.
[932] Panykhos: *I.Tralleis* 77 ll. 14-15; Tate: *La Carie* 67 ll. 12-13. Note also T. Flavius Damianus' claim to have left behind 127,816 denarii after office as *grammateus* at Ephesos in the late 2nd century CE: *I.Ephesos* 3080 ll. 17-20, with Cramme (2001) 106.
[933] E.g. Archippe of Kyme: Distributions of money towards sacrifices to the *boule pandemos*, citizen tribes, and non-citizens: *SEG* 33.1036 ll. 20-27, 33.1037 ll. 16-19, 33.1039 ll. 56-59.
[934] *I.Ephesos* 27 ll. 220-352, 485-553, with Rogers (1991a) 41-79; other examples of 2nd and 3rd CE in Laum (1914) 1.103, Zuiderhoek (2009) 100-101.

Zeus Panamaros of Stratonikeia, of the Augustan period, who distributed three and two drachmas to individual citizens and non-citizens respectively on their birthdays.[935] Significantly, this was allied to a distribution of bathing-oil to all social groups and ages,[936] thereby illustrating vividly the coevality of increasingly monetary conceptions of euergetism and changing attitudes to gymnasial oil. Indeed, oil may be said here to function like money. In the late 2nd and early 1st centuries BCE public distributions could be made of grain, sweet-wine, or money towards sacrifices, like those of Moschion or Archippe; oil is never distributed, so long as it remained a closely guarded medium of gymnasial euergetism. As the provision of bathing-oil increasingly denoted a benefactor's personal wealth, however, it is unsurprising that handouts of that wealth in its raw monetary form eventually followed. Two compatriots of Herakleitos and Tatarion, Chrysaor and Panphile, evenly proudly recorded their donations on their dedicatory inscription of a temple to Hekate.[937] Around the mid-century, Aristokles Molossos at Aphrodisias further bequeathed a fund in his will towards annual monetary distributions to the people.[938] Cash handouts may also have been seen as a distinctly 'Roman' practice, and could thus appeal to the social marginal of *poleis*:[939] the earliest example of monetary distribution at a *triclinium*, a Roman-style reclining banquet, are the 25 denarii to councillors of Potens of Iasos.[940] By the end of the 1st century, he would be followed even by local magnates, like a T. Flavius Praxias of Phrygian Akmoneia, who similarly left money for a cash distribution to councillors at a reclining banquet.[941]

---

[935] *I.Stratonikeia* 527 ll. 6-7, 1428 ll. 6-8. Less certain is the contemporaneous 'casting-out' (διαρρίφα) of Kleanax of Kyme (*SEG* 32.1243 ll. 38-39) which evokes imperial Roman *sparsiones missilium*, distributions of coin and gifts, although the object of Kleanax' largesse is unknown; see also Robert (1969-1990) 7.740-745 and *BE* 1983 323 pp. 135-136, drawing connections with ῥίμματα, e.g. *IG* VII 2712 ll. 76-77.
[936] *I.Stratonikeia* 527 ll. 7-8.
[937] *I.Stratonikeia* 662 ll. 4-5.
[938] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.803 ll. 22-32, 35-42.
[939] Notably, the first monetary distributions known at Rome were those of Julius Caesar and Augustus: Van Berchem (1939) 120 and Cooley (2009) 74-75, 169.
[940] *SEG* 43.717 ll. 19-21
[941] *IGR* IV 661 ll. 19-22, with Slater (2000) 118-119.

Wealth and images of Roman euergetic families

While the wealth of resident Romans and its imbrication among local elite classes served to monetarise euergetic behaviour and its representation, it arguably also lent greater authority to personal wealth, especially wealth derived from commercial enterprise, as a prime source of legitimating authority for public giving – even to the potential neglect of citizen status. New solidarities emerged from this. One such example, even if it can only be hinted at briefly here, is the growing prominence of non-civic trade associations in euergetic exchange, especially from the 1st century CE. They could be recipients of benefaction, as with Potens' concession of interest on a loan to the 'rowers' of Iasos.[942] More significant, however, is their involvement as benefactors and honouring bodies. The self-identification of a Euschemon (1st/2nd CE) as a purple-trader only, in his dedicatory inscription for a temple to Tyche at Miletoupolis, marks a new mentality.[943] Over the 1st century associations of leather-workers or bronzeworkers at Thyateira, or even the slave-traders of Sardeis, publicly honour their benefactors for their civic careers, thereby actualising their place within *poleis*.[944] Such honours by trade associations are unknown in the Hellenistic period, and must surely reflect the increasingly distinctive presence of such associations in civic assemblies from the 1st century BCE onwards – groups who were known in such settings by their trade, regardless of their citizenship.[945]

Moreover, wealth could now create new relationships with audiences of benefaction. A notable emergent feature of the early empire are dedicatory inscriptions that include no

[942] *SEG* 43.717 ll. 17-18.
[943] *I.Miletoupolis* 35.
[944] *TAM* V.2 936 (bronzeworkers), 991 (leather-workers), 1002 (leather-cutters), *I.Sardis* II 339 (shoemakers), 347 (slave-traders).
[945] Euergetism and non-civic associations in general, and lack of Hellenistic evidence for this: Zimmermann (2002) 105-111 and Dittmann-Schöne (2010) 52-62; associations at assemblies: Cic. *Flac.* 17 (cobblers and girdle-makers at Pergamon), Dio Chrys. *Or.* 34.21-23 (linen-workers of Tarsos), with Ruggini (1976) 463-465. This may be due to the increasingly wealth-based character of assembly participation in the imperial period: Fernoux (2011) 81-97; Brélaz (2013) 371-373.

indication of civic office-holding, even if dedications by office-holders are still otherwise extremely common. Private benefactions are certainly attested already in the 3rd and 2nd centuries, although we possess no corresponding dedicatory inscriptions,[946] so that it is unclear if these individuals were permitted to present their benefactions as private ones; such inscriptions would have been closely guarded by civic authorities.[947] From the late 1st century BCE, however, instances of private dedications by local benefactors not only survive, but are increasingly numerous. L. Mundicius' dedication of workshops represents one of the earliest cases,[948] and he is followed by other Ephesian benefactors of the Augustan age – Sextilius Pollio, Mithridates and Mazaios and even the local notable Herakleides Passalas presented dedications as purely private ventures.[949] The practice is attested for both Roman and non-Roman benefactors, and encompasses not only minor donations like individual columns, but even major undertakings like buildings.[950] In publicly presenting benefactions purely as private individuals, benefactors emphasised that personal wealth could exist for the public good outside of the legitimating framework of office-holding, civic institutions, and, especially in the case of Roman benefactors, of citizen status. It is perhaps not coincidental that some of the most monumental private dedications were those of

[946] Malousios of Gargara: *I.Ilion* 1 (theatre); Diodotos at Halikarnassos: Michel, *Recueil* 456 (gymnasium); Apollophanes at Magnesia: *I.Magnesia* 92a-b, (theatre); Archippe of Kyme: *SEG* 33.1040-1041 (*bouleuterion*, shrine and altar of concord, stoas and workshops).
[947] The city of Kyme explicitly granted Archippe permission to inscribe decrees on the *bouleuterion* she built: *SEG* 33.1040 ll. 26-28; examples of such private dedications in the Hellenistic period are few and confined to foreign citizen benefactors: Meier (2012) 151-152, Von Hesberg (1994) 36-48.
[948] *I.Ephesos* 443.
[949] For Pollio and Mithridates and Mazaios, see chapter 4 above; Herakleides Passalas dedicated the pavement of the Triodos: *SEG* 43.791.
[950] *SEG* 39.1130 (Mylasa, Aetion, baths), *I.Nordkarien* 224 (Alabanda, Menippos, column in portico of Apollo), 225 (Alabanda, Ti. Claudius Napes, column), 407 (Kys, Idomeneus, statue of Nero), *I.Labraunda* 20 (Menelaos, baths), *SEG* 46.1655 (Hierapolis, Hikesios and Euesbes column in baths), *I.Priene2014* 156 (M. Antonius Rusticus, temple-steps), *Milet* VI.2 907 (G. Vibus Dionysios, unknown building), *I.Ilion* 90 (Ti. Claudius Philokles and wife Claudia Parmenis, stoa), *IGR* IV 228 (Ti. Claudius Halys, baths), *I.Assos* 22-23 (Kleostratos, an unknown building).

resident Romans, like M. Mummius Macer and G. Octavius, who seem to have single-handedly embellished the built landscape of Blaundos in the Flavian period.[951]

Where civic legitimation through office-holding was not a possibility, especially with Roman benefactors, emphasis on the familial unit could form an alternative. This is what Potens did at Iasos in making his benefaction with his sons, thereby directing attention, in lieu of institutional credentials, to the lineage that wealth could generate. Similarly, Sextilius Pollio at Augustan Ephesos dedicated his stoa-basilica and aqueductal bridge alongside his wife Ofillia Bassa, stepson Ofillius Proculus, and unnamed children (presumably his children by Ofillia), without mentioning civic office; he may not ever have held any.[952] His children's anonymity, like Potens', suggests their minority, and thus that their inclusion was due not so much to any material contribution they might have made personally, as that doing so conveyed the impression of familial descendance.[953] While such joint dedications, even with children, are by no means exclusive to non-citizen benefactors, who may have been legally barred from office (office-holding local notables also increasingly include them in benefactions as we will see later), they are a feature of such individuals: freedmen like Stertinius Orpex and Ti. Claudius Halys, notably, made benefactions alongside their families.[954]

As well as furnishing an alternative source of legitimacy, emphasis on family allowed resident Romans to compete for civic status with local notables who did bear office;

[951] Von Saldern (2006) 323-326 ns. 3, 4, 6 (G. Octavius, temple and porticos) and 326-327 n. 9 (G. Mummius Macer, propylon and workshops) with Thonemann (2013b) 32-35.
[952] Stoa-basilica: *SEG* 39.1210; aqueductal bridge: *I.Ephesos* 3092. Pollio is only ever attested as overseer of the *aqua Throessitica* alongside his stepson: *I.Ephesos* 402, with Cramme (2001) 137-138; this may have been a provincial and not civic appointment. No office on his lone statue-base: *I.Ephesos* 717a.
[953] Van Bremen (1996) 289-290.
[954] *I.Ephesos* 2113 with Engelmann (2004), *IGR* IV 228 ll. 2-3; note that familial contributions feature heavily in the dedication of a customs-house by the fishermen of Ephesos under Nero, many of whom were Italians: *I.Ephesos* 20a ll. 12-14, 32-34, 40-42, 49-54, 57-58, b ll. 14-15, 18-19a, 20-20a, 36-38, 41, 55, 67-71.

at Ephesos, the Greek elite made benefactions proudly recording their office-holding.[955] It also reflects the sheer trans-local character of Roman habitation in Asia, with resident Romans forming from the late 1st century a *conventus* in the province, and following organisational networks transcending civic limits now largely obscure to us.[956] Already in the mid-1st century BCE Cluvius of Puteoli, for instance, held no fewer than six cities in Karia in his debt.[957] This trans-civic character seems to be the implication of the surviving posthumous honorific monuments of the 1st century BCE and CE recording honours by multiple cities: of the thirteen known, seven preserve the names of honorands, of which six are almost certainly resident Romans or their descendants.[958] The geographical networks represented in these are mainly micro-regional or regional, spanning cities and their immediate neighbours or larger conglomerates like Karia, so that it is possible these individuals enjoyed some permanent legal status as residents or even citizens.[959] The implication must be that resident Romans served to galvanise pre-existing trends towards regional elite mobility seen in figures like Sibilos of Mylasa or Polykles of Rhodes.[960]

Some of these region-wide Roman families are more than mere names. One is the Julii Cornuti, based at Perge, but whose members in the 1st century CE are attested also as major figures in civic life at Apollonia Mordiaion in Phrygia, where one G. Julius Patruinus

[955] At Ephesos, local notables did advertise office in dedications: Herakleides Passalas' statue of Augustus as gymnasiarch (*I.Ephesos* 252); Hieron' donation of a *psalis* as *prytanis* (*I.Ephesos* 2033); Glaukon's donation of a *sphairisterion* to the gymnasium as *prytanis* (*SEG* 48.1375).
[956] *Conventus civium Romanorum*, possibly related to individual civic associations of resident Romans: Magie (1950) 2.1051, 1615-1616, Cassola (1970-1971) 314-316.
[957] Cic. *Fam.* 13.56; a relative was honoured at Magnesia: *I.Magnesia* 139.
[958] *I.Sestos* 2 (Titus Porphanus Nikias), 3 (Titus Porphanus), 4 (unknown, but honoured by resident Romans), *I.Erythrai* 421 (unknown), 422 (unknown, but honoured also by Romans at Teos), 429 (unknown, athletic victor), 430 (L. Marius Caiata), *TAM* V.2 1133 (N. Terentius Primus, Thyateira), *MAMA* IV 315 (Q. Plautius Venustus, Pepouza), Merkelbach-Stauber, *SGO* I 03/06/03 (Ambivia, Teos), *I.Ephesos* 3293 (Matreas), *SEG* 62.798 (unknown, Antioch-on-the-Maeander), *I.Tralleis* 31 (unknown); for such *tableaux d'honneurs*, Boulay (2012).
[959] The posthumous character of these monuments means we do not hear of grants of citizenship or privileges. Note, however, a G. Julius Potitianus (a resident Roman) honoured at Aphrodisias for receiving decrees and citizenship from many other cities: *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.105 ll. 15-17. For the largely micro-regional and regional, but not necessarily provincial character of these networks, Thonemann (2011a) 237-239.
[960] Boulay (2012) 69-75.

Cornutus was *agonothetes* of the imperial cult and honoured as φιλόπατρις and son of the city,[961] and Akmoneia, where a L. Servenius Cornutus is known.[962] Its leading figure in the mid-1st century, G. Julius Cornutus, made benefactions not only at Perge, but also at Apollonia and even Ankyra; he was also honoured by neighbouring villages of Perge.[963] Crucially, one of his better surviving dedications in the Pergaian gymnasium presents him as a private individual, and accompanied by his wife Caesia Tertulla only;[964] in the second, he is named hereditary high-priest, but is joined by two of his children, and a Julia Severa – all bear imperial cult priesthoods, but the emphasis is firmly placed on their common *gentilicium*, Ιούλιοι, set in the centre of the inscription.[965] The wide-ranging influence of the Cornuti, and this G. Julius Cornutus in particular, across Pamphylia, Phrygia and Galatia, arguably underpins the emphasis on familial ideology in both these dedications. Very significant in this regard is the presence of Julia Severa in the second dedication, who may be identical with the mother of Servenius Cornutus at Akmoneia – this would be the southern-most evidence for her career.[966] A descendant of Galatian royalty, Julia Severa might have formed an intermediary figure bridging the Cornuti and local ruling classes, and it is all the more noteworthy that, as a woman, she is attested as a major benefactress at Akmoneia, holding the high-priesthood and *agonothesia* of the imperial cult, and even building a synagogue for the Jewish community.[967] One wonders if her prominence was due to her connections to powerful Roman families like the Cornuti and Servenii; it is notable in any case that women at Akmoneia, a city with a lively resident Roman community (like

[961] *SEG* 62.1121-1122. A Cornutus εὐεργέτης is also attested under Tiberius: *RPC* I 3528; and a festival Cornuteia was celebrated into the 2nd century CE: Labarre, Özsait, Özsait and Güceren (2012) 129 n. 8.
[962] *PIR*^{2} S 566, attested in *MAMA* XI 5 and *IGR* III 315. A Tertulla attested at Akmoneia may have been the daughter of G. Julius Cornutus of Perge: *MAMA* VI 317, with Bru, Demirer and Tüner Önen (2016) 70.
[963] *I.Perge* 36-41, Mitchell (1974) 37-38, *I.Ankyra* 70; an early legate of Galatia was a Cornutus Aquila: *PIR*^{2} C 1510.
[964] *I.Perge* 39, also dedicated to the emperor only, Claudius or Nero: Özdizbay (2020) 87.
[965] Bru, Demirer and Tüner Önen (2016) 65-72.
[966] As suggested by Bru, Demirer and Tüner Önen (2016) 70-71.
[967] *PIR*^{2} I 701; *MAMA* VI 263, 264 (synagogue benefaction), 265 ll. 11-12, *RPC* I 3171, 3173-3177; cf. Edelmann-Singer (2013).

several other Phrygian cities), do seem to have been aware of their role as intermediaries between Romans and local notability, as the existence of a group of 'Greek and Roman wives' under Augustus attests, for instance.[968]

It may be that womanhood, although notably absent in Potens' stele, formed a logical focal point for resident Romans seeking to integrate into euergetic ideology. At least one of the thirteen multi-city posthumous honorific monuments known honoured a woman, Ambivia of Teos. Another case of a regionally attested settler family, the Lollii in the Troad known at Assos and Alexandreia Troas,[969] further suggests the important role of women in Roman euergetism. At Assos, a funerary monument records posthumous honours by the city and its resident Romans for Hellanikos and his wife Lollia Arlegilla – the joint honours would have commemorated the marital alliance between the Lollii and a local family.[970] Here, we know of another leading couple of the Augustan age, Lollius Philetairos and his wife Lollia Antiochis – possibly descendants of the Lollii – who both held office as *basileus*/*basilissa*, Assos' premier magistracy, and made benefactions of a stoa and baths, with Antiochis even doing so, it would seem, as an individual woman, and describing herself as the first *basilissa* of Assos.[971] Like Julia Severa at Akmoneia, this may not be a coincidence, with Assos hosting a lively resident Roman community in the 1st century CE.[972]

The presentation by resident Roman benefactors of the family-unit, and in particular womanhood, in public benefactions may thus be regarded as another manifestation of the way that the heightened role of wealth in public generosity gave rise to new ways of talking about civic honourability, alongside the emergence of non-civic associations as honouring

[968] Romans at Akmoneia: Thonemann (2010) 170-174; women of Akmoneia: *MAMA* XI 99 ll. 1-3, with Thonemann (2010) 174-178.
[969] *I.Alexandreia Troas* 35 for a Q. Lollius Fronto (1st century CE), with Hatzfeld (1919) 163.
[970] *I.Assos* 14.
[971] *I.Assos* 15-17, and 16 ll. 2-4 for Antiochis' claims.
[972] Cf. *I.Assos* 26 ll. 10-12, 26 for a G. Varius Castus, descendent of the Varii, for whom see *I.Assos* 70; *I.Assos* 38 is a bilingual dedication.

bodies and privately dedicated benefactions. Of course, we should not forget that one other approach for some Roman families may have been to eschew the civic realm altogether, like the Sestullii of Phrygia, who seem to have maintained their influence from their estates for centuries, and are never attested as civic benefactors.[973] The promotion of the family, nonetheless, was by no means a rhetorical strategy limited to resident Romans or the socially marginal, even if they did give impetus to pre-existing developments. It is time now to consider the way that local elite families – although the distinction 'local' and 'Roman' cannot be entirely clear-cut, of course – also increasingly emphasised the role of families, and thereby subtly reshaped the ethics of civic honouring altogether. We begin by looking at two women honorands at Kyzikos, where the intersection of Greek and Roman families actually led to open hostility in the early imperial period, and where the ideology of domesticity could serve as a complement to the civic ideals sustained by the gymnasium.

Apollonis and Antonia Tryphaina: Family, women, and Romans at Kyzikos

Sometime in the second quarter of the 1st century CE stirring homage was paid by the city of Kyzikos and its resident Roman community to Apollonis, a recently deceased leading local woman. Public mourning was declared, and a grand funeral procession convoked; numerous statues were set up around the city. The whole event gathered the Kyzikene community together in emotional unison, as the city's inhabitants ran up to their magistrates to implore them to honour Apollonis.[974] Although the decree preserving these details is fragmentary, Apollonis' honours represent a crucial transitional moment in the history of the highest honours paid by cities to their citizens. Her public funeral and burial evoke those

[973] Mitchell (1979) and (1993) 1.158.
[974] *SEG* 28.953, with ll. 36-37; for the decree, see also Schwertheim (1978), Ehrhardt (2008), and Sève (1979) 334-335 for the 25-50 date.

granted to leading late Hellenistic statesmen, and especially the citizen-ambassadors of the 1st century BCE – Diodoros Pasparos of Pergamon, Artemidoros of Knidos, Kallikrates of Aphrodisias – who were even buried in the gymnasium.[975] At Kyzikos, one such was an Asklepiades, who had fought under Caesar in the Alexandrine War in 46 BCE.[976]

Unlike these earlier honours, however, which emphasised the masculine world of the gymnasium, the posthumous tribute paid to Apollonis highlighted the domestic sphere. While the *paides* and ephebes lead the funeral procession, they are joined by all free male inhabitants (citizens and non-citizens alike) and, strikingly, the female equivalents to all these groups also: the *parthenoi* and all free women, citizen and non-citizen. Of the two cult-statues she receives, one is placed in the *Charitesion*, and crowned annually by the priestesses of Artemis, of whom she had herself been one (ll. 57-63); the other is set up in the stoa of the tetragonos agora, and is even to be crowned by all newly wedded couples after reporting the completion of their marriage rites to the *kosmophylax* (ll. 63-71). It is therefore Apollonis' persona as a model wife and symbol of marital concord, above all, that is given honorific prominence; the perpetual crownings and inscriptions on her many honorific statues place her σωφροσύνη at the core of their speech-acts (ll. 54-56, 83-86). Needless to say, Apollonis was not ultimately buried in the gymnasium, but in a tomb at the ancestral burial-place of her husband's family located in the harbour (ll. 49-50).

The striking emphasis on domesticity in the posthumous honours for Apollonis is not due only to the fact of her womanhood. In the only earlier known case of female public burial, Archippe of Kyme, it is the gymnasium alone that buried her, and there is no mention of groupings of women.[977] A connection should also be sought with Kyzikos' chequered history with its resident Roman population, which notably figures as one of the honouring

[975] See chapter 2, and in general Chiricat (2005) and Fröhlich (2013) 259-274.
[976] *SEG* 55.1329 ll. 25-26 mentions a *heroon*, very likely referring to a tomb in the gymnasium: Chiricat (2005) 220-221.
[977] *SEG* 33.1039 ll. 50-51.

bodies. The early history of these relations before the late 1st century BCE may have been fairly standard, even peaceful. We find pro-Roman loyalist figures, like Machaon and Asklepiades, and isolated evidence for close friendships between resident Italians and Kyzikenes, like that between M. Stlaccius and Soterides, who prayed for the former after being captured and enslaved while fighting for Caesar in Libya.[978] Romans were even holding civic office by the end of the 1st century.[979] It is from this time too, however, that we hear of violence between Kyzikene citizens and resident Romans. In 20 BCE, the city lost its freedom as punishment for whipping some Romans to death.[980] Freedom was regained in 15 BCE through the intercession of Agrippa,[981] but hostilities persisted. In 25 CE Tiberius again stripped the city of its freedom, after allegations that it had committed acts of violence (although not necessarily involving murder or capital punishment, as in 20 BCE) against its Roman population, and had failed to complete the construction of a temple to Augustus.[982]

While the precise contexts underpinning these episodes of violence elude us, they furnish the backdrop to appreciating the tone of Apollonis' posthumous honours, which even allude to the 'most pressing times', and were conceived for the safety of the city.[983] They also contrast somewhat with the hyper-gymnasial honours conferred on Demetrios, grandson of the Asklepiades who had fought under Caesar, around the turn of the 1st century

[978] *CIG* 3668; cf. Maffre (2017) 268-273 for Italian presence at Kyzikos from the 2nd century BCE onwards for sources; the apparent absence of Kyzikene involvement in Mithridates' Italian vespers of 88 may suggest the Italian population was not significantly large before that point (271).
[979] A L. Vettius Rufus was hipparch: *SEG* 40.1126.
[980] Cass. Dio 54.7.6. Thornton (1999) 513, Dmitriev (2005b) 305 identify these Romans as Kyzikenes who had obtained Roman citizenship, but the severity of the punishment suggests the resident Roman population as well; see also Fournier (2014) 325-326.
[981] Cass. Dio 54.23.7; possibly commemorated by a dedication: *SEG* 33.1055.
[982] Tac. *Ann.* 4.36.2 (violence to Romans and neglected worship of Augustus), Suet. *Tib.* 37.3 (only violence to Romans), Cass. Dio 57.24.6 (imprisonment of Romans and neglected worship of Augustus) For the complexities, and Dio's offering a clearer account (Romans were imprisoned, judicially punished), see Thornton (1999) 511.
[983] *SEG* 28.953 ll. 28-29, 87-88.

CE, and thus at a time when hostilities with Romans may still have been raw.[984] Here the city assumes a dominant ideological role. While the resident Romans do feature alongside the city as honouring bodies at the first proclamation of Demetrios' honours (ll. 5-6), at the three other such proclamations mentioned (at the Rhomaia, his grandfather's honorific games, and the annual games held by the gymnasiarch), and on the base of his cult-statue, it is only the city which honours him (ll. 8-19, 24-29). In the honours for Apollonis, however, the resident Romans appear even on her statue-base.[985]

Against this background of hostility and tensions with resident Romans and the ruling power, the ideological power of womanhood as a metonym for the domestic sphere of the family provided a suitable counterpart to the gymnasium and the chauvinistic connotations of civic pride with which it was associated, and which may even have fuelled the Kyzikenes' hostility to its Romans. It may be that Apollonis had been married to a resident Roman, like Hellanikos at Assos, which would only have enhanced the meanings carried by her honours. Remarkably, another leading woman of Kyzikos, closely contemporary to Apollonis, further suggests the symbolic significance of womanhood. This is Antonia Tryphaina, a scion of Asia's two leading families in the 1st century BCE (of Chairemon of Nysa and Zenon of Laodikeia), daughter of Polemon king of Pontos,[986] and wife to Kotys, king of Thrace.[987] She seems to have settled in Kyzikos after her husband's death in 19 CE, and lived to the time of Caligula;[988] three ornately phrased decrees record honours which the city conferred on her over the period roughly 25-37 CE.[989]

[984] *SEG* 55.1329; for the dating, Chiricat (2005) 221-222, although he does not associate these honours with the grant of Agrippa in 15 BCE.
[985] *SEG* 28.953 ll. 83-86.
[986] Cass. Dio 53.25.1-2, 54.24.5-7.
[987] For Tryphaina, Sullivan (1980) 922-923; she appears in the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*: McKechnie (2019) 92-93.
[988] Strabo 12.3.29, Tac. *Ann.* 2.66-67.
[989] *IGR* IV 144-146.

The earliest of these (perhaps shortly after 25 CE) records her priesthood of Augusta Nikephoros, during which she held the Sebasteia as a tax-free festival. Although Romans are never named – perhaps as a function of the decrees' deliberately obfuscating high-blown style – this benefaction would have resonated closely with the resident Roman population and the commercial enterprise to which they were closely bound. The decree celebrates her goodwill to 'merchants from all over the world, and foreigners visiting the festival', and the honours she receives from 'the businessmen (ἐργασταί) of Asia'; the latter term may be a guarded reference to the *negotiatores*.[990] Her priesthood of Livia, and goodwill to Tiberius, may well suggest Tryphaina's role in assuaging concerns about Kyzikos' relationship with Rome after 25 CE. A second decree from the reign of Caligula commemorates the clearing of Kyzikos' harbour, which had silted up after neglect due to war.[991] This was clearly an achievement with significant economic consequences,[992] and it is especially noteworthy that it is defined as a benefaction that reconfigured Kyzikos' history as a foundation of Agrippa, and not of the eponymous Kyzikos (οὐχ ἱστορήσασα ἡμᾶς ὡς παλαιὸν | Κυζίκου κτίσμα, [ἀ]λλὰ ἐπιγνοῦσα νέαν Ἀγρίππα χάριν).[993] Tryphaina's euergetism was thereby explicitly intended to recall Agrippa's return of the city's freedom in 15 BCE, the most recent positive memory of its interactions with Rome, to the diminution of memories of equally recent tensions with its resident Romans (in 20 BCE and 25 CE).

These harbour benefactions had been plans conceived by Tryphaina's husband Kotys, and passed on to their son Rhoemetalkes, Thrakian king from 38 CE.[994] The latter was by this time hardly an infant, as a friend and close coeval of the emperor Caligula, and

[990] *IGR* IV 144 ll. 7-9, 13-17; e.g. *Syll.*[3] 1229 for ἐργαστής = *negotiator*; cf. Homolle (1879) 370-372 on *I.Délos* 1652.
[991] *IGR* 146 ll. 7-8; this was perhaps the threat of Thracian invasion in 21-26, cf. Maffre (2017) 262.
[992] Prices seem to have risen in the marketplace as a result of the anticipation around the clearing of the harbour; the decree of the city places limits on market-prices, and punishments for those in breach of these (ll. 18-26); cf. Migeotte (2011) 433-434.
[993] *IGR* IV 146 ll. 6-7.
[994] *IGR* IV 146 ll. 10-14, with the corrections and readings of Wilhelm (1923) 429-431.

one might legitimately wonder why Tryphaina, and not king Rhoemetalkes, assumes such a central role in the decree, especially as the funds for the project clearly derived from the Thrakian house.[995] Some clue may be gained from the rhetoric of the third decree concerning Tryphaina, honouring her and her three sons Rhoemetalkes, Polemon, and Kotys, client-king appointees of Caligula, on the occasion of their visit to the city (probably in 37 CE).[996] A lengthy portion outlines Tryphaina's role in high politics within the penumbra of imperial majesty: Caligula is the sun-god over kings, and her sons the recipients of the gods' (i.e. emperors') favours (ll. 3-11). The heightened rhetoric here, however, is necessary to present Tryphaina's role as mediator between the cosmic order of gods and kings, and the humble simplicity of the city; the syntax presents her as based at the city, where her sons meet her on their arrival (ll. 11-12: συνιερουργήσον|τες καὶ συνεορτάσοντες τῆι μητρὶ, ἐπιτελούσῃ…), although she had actually arrived with them, as we learn later (ll. 18-19). For all her connections to Rome and kingly power, Tryphaina regards Kyzikos not only as a friend, but a true fatherland (ll. 12-14: ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς εἰς γνησίαν πατρίδα…ταύτην ἡγημένη πατρίδα). Although the decree honours her sons too, it is primarily intended to express gratitude to her (ll. 16-17). The main honour is a processional welcome, led by priests and priestesses, and the archons and *stephanephoroi* with 'all Kyzikenes' – that is, the civic population, without discrimination of gender (ll. 19-24). These groups recall those at Apollonis' funeral: the gymnasium appears too, but only as an afterthought, with only ephebes and *paides* present (ll. 23-24), and not even the gymnasiarch.[997]

The honorific focus on Tryphaina therefore reflects her symbolic potency as a figure joining two worlds – the framework of two-level sovereignty comprising client-kings and

[995] *IGR* IV 147a ll. 1-6, a dedication for the harbour-clearing works, records that the expense was shared between Tryphaina and Rhoemetalkes.
[996] *IGR* IV 145 ll. 6-7; Cass. Dio 59.12.2.
[997] In the only other epigraphic example of an *apantesis*, Pergamon's honours for Attalos III, the gymnasial members precede the citizen body: *OGIS* 332 ll. 33-38.

Rome, in which Kyzikos was unusually poised, and the city, presented as the hearth of home. It is her domestic role as resident of Kyzikos, and mother, as the daughter and mother of kings, which is emphasised, and never her status as former 'queen'.[998] Tryphaina's intermediary role, framed by her femininity like Apollonis, would have imbued her benefactions with further significance by presenting her as the guarantor of the bonds of family, and appeaser of Rome and Kyzikos' Roman population, which may thereby also have been invited to draw parallels with the contemporaneous political prominence of womanhood at Rome itself, in empresses like Livia (recall Tryphaina's priesthood).[999] This conciliatory tone ultimately worked, as a bilingual dedication to Claudius in 51/52 of a triumphal arch by Kyzikos and its Romans would suggest.[1000] Overall, it is remarkable that we know here of two major female benefactors at a time of crisis in the city's relations with Rome, and one wonders whether this reflects some sort of localised phenomenon. A tradition of powerful intermediary women existed here: Tryphaina's procession with her sons is strikingly reminiscent, for instance, of the similar procession of queen Apollonis and her sons Eumenes II and Attalos II in 183, which was likened to the filial piety of Kleobis and Biton.[1001] This had taken place soon after victory over the Gauls, at Lypredon, and evokes the long shadow of the Attalids, whose euergetic ideology had deployed the image of family, as we saw in chapter 1. Where Eumenes had counterposed domesticity to the then traditional model of Hellenistic military kingship, however, this Kyzikene queenly tradition arguably had new significance in the early empire, in presenting domestic concord as a stabilising

[998] *IGR* IV 144 l. 3. At best she is described as 'the greatest and emperor-loving: *IGR* IV 146 ll. 3-4. In striking contrast, her dedication of the harbour-clearing works does call herself queen: *IGR* IV 147a ll. 8-9: Ἀντωνία Τρύφαινα Κότυος βασιλ[έ]ων [καὶ] | θυγάτηρ καὶ μήτη[ρ αὐτὴ] βασ[ί]λ[ι]σσα.
[999] Purcell (1986) 84-95.
[1000] *CIL* III Suppl. 1 7061.
[1001] Polyb 22.20.4-8, with Thonemann (2013a) 41-42. For queen Apollonis at Kyzikos, Thornton (1999) 498-504.

source of political security alongside the hyper-masculine, and potentially destabilising, patriotism based in the gymnasium.

Familial trends

Apollonis and Tryphaina of Kyzikos therefore epitomise the emergence of familial imagery and domesticity in euergetic rhetoric as a complement to the longstanding presentation of virtuous citizenship founded in the ideals of gymnasial training. This is part of a broader process that has been termed the 'domestication' of public life, by which the virtues of family and elite households increasingly came to the fore in euergetic behaviour and discourse in response to the supposed 'oligarchisation' of *polis* societies from the 2nd century BCE to 1st century CE.[1002] What has perhaps been less clearly articulated is the extent to which this development in public language was not simply a straightforward corollary to socio-economic change, some of which was detailed in the first half of this chapter in relation to resident Romans, but functioned competitively as rhetorical argument before assemblies, and is chronologically specific: as will be suggested in the following, an intensification of this 'domestication' of euergetic discourse can be identified from around the late 1st century BCE onwards. This intensification manifests in several themes of this discourse: the presentation of office-holding and associated benefactions as familial acts, the rhetorical emphasis on euergetic genealogy and descent from benefactor families, and the increasing focus on the family-unit as a source of honorific exemplarity. The result of these developments, as will be suggested afterwards, is a change in attitudes to civic honouring in the early empire.

[1002] E.g. Van Bremen (1996) 156-170, Strubbe (1999) and (2001) 34-39.

Familial office-holding and benefactions

Like Kyzikos, the proud maritime island polity of Rhodes also had a difficult relationship with its resident Romans in the early 1st century CE, and was similarly punished with the loss of its freedom after impaling some Romans under Claudius.[1003] Whatever the precise nature of this conflict, it is notable that in the decades immediately preceding the honours for priests of Athena Lindia (commemorating their year in office), all of local origin, present them alongside their wives, sometimes as priestesses, in a gesture that stands in striking contrast to the otherwise near-invisibility of priestesses on Rhodes in the Hellenistic period.[1004] This interest in presenting the office-holding couple is also observable at Stratonikeia, where priests of Zeus Panamaros regularly commemorate their office and make benefactions alongside their wives, like the Chrysaor and Panphile we met earlier;[1005] in some examples, it is not only wives, but also other extended family members and even children who are jointly commemorated or presented as dedicators.[1006] This tendency to 'familiarise' public office-holding, by which benefactions made during office were accompanied by the dedicator's wife, and sometimes children, is a phenomenon that is traceable across other cities of Asia.[1007] Some parallels exist for benefactions by couples and

[1003] Cass. Dio 60.24.4, with Fernoux (2017) 100-102.
[1004] *I.Lindos* 347 (42 BCE), 378a (27 BCE), 392, 394, 395 (10 CE), 420a (23 CE); see also 384 (9 BCE), with Zachhuber (2018) 86-93, who does however note (100-103) that such couple presentations are limited to this short time-span at Rhodes.
[1005] For the chronology of the priests and their commemorative inscriptions at Panamara, Laumonier (1937) 237-252. Before the reign of Augustus, priests alone appear on dedications: *I.Stratonikeia* 101-106, 147; 148 (1st century CE) is an exception. From Augustus onwards and over the 1st century CE, they are accompanied by priestesses, usually wives, but sometimes also siblings, mothers and daughters: *I.Stratonikeia*: 107, 108 (sister), 109 (mother), 110 (sister), 113, 117, 119, 121-122, 123 (daughter), 124-125, 127, 130, 133, 142, 146, 149, 156, 161, 169, 172, 174.
[1006] *I.Stratonikeia* 120, 126, 134-136, 139-141, 143-145, 150-151, 157, 168, 220a.
[1007] Some examples, from the late 1st century BCE to 1st century CE: *I.Mylasa* 326 (wife and children), *LBW* 502 (son), *I.Stratonikeia* 113 (wife), *I.Nordkarien* 406 ll. 22-25 (wife and children), *SEG* 45.1719 (wife and daughter), *IG* XII.4 951 (wife and children), *I.Mylasa* 952 (wife and children), *I.Perge* 56 (brother), *I.Didyma* 326 (parents), *I.Stratonikeia* 173 and 175 (son), 1026 (sons); for Aphrodisias, see below.

siblings in the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE, although these are scarce in general.[1008] What is certainly more unusual is that from the late 1st century BCE one also finds the phenomenon observed at Rhodes and Stratonikeia, of couples holding office jointly, for 'mainstream' civic magistracies, and not only priesthoods. The gymnasiarch Asklepiades who distributed oil to slaves at Dorylaion actually held his office jointly with his wife Antiochis, who invited women to the gymnasium; Lollius Philetairos and Lollia Antiochis at Assos were *basileis* at the same time. Other such examples of joint office-holding are to be found only in the imperial period.[1009]

In some cases, like that of [Phil]e the *stephanephoros* at Priene, women even seem to have held such magistracy alone, unaccompanied by their husbands. The novelty of this can be sensed in her self-identification, when dedicating an aqueduct, as the 'first' (πρώτη) such female *stephanephoros*.[1010] Other women of the late 1st century BCE to 1st century CE were also praised for their primacy around office-holding – a phenomenon that should be related to the titularising tendencies towards emphasising primacy explored in chapter 4, but was also undoubtedly a product of the broader concern to present the family-unit in public life.[1011] Office-holding by women is extremely rare in the Hellenistic period, and almost never occurs jointly with their husbands.[1012] Even more notable is the increasingly prominent role accorded to children, as in the dedications from Panamara, which virtually emerges only in the early empire, and is entirely unknown in the Hellenistic period. In this

[1008] For example, *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 31-34, 39-67, 75-79, 97-102 (Moschion and Athenopolis' donations), *Milet* I.2 1-2 (Timarchos and Herakleides, possibly brothers, 175/166); for the few known couple benefactions in the 3rd and 2nd centuries (*Tit.Cal.* 105, 106, 135, *IG* IX.1 278 (Opous), *IG* IX.1 694 (Kerkyra)), Van Bremen (1996) 137-138.
[1009] *IGR* IV 522, *I.Assos* 15-17; female magistracies in general: Kirbihler (1994) and Van Bremen (1996) 55-76 and 303-357.
[1010] *I.Priene2014* 305 l. 5. Πρώτη γυναικῶν here implies both precocity as a woman magistrate ('first of women'), but also her social standing among other Prienian nobility ('first among women'): Van Bremen (1996) 31 and Sherk (1992) 242-243.
[1011] Other 'first' women: Van Bremen (1996) 57-58, 118.
[1012] For the few Hellenistic cases of women holding eponymous office, Van Bremen (1996) 30-34.

sense, it is legitimate to wonder if contemporaneous resident Romans of the Augustan period like Sextilius Pollio at Ephesos set new trends.

Children are sometimes even attested as magistrates alongside their fathers alone (and thus not as part of a family-unit with their mothers as well) from the 1st century BCE onwards.[1013] Although rare, the phenomenon is a striking illustration of the way that the inclusion of family members beyond adult males must be analysed primarily as a form of rhetorical posturing before assemblies, as a function of the regularisation of promise-making behaviour that increasingly characterised office-holding from the late 2nd century: that is, civic notables in the early empire were keener to argue for local political standing on the basis of familial virtuousness, and the promise of familial continuity. At late 1st-century CE Stratonikeia, the couple Ti. Claudius Lainas and Claudia Macrina included their son Paionios in the commemorative inscription for their joint-priesthood, who 'had been born in their priesthood'.[1014] Paionios' political destiny was set, but still required constant public reinforcement – he would have to make further promises to hold priesthoods in later years.[1015] One can only imagine the *coup de théâtre* that this lucky event afforded his parents, but must also remember that the very fact that this was inscribed reveals an anxiety around maintaining familial control of political standing that is not to be found before the late 1st century BCE: promise-making was now more and more centred on office-holding, and not only on benefactions made in a private capacity, like those of Heroides in late 2nd-century Priene made in the name of his father.[1016]

[1013] Some 1st-century CE examples, all alongside their fathers: *I.Stratonikeia* 1033, 1026, *I.Didyma* 284, *LBW* 502. The earliest lone child gymnasiarch is Damonikos at Apollonis, albeit financed by his father: *TAM* V.2 1203 ll. 16-19, with Fröhlich (2002) 83-84 and (2009) 81. For youth magistrates in general, see Kleijwegt (1991) 247-262, Strubbe (2005) 91-106 and Quaß (1993) 322 n. 1376; the (few) examples derive primarily from the 2nd and 3rd centuries CE.
[1014] *I.Stratonikeia* 170 ll. 3-4.
[1015] *I.Stratonikeia* 172 ll. 16-19.
[1016] *I.Priene2014* 65 ll. 157-160. Promise-making more common in the imperial period: Dmitriev (2005b) 150-155, Quaß (1993) 211-212.

The reification of ancestral virtue

It is unsurprising that this early imperial concern with presenting public benefactions and office-holding as familial ventures, and emphasising the continuity of the family's political standing, is contemporaneous with a heightened rhetoric around ancestry and lineage. Around the time Ti. Claudius Lainas and Claudia Macrina displayed their new-born son before the Stratonikeian assembly, Dio Chrysostom, in attempting to assuage the displeasure of the people of Prousa, evoked the ancestral goodwill of his family towards the city dating back to his great-great-grandfather, who had lived around the time of Mithridates' invasion of Bithynia.[1017] This sort of conscious memorialisation, stretching back nearly two centuries, is difficult to parallel in the Hellenistic period, and indeed before the Mithridatic wars.

As Philippe Gauthier memorably expressed, the honorific rhetoric around citizen benefactors of the late Hellenistic period, beginning around 150 BCE, increasingly makes reference to the ancestral virtue of the honorand.[1018] The decree for Moschion of Priene, for example, praises him for having been disposed to the fatherland in a manner worthy of the virtue and renown of his ancestors.[1019] The operative concept here is that of *being worthy* of a generalised group of 'ancestors' (ἀξίως τῆς προγόνων ἀρετῆς); there are a number of parallels for this collocation in decrees for other late Hellenistic citizens during the late 2nd to mid-1st centuries.[1020] Implied in this, as is sometimes openly expressed, is the idea that one's moral qualities derive from one's ancestors (διὰ προγόνων).[1021] While ancestral virtue

[1017] Dio *Or.* 46.3 with Salmeri (2000) 64-65; see also *Or.* 31.66-69, on the Rhodians' neglect of the honours for those who had helped service the city's debt during the Civil Wars.
[1018] Gauthier (1985) 57-58.
[1019] *I.Priene2014* 64 ll. 19-20.
[1020] See also *I.Priene2014* 63 l. 10, *SEG* 33.1036 ll. 13-15, 1037 ll. 10-11, 1038 ll. 7-8, 24-25, 1040 ll. 16-19; *I.Ilion* 52 ll. 1-2, *I.Mylasa* 110 l. 5, 871 ll. 6-8, *IG* XII.9 235 ll. 3-4, *SEG* 53.1360 ll. 9-10.
[1021] *SEG* 18.570 ll. 5-6, *SEG* 33.1039 ll. 20-21, *IG* XII.9 236 ll. 2-3, *I.Ephesos* 6 ll. 20-21.

is certainly not evoked regularly in earlier Hellenistic decrees, it is important to stress that the quality of being *worthy* of one's ancestors, or deriving one's virtues from one's ancestors, is not in itself incompatible with the egalitarian ideals of *polis*-communities of this time. Indeed, in the 3rd century an Aristokritos of Kalymna is praised for taking up 'the goodwill derived from his ancestors (τὰν παρὰ τ[ῶν] | γονέων εὔνοιαν).[1022] Nor is Gauthier's chronology entirely watertight, because praise for individuals 'worthy' of their ancestors can already be found in the early 2nd century BCE.[1023]

While this rhetorical development does seem to suggest a growing sense of the exclusivity of benefactor families, it is not ubiquitous, and is not found, for instance, in decrees where we might have expected it – like those from Klaros, Metropolis, Sestos, for instance. From the 1st century BCE, one arguably discerns a further development from worthiness of ancestral virtue that is subtly different, and which is perhaps obscured by Gauthier in classifying a 'late Hellenistic' periodisation spanning the late 2nd century to early empire. We can see its results in a mid-1st-century CE monumental base honouring Ti. Claudius Theogenes Lachanes as *agoranomos*, secretary of the people, and overseer of public works, which adds at the end that he had:[1024]

> '…comported himself in a manner not only comparable to his ancestral virtue (ἀναλογούντως ταῖς προγονικαῖς ἀρεταῖς), but had embellished the good deeds of his family (καῖ τὰς τοῦ γένους εὐπραξίας) through his eager devotion to his native land.'

What is remarkable here is that Lachanes is praised not only for living up to his ancestral virtue, but for actively contributing to it. While Gauthier is certainly right to identify a greater rhetorical interest in ancestral lineage from the 2nd century BCE, it is crucial to note

[1022] *Tit.Cal.* 52 ll. 1-2.
[1023] *MAMA* VI 173 ll. 2-3, *SEG* 46.1721 ll. 10-11. Note that already e.g. Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 55.3 stresses patrilineal ancestry when selecting jurors.
[1024] *I.Sardis* II 337; his daughter Claudia was honoured on the opposite face of the base.

that while these earlier examples generally only conceive of ancestry as something against which one's moral qualities should be compared, should live up to, and from which these were sometimes said even to derive, it is only from the early to mid-1st century BCE that ancestry becomes reified to the point that it forms a moral quality in itself, and could thus be embellished and, implicitly, 'surpassed' by Lachanes.[1025]

The implication of his base, that he was *worthy because of his* ancestors, and not only *worthy of* them, can only be traced in the 1st century BCE. A Melanion of Iasos was descended 'from benefactor ancestors' (προγό|νων ὑπάρχων εὐεργετῶν τῆς πόλεως);[1026] in the 60s, Diodoros Pasparos is called a benefactor 'through his ancestors'.[1027] In 61/60 a Plutarchos of Maionia is praised as being of the 'first family':[1028] this is the earliest evidence for a hierarchical conception of virtuousness, founded specifically and openly on the notion that some families were superior to others. By the late 1st century BCE we encounter the rhetoric of being εὐγενής, closely tied to service to the imperial cult: thus G. Julius Epikrates is adorned with good birth, brilliance, and renown (εὐγενήᾳ τε καὶ λαμπρότητ[ι καὶ δό]ξῃ κεκοσ|μημένος).[1029] Εὐγενεία is not a quality that one finds in the public language of the Hellenistic period. The crises of the Mithridatic and Civil wars which had produced influential civic ambassadors and 'super-ambassadors' formed the crucible in which this reification of ancestry took place. This is not only because the tendencies to elitism over the 2nd century BCE (as detailed in chapter 3) would have established a firmer sense of elite exclusivity by the mid-1st century, but also because figures of this time were memorable for their benefactions in unprecedented ways. It is noteworthy that Theophanes of Mytilene,

[1025] For the idea of surpassing ancestral virtue, see also *SEG* 57.1198 ll. 11-13 (17/16 BCE).
[1026] *I.Iasos* 98 ll. 1-2.
[1027] *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 5 ll. 22-23, 31, *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 6α l. 47. Note also *TAM* V.2 937 ll. 4-8 and *Syll*.[3] 730 ll. 27-29 (from Olbia).
[1028] *TAM* V.1 514 ll. 3-4.
[1029] *SEG* 44.940a ll. 7-8; see also *SEG* 32.1243 l. 5, *I.Sardis* 7 l. 122, *SEG* 39.1194 ll. 8-9, *I.Magnesia* 163 ll. 2-3, *SEG* 44.872 ll. 7-11.

Theopompos of Knidos, or Epikrates of Miletos, for instance, continued to be remembered and evoked by their descendants in the 1st century CE and later still, reflecting continuity largely unprecedented for earlier Hellenistic notables.[1030]

Praise for being *worthy* of one's ancestors in Hellenistic style still persists in the early empire,[1031] but is increasingly joined by the notion that innate, ancestrally derived virtue was an honourable quality itself. Honorific statue-bases more and more emphasise that their honorand was descended from benefactors, like the Iasian decree for Melanion;[1032] some, like a base for the gymnasiarch Iason at Miletos of the 1st century CE, even dedicate more space to the fact of being descended from benefactors (eight lines) than his achievements as gymnasiarch alone (three lines).[1033] The deeds of one's ancestors could form, as one moves into the 1st century CE, 'benefactions' in themselves. Several honorific inscriptions even praise honorands solely on account of the deeds of their ancestors, as an extension of the more common, and already established, genre of honour for the achievements of a close relative, like a father or son.[1034] In a manner somewhat analogous to the emergence of couple-dedications at Stratonikeia, the commemorative inscriptions of Miletos' *prophetai* and *hydrophoroi* become voluble about lineage and antecedence from the mid-1st century BCE in ways which are unprecedented in earlier texts. The most notable and earliest case is Eudemos (*prophetes* 41/40 BCE), who boasted of a lineage of civic benefactors extending back to the 4th century BCE; his granddaughter, Berenike Minnis

[1030] Theopompos' female descendant: *I.Knidos* 71 ll. 1-3; new Theophanes: *SEG* 29.741 ll. 1-2; Epikrates' statue re-erected by descendant: *SEG* 44.938 ll. 17-22. Note also a mid-1st-century descendant of Lykomedes, the triumviral tetrarch of Komana (*I.Didyma* 107 ll. 18-20), and a 1st-century Koan who mentions his father as ambassador to the Senate in the Mithridatic wars, and grandfather of the late 2nd century: *IG* XII.4 1036 ll. 1-9, with Buraselis (2000) 5-24.
[1031] E.g. *MAMA* IV 162 ll. 6-10, *I.Ephesos* 650 l. 15.
[1032] *IG* XII.6 296 ll. 3-5, 297 ll. 4-6, 327 ll. 3-4, 328 ll. 5-8; *I.Mylasa* 402 ll. 4-7; *I.Mylasa* 411 ll. 4-5; *I.Iasos* 90 l. 7, 117 ll. 3-4; see *I.Iasos* 89 ll. 4-6, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.612 l. 3, *I.Perge* 23 l. 22 for descent from virtuous ancestors.
[1033] *Milet* I.9 309 ll. 4-11.
[1034] Praise for the achievements of one's γένος or ancestors: *I.Iasos* 96 ll. 4-7, 97 ll. 9-12, *La Carie* 59 ll. 9-11, *TAM* V.3 1441 ll. 2-3, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.518 ll. 6-9, 12.312 ll. 8-11, 12.905 ll. 5-9, *MAMA* XI 2 ll. 3-6.

would do the same in 6/5 BCE.[1035] At Aphrodisias some were honoured as being of the 'first' family.[1036] A remarkable but unsurprising consequence of the reification of ancestry as an honourable quality is the public display of claims to deep historical and even mythological heritage, like Potamon of Mytilene, who was descended from Penthilos, king of the Aiolians,[1037] or notables from Kos and Samos whose honours evoked Asklepios, Herakles and Alkibiades as ancestors.[1038] Mithridates of Pergamon and a Ti. Claudius Philisteus of Teos were compared to mythological founders,[1039] while a M. Antonius Meleager from Alabanda was said to descend from unnamed kings.[1040] Such specific claims may have been in part due to the increasing Romanity of civic ruling classes, but must be seen primarily as only the most exceptional instances of a broader concern with euergetic heredity.[1041] It is also noteworthy that ancestry-claims seem largely to have been confined to indigenous civic elites, forming a means of legitimating social status not available to resident Roman benefactors: a tell-tale case is A. Mussius Aper, who was praised at Iasos for εὐγενεία, but one which seems more to denote his rhetorical and poetical attainments than 'high birth'.[1042]

[1035] *I.Didyma* 259, with Chiricat (2005) 207-211 and Günther (2014) 160-161, and *I.Didyma* 345. 1st-century *prophetai* and *hydropohoroi* mentioning ancestral lineage: *I.Didyma* 346 ll. 3-17, 339 ll. 3-18, 334 ll. 4-13, 343 ll. 3-19, 272 ll. 4-5. This evocation of ancestry may even reflect heightening competition: Marcellesi (2005) 97-98, 104-108.
[1036] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.207 l. 4, 11.18 ll. 6-7, 11.508 ll. 4, 22-23, 12.202 ll. 7-8, 12.203 ll. 5-6, 12.512 ll. 6-7; for 'founding family', see below; see also *I.Ephesos* 3825 ll. 16-17.
[1037] *IG* XII Suppl. 7 ll. 2-3, with Parker (1991) 116 and Ellis-Evans (2019) 265-276.
[1038] *IG* XII.4 841 ll. 5-6, 820 ll. 4-8 and 842 ll. 4-8, with Pugliese Carratelli (1994) and Bosnakis and Hallof (2010) 344-348; *IG* XII.6 300 l. 3, 310 ll. 8-9. A Sardian notable claimed to be an Athenian by descent: *I.Sardis* 40 l. 12.
[1039] *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 407 n. 36 ll. 5-6 and *MDAI(A)* 24 (1899) 177 n. 27 l. 5 (new founder after Pergamos and Philetairos); *LBW* 108 (new Athamas); in general, Strubbe (1984-1986) 297-298.
[1040] *I.Nordkarien* 220 ll. 5-6.
[1041] *Pace* Spawforth (2012) 40-41, who is too emphatic about Romanity.
[1042] For ancestry as legitimation, see also Zuiderhoek (2009) 140-146. The only other 1st-century CE instances of resident Roman ancestry-claims are *IGR* IV 783 ll. 10-11 (albeit of the vigorous Roman population in Phrygia) and *I.Didyma* 343, although based on the *hydrophoros*' grandfather's service as a centurion.

Double exemplarities before city and family

This reification of ancestry in the early empire had important consequences for the function and character of civic honorific exemplarity. In short, family members come to stand alongside the civic community as an audience to honourable action. The resultant doubling of exemplarity, with praise now facing not only the city but the family also, thereby involves a further aspect, of praise directed to the family being explicitly and publicly witnessed, and thus conceptually integrated with exemplarity to the city. One concrete reflection of this is the inclusion of praise for domestic virtues, as in the mid-1st-century CE decree for Attalos from Julia Gordos, which lauds him not only for his public career, but also for having been a devoted father, compassionate to his son-in-law, and loving to his grandchildren.[1043] Other Lydian decrees, likewise for male honorands and not only women, include similar praise;[1044] this may be due in part to the unusually complex and extensive kinship structures particular to Lydia.[1045] The ethos of publicly commemorating virtuousness towards the family in a manner commensurate to 'traditional' praise for virtuousness to the community is nonetheless traceable elsewhere in early imperial Asia.

The most notable sign of this province-wide concretisation of the family-unit as an audience to honorific exemplarity (indeed traceable across Asia Minor and Greece generally too) is the increasingly popularity of what one might call the 'public private' honorific statue. For example, a base from Magnesia:[1046]

> [ἡ] βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἐτείμησαν
> Ἀμύνταν Μυωνίδου γένει καὶ

[1043] *SEG* 62.917 ll. 23-28.
[1044] Attalos' grandson and namesake: *SEG* 62.918 ll. 12-13 (compassion to relatives); his wife Stratonike: *TAM* V.1 688 ll. 7-13 (model mother and mother-in-law); a Theophilos: *TAM* V.1 687 ll. 12-13, 17 (a 'house-orderly' (οἰκοδεσπότης) life, sympathy to his wife).
[1045] See for example: *TAM* V.2 702-705, Robert (1969-1990) 2.1344-1346.
[1046] *I.Magnesia* 131; for other 1st-century BCE cases, *I.Magnesia* 153, *Milet* I.9 309, *I.Sardis* 31, *I.Erythrai* 43.

δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ καὶ σωφροσύνῃ
διενένκαντα. Πλουταρχὶς
Ἀριστίωνος Μιννὶς καὶ Μυων[ί]-
δης Ἀμύντου τὸν ἑαυτῶν υἱ-
ὸν ἀνέθηκαν.

The council and people honoured Amyntas son of Myonides, distinguished for his family, renown, virtue, and prudence. Ploutarchis Minnis daughter of Aristion and Myonides son of Amyntas dedicated (this statue of) their son.

Equal space is afforded to both the main 'civic' honorific formula and the 'private' formula presenting the honours by Amyntas' parents. The virtues that have resonance in the community – his birth, renown, virtue and wisdom – are thereby presented not only as civic virtues, but also as the product of an 'alternative' persona, as the son of Ploutarchis and Myonides. This sort of double honouring is largely unattested in the Hellenistic period, where private honours for family members or friends are never simultaneously expressed as public ones, even if they did ultimately have 'public' resonance. The meshing of public and private formulas happens first around the turn of the 1st century BCE, where for instance an honorific dedication for Thrasyboulos by his wife reads 'Megiste…set up the statue of her husband Thrasyboulos son of Philios, with which the *demos* had honoured him, for his virtue and goodwill towards it'.[1047] Here the private honorific formula still takes precedence, and the public writ is only included awkwardly at the end. The double formula found on Amyntas' base forms the developed, formalised version of this, and becomes quite common across the 1st century CE.[1048] In longer realisations, like a base for L. Nonius Aristodamas at Kos, honoured by the city for his career as *monarchos*, imperial cult priest, *agonothetes*, ambassador to Rome,[1049] but also by his foster-daughter and client (ll. 18-23), the dual

[1047] *I.Priene2014* 250. Note also *IG* XII.9 236 (c. 100 BCE), where the Eretrians honoured Theopompos with two statues (ll. 32-38), and separately instructed that the statues of his sons and daughter, originally set up by Theopompos, be inscribed with a public honorific formula (ll. 48-51).
[1048] Some illustrative examples: *I.Ephesos* 650, 3032, *I.Tralleis* 75, 77, *I.Magnesia* 160-163, *I.Iasos* 117, 122-123, *TAM* V.2 978, *MAMA* VI 265, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 7.8, 11.4.
[1049] *IG* XII.4 822 ll. 4-18.

exemplarity of a civic career would have been even starker – here, the final unqualified justification for the honour in Aristodamas' 'piety and gratitude' may equally refer to the sentiments of the city as to those of the statue's dedicators.

The public takeover of private statue-honours in the early empire was not total,[1050] but has an interesting side-effect. The process can be traced back to the 2nd century BCE, when monumental statues for family members, which had typically been set up by family members as private dedications, and sometimes in purpose-built exedras centred around a key male family member, are increasingly set up by civic authorities.[1051] The family-group for Archippe of Kyme, including her father and brother, is an early example.[1052] By the 1st century BCE, the setting up of familial exedras seems to have become a predominantly public honour, or at least publicly erected exedras are more common than ever: they probably comprised an exceptional honour, and are accorded only to the most significant benefactors, like Roman officials, and often to higher-ranked ones like governors.[1053] One effect, however, of the reification of ancestry, and the tendency to formalise the dual public and private nature of civic honouring, may have been an increased interest in emphasising posterity. A good illustration of this is the mid-1st-century exedra for G. Julius Theopompos and his wife, sons and daughter, which is centred on his achievements as the city's saviour, and hence emphasises the role of his children in perpetuating this – a role that, in this case, had quite public implications in the future preservation of Knidos' constitution.[1054] While the family exedra ultimately has its generic antecedents in the dynastic statue-groups of the

[1050] 'Traditional' private honorific statues with dedicatory inscriptions by family members alone continue; e.g. *SEG* 51.1618, *TAM* V.2 1120, *MAMA* IV 160, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.530, *IGR* IV 1565; the 'public private' double-formula may have been a special privilege, but is nonetheless novel.
[1051] Von Thüngen (1994) 34-35.
[1052] *SEG* 33.1035 ll. 1-5, 33.1037 ll. 12-14; see also *Oropos* 294 (150-100 BCE) ll. 17-25; in general, Van Bremen (1996) 183-187, Ma (2013) 235-237.
[1053] Honours for family members of Roman officials: Balty (1988) 34-37, with examples from Erkelenz (2003) 253-255, 281-282, 289, 305-306, 310. For exedras becoming largely public in the 1st BCE, Von Thüngen (1994) 34-35; the only exception is *I.Lindos* 131. Public statues for women also rare before 1st century BCE: Dillon (2010) 38-39, Van Bremen (1996) 184-190.
[1054] *I.Knidos* 51-55.

4th century, which emphasise ancestral lineage and look to the past,[1055] from the 1st century BCE onwards the honouring of family members, and indeed of individuals generally, reveals a heightened fixation on children. Telesteira, Theopompos' wife, is even praised as a grandmother (τέκνων τέκνα παρέστασε τᾶι πατρίδι),[1056] while slightly earlier Diodoros Pasparos was honoured in order to extend his zeal 'to the children of his children'.[1057]

From the reign of Augustus onwards, one even begins to find single honorific acts not only for multiple family members and couples, but also for parents and children.[1058] One of the last decrees of the *koinon* for Menogenes of Sardeis further grants his son Isidoros a gilt shield-portrait on account of the 'finest hopes' placed in him; the primacy of familial continuity is highlighted by the local replication of this honour for Isidoros (not Menogenes, importantly), by the inhabitants of the sanctuary of Zeus and Artemis.[1059] The impetus for this came from the *koinon*, as we saw in the last chapter, but equally also from a concretising preoccupation with descendance. The decree for his close contemporary, Kleanax of Kyme, does not specifically honour him alongside his son Sarapion, but does explicitly praise Kleanax for having nurtured his son in the right way, educating him in letters, and raising him up to be, as he was already proving to be, a protector and helper of the city.[1060] Furthermore, Sarapion had been officially granted the φιλο-compound title of φιλοπάτωρ, and father and son had also been praised in an earlier decree for their φιλοστοργία (ll. 26-28): the most notable aspect of these details is that they reflect the formalisation of private filial piety as a public civic virtue, much as we find in the Lydian decrees mentioned

[1055] Hintzen-Bohlen (1990), Van Bremen (1996) 173-180, Ma (2013) 198-200.
[1056] *I.Knidos* 52 l. 8, with Thériault (2003) 240-241.
[1057] *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 6α ll. 26-29.
[1058] Husband and wife: *I.Miletoupolis* 25, *IGR* IV 1348, *MAMA* IX 28, *I.Stratonekeia* 527, 1428, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 1.7, 1.8; parent and child/children: *I.Sardis* 41, *I.Sardis* II 337, *I.Nordkarien* 467, *I.Smyrna* 641; whole family: *IGR* IV 1348, *TAM* V.2 1434, *I.Nordkarien* 463.
[1059] *I.Sardis* 7 ll. 112-117, 132-139.
[1060] *SEG* 32.1243 ll. 21-25.

above.[1061] What arguably distinguishes this early imperial meshing of private and public – already perceptible from the 2nd century BCE, as seen – is the emphasis precisely on the familial future, and not only the honorand himself. Thus, while late 2nd-century BCE citizens like Heroides of Priene and Polemaios of Kolophon had notably opened their houses to the civic population on the occasion of their marriage-day – a strong indication of the 'domestication' of public life – the similar event in Kleanax's decree a century later is not centred on his *own* marriage, but rather the marriage of his *daughter*.[1062]

Perhaps the most striking indication of this concern for progeny are the so-called 'consolation' decrees that emerge practically only in the imperial period, in which a deceased individual is honoured posthumously, and public consolation is specifically conveyed to family members (παραμυθήσασθαι, παρηγορῆσθαι). Apollonis received this honour at Kyzikos, and others too – not all were youths, but youths do feature prominently.[1063] Consolation, importantly, is not present in the only comparable late Hellenistic decree for Philonides of Synnada: while his death evokes the lost hopes of his illustrious family, the point of his decree, which granted major honours possibly even including cult, is fundamentally to bring attention to the excellence of Philonides' virtues and to encourage others to imitate them.[1064] The formal consolation offered to the mother of T. Antonius Lysimachos Grypos at Aphrodisias to 'bear her grief with courage

[1061] For similar compounds (of 1st-century CE date) relating to family members: *I.Tralleis* 75 l. 16, 162 l. 10, *I.Didyma* 281 n. 15, *I.Sardis* 41 l. 11, *I.Aphrodisias2007* l. 27; cf. Veligianni (2001) 63, Heller (2020) 37-40.
[1062] *SEG* 32.1243 l. 19. Heroides: *I.Priene2014* 65 ll. 162-170, Polemaios: *SEG* 39.1243iv ll. 24-34; also *IG* XII.5 863 ll. 5-7, 864 ll. 5-8, 865 ll. 9-12 (Tenos, 2nd century BCE) records the wedding of Medeios' daughter to Souniades, but the two men are also honoured together in these decrees; cf. Robert and Robert (1989) 50, Strubbe (2001) 36; see, with more nuance, Van Bremen (1996) 163-164.
[1063] For key studies, Buresch (1894), Ehrhardt (1994), Strubbe (2001), Pleket (1994), Kokkinia (2007). 1st-century examples: *I.Knidos* 72 ll. 12-14, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.309 ll. 15-17 (with Van Bremen (1996) 148 n. 20 for date); 12.207 ll. 11, 14-15, 12.704a ll. 11-13, b ll. 15-21, c ll. 16-21, *IG* XII.4 1065 ll. 7-8, *SEG* 61.1124 ll. 19-22, 1125 ll. 11-14, *I.Mylasa* 411 ll. 10-12, *SEG* 62.798a ll. 6, 9-10; also *I.Iasos* 122 l. 16 123 l. 8; possible cases: *SEG* 63.1108 (Poimanenon, late Hellenistic/early imperial). Deceased youths mourned for dashing hopes: *I.Kibyra* 56 ll. 8-9, *I.Priene2014* 60; cf. Kleijwegt (1991) 225-233.
[1064] Michel, *Recueil* 545 ll. 13-19; possible cult: Strubbe (2004) 318-319.

(εὐθαρσῶς)',[1065] on the other hand, should be regarded as an additional 'honour' to the deceased, and one that quite specifically brought attention to the phenomenon of dual exemplarity outlined in the preceding paragraphs: consolation emphasised the exemplarity of the deceased as a citizen, but also as a model for the deceased's family. The fact, however, that such gestures of consolation were inscribed, and that we have consolation decrees at all, suggests a third layer of exemplarity implied by the concretising collusion of public and private spheres in the early empire – namely, that the deceased's family should be *seen by the city* to be acting in model ways before each other, and conversely that the city should be seen to be engaging directly with the family's grief. This further layer would explain the open acts of public grief that sometimes precede consolation, as with the death of Apollonis at Kyzikos, as we saw earlier, or of an Athanagora at Knidos, which provoked the people to pour out in disbelief and misery. Such public displays of grief were doubtless deeply felt, but also had a political dimension, in reinforcing the publicness of the deceased's family's grief, and hence the publicness of the stoicism with which they were implored to bear it.[1066]

From exemplarity to memorability: a new ethos for civic euergetism

Why it is that the three aspects of euergetic ideology discussed above – the tendency to present office-holding and benefactions as familial affairs, the reification of ancestry, and the formalisation of dual exemplarity, should have concretised in more specific ways only from the late 1st century BCE onwards is more difficult to say. A significant factor, although largely impossible to measure, may have been the change in fiscal regime after 48 BCE, when authority over taxation was transferred from *publicani* to the cities themselves: it is

[1065] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.204 ll. 14-15; also 12.704b ll. 20-21, c ll. 19-20; for the stoic overtones, Strubbe (1998) 52-58.
[1066] *I.Knidos* 72 ll. 3-5, 9-11; cf. Van Bremen (1996) 161-162.

possible that the increased burden on civic notables this entailed may have encouraged some to focus attention on euergetism and liturgical office-holding, which may have served as grounds for immunity from such taxation. In these circumstances emphasis on familial continuity would have assured a family's continued role as benefactors, and hence exemption from furnishing the *tributum capitis*.[1067] The ideological role of the imperial family in encouraging imitation at the local level must also have been a factor, even if this imitation took the form of enhancing pre-existing trends, rather than creating the notion of familial and dynastic continuity *ex nihilo*. The contemporaneity of the honours for the sons of Menogenes of Sardeis and Kleanax of Kyme with the ascension to manhood of Lucius and Gaius Caesar in 5-2 BCE, for instance, is remarkable.[1068] Whatever the precise causal factors for this change, however, what I wish to emphasise in this last section of the chapter is the way in which this concretisation of familial ideology forms a tipping-point moment in the evolving meanings of honorific exemplarity, whereby the primarily protreptic role of honours in the Hellenistic period in encouraging replication was increasingly joined, in the early imperial period, by the function of commemorating individual achievements as unique and irreplicable.

The public honouring of citizens had been intrinsically bound up, since the 4th century BCE, with the permanence and memorial character of the honours granted. At the same time, the functions of this memoriality were largely centred, across the classical and Hellenistic period, on encouraging social replication and emulation by fellow citizens.[1069] This is not, fundamentally, an ethic that disappears even under the early empire. A notable feature of the rhetoric around exemplarity, however, as one moves across the 1st century

[1067] For Caesar's reform, Le Teuff (2017) 61-69. Some citizens were even honoured precisely for benefactions relating to relieving the pressure of the capital tax taxation: Ti. Claudius Nikasion at Ilion, *I.Ilion* 28 ll. 13-15; an unknown individual at Lampsakos, *I.Lampsakos* 10 ll. 3-5; Tate at Herakleia Salbake, *La Carie* 67 ll. 11-13; Satyros at Tenos donates money to cover the city's tax obligations, *IG* XII.5 946 ll. 20-22.
[1068] As adumbrated by Rowe (2002) 148-149.
[1069] E.g. at Athens: Lambert (2011) 194-202.

BCE, is that hortatory clauses outlining the exemplary, protreptic function of the honours conferred become scarcer. The baroque example of such a clause in Hellenistic Asia is that in the decree for Menas of Sestos:[1070]

> 'In order then that the people may be seen honouring fine and good men and receiving those who have been from the earliest manhood zealous for our common affairs and dedicated to seeking fame, and not to be falling short in returning gratitude, and that others, observing the honours conferred by the people on those who are fine and good, may become emulators of the finest deeds, and be encouraged towards virtue, and so that our common affairs may be increased when all are striving to achieve glory and are always securing something honourable for the fatherland…'

Clauses of this kind are still widely attested in other 2nd- and early 1st-century decrees;[1071] in what decrees that we do possess from the mid-1st century BCE onwards, however, such clauses are encountered less and less,[1072] or place a notably greater interest in the memorial, rather than solely exemplary, function of the honours. Menogenes of Sardeis' honours by the *koinon* were not meant primarily to exhort others to be like him, but to 'testify (μαρτυρῆσαι) to the man that he never fails to serve the affairs of the *koinon* of Asia, and has always been a cause for good';[1073] a clause from a fragmentary early 1st-century CE decree from Halikarnassos provides a threefold hortatory function, 'in order to encourage others towards virtue and the finest deeds, to preserve undying memory of the affairs that had been set aright for the fatherland by him, and for the excellence of his children and descendants'.[1074] Here exemplarity to others, self-memory, and exemplarity to one's family, feature as distinct motivations, and strongly indicate the role of familial ideology in

[1070] *I.Sestos* 1 ll. 86-92.
[1071] E.g. *I.Magnesia* 92b ll. 7-9, *I.Metropolis* 1b ll. 32-34 (Apollonios of Metropolis), *I.Mylasa* 869 ll. 4-7 (Phaidros), *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 273 n. 10 ll. 31-32 (Metrodoros, Pergamon), *I.Iasos* 98 ll. 29-31; in the 1st century, see also *I.Nordkarien* 211 ll. 34-40 (Pyrrachos of Alabanda); *I.Priene2014* 68 ll. 128-131
[1072] A rare exception: *I.Perge* 23 ll. 15-17 (early 1st century CE).
[1073] *I.Sardis* 8 ll. 107-109.
[1074] Cousin and Diehl (1890) 97-99 n. 4 ll. 8-12.

encouraging this turn towards the memorial. The decree's evocation of 'undying memory' already has precedents from the late 2nd century, when ἀίδιος/ἀθάνατος/αἰώνιος μνήμη is increasingly presented as one of the motivations for conferring honour.[1075] The concretisation of familial ideology in the early empire, however, generated greater interest in memorability. By the later 1st century CE, an Attinas Meliton of Aphrodisias received statue-honours because 'the mindset of such men is deserving of honour and fitting testimony (μαρτυρία)'.[1076] It is this language of 'testimony', μαρτυρία, that increasingly attaches to the exemplary function of civic honouring; a contemporary notable of Julia Gordos, Theophilos, received posthumous honours that were intended encourage others towards virtue, but only so that they may obtain such μαρτυρία, and not primarily because this would contribute to the community.[1077] Most strikingly, the 'testimony' embodied by Attinas' statues at Aphrodisias would be borne out, so his decree stipulates, by accompanying inscriptions that conformed to his εὐγενεία, and the solemnity and modesty of his life.[1078]

This subtle ideological proclivity for testimony over exemplum should also be observed in a widespread change in honorific formulas inscribed on statue-bases, framed around consecutive participial clauses, which become longer and more detailed from the mid-1st century BCE onwards. We might compare, for instance, the honorific inscription for

[1075] *SEG* 33.1039 ll. 23-24; ἀίδιος μνήμη appears in relation to the Attalids: *I.Pergamon* 160 ll. (Athenian decree for Eumenes II, 175 BCE); also *SEG* 37.1312 l. 6 (gymnasiarch from Mallos, worthy of αἰώνιος μνήμη, 2nd BCE); from the 1st century onwards: *IG* XII.9 236 ll. 16-17 (Theopompos of Eretria for seeking ἀθάνατον ὑπόμνημα, 100 BCE), *OGIS* 438 l. 12 (Herostratos striving for αἰώνιος μνήμη), *Chankowski.DiodPasp* 6γ ll. 17-18 (Diodoros Pasparos regarding nothing greater than ἀίδιος μνήμη); note also *I.Ephesos* 6 ll. 23-24 (Diodoros the gymnasiarch motivated to maintain a conviction worthy of μνήμη, late 2nd BCE), *I.Priene2014* 68 l. 15, 69 l. 17 (Zosimos motivated by the μνήμη guaranteed by the people's honours), *IGR* IV 1703 ll. 24-26 (the μνήμη of Nassius' children to remain for all time through the honour); see also Habicht (1998).
[1076] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.206 ll. 9-11.
[1077] *TAM* V.1 687 ll. 22-25.
[1078] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.206 ll. 22-24.

Menippos of Klaros of the late 2nd century BCE with the statue-base inscription for Teimokles of Aphrodisias of the later 1st century CE:[1079]

> ὁ δῆμος | Μένιππον Ἀπολ| λωνίδου τὸν φύ|σει Εὐμήδους | εὐεργέτην ὄντα | καὶ περὶ τὴν πολι|τείαν ἐκτενῆ καὶ | φιλάγαθον καὶ προσ|τάντα τῆς πατρί|δος ἐν καιροῖς | ἀναγκαίοις
>
> The people honoured Menippos son of Apollonides, natural son of Eumedes, for being their benefactor, zealous in regard to public life, and benevolent as a leader of his fatherland in difficult times.
>
> ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος [ἐτεί-
> μησαν ταῖς καλλίσταις
> καὶ μεγίσταις τειμαῖς star
> Τειμοκλέα Ἀπολλωνίου
> τοῦ Ὑψικλέους ἄνδρα σοφὸν
> καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθόν γένους
> πρώτου καὶ ἐνδοξοτάτου
> γυμνασιαρχήσαντα καὶ
> στεφανοφηρήσαντα με-
> γαλοψύχως καὶ φιλοδόξως
> καὶ ἀρχιερατεύσαντα τοῦ
> Αὐτοκράτορος καὶ ἀγωνο-
> θετήσαντα καὶ δὶς ἑστιάσ-
> αντα τὸν δῆμον καὶ πάν-
> τα ποιήσαντα μεγαλομε-
> ρῶς λάμπρότατα καὶ πολυ-
> τελέστατα ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀξίως
> καὶ ἀναλογούντως τῆι πατρί-
> vac. δι καὶ τῶι γένει leaf
>
> The council and people honoured with the finest and greatest honours Teimokles son of Apollonios son of Hysikles, a wise man, fine and good, of a leading family of the highest renown, who was a generous and zealous gymnasiarch and *stephanephoros*, a high-priest of the emperor, *agonothetes*, who twice feasted the people and accomplished all deeds with magnificence, splendour and lavishness from his own funds, in a manner worthy of and appropriate to his fatherland and family.

In listing achievements with participial clauses, both present examples of the 'Anatolian style' honorific formula.[1080] While we know that Menippos' inscription derived from a text

[1079] *SEG* 37.957, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.512.
[1080] For the 'Anatolian style', Ma (2013) 32.

agreed on in his decree, however,[1081] we cannot be sure that this was the case with Teimokles', whose sheer length argues against this. Rather, we seem here to be presented with a redaction of the text of an earlier decree in the format of an honorific formula. Moreover, this sort of redacted honorific decree on statue-bases becomes the main epigraphic form of civic honours in the early empire. The earliest major examples of Teimokles' 'long honorific formula' come from around 50 BCE, just as familial ideology begins to crystallise.[1082] At 3rd- to 1st-century BCE Hellenistic Priene, the dominant form of public civic honour is the inscribed decree (on stelai or architectural blocks), for foreigners and citizens, while statue-bases employing honorific formulas (excluding private statue-honours) are the minority (seventy decrees to twenty bases); at Aphrodisias, where inscribed honours largely emerge only in the 1st century BCE, the dominant form is by contrast the inscribed statue-base from the 1st century BCE to 2nd century CE (seventy-eight bases to twenty-one decrees).[1083] This change from decrees to statue-bases is well-recognised,[1084] but is not absolute – decrees do continue to be inscribed, albeit in smaller numbers, in the imperial period.[1085] The concurrent change in the character of honorific formulas, as these become summaries of the texts of decrees, as outlined above, does nonetheless suggest a general change in habit and mentality. In brief, these longer formulas further corroborate the view that civic honouring was increasingly regarded as being memorial and commemorative, rather than only exemplary and protreptic. The honorific formula presents obvious advantages over the decree, with its formal components of motivation and

[1081] *SEG* 39.1244iii ll. 29-34.
[1082] *I.Sardis* 27 (Iollas, Sardeis), *SEG* 31.899 (Diotrephes, Antioch), *SEG* 63.1333 (M. Antonius Idagras, Patara); cf. Forster (2018) 402-403.
[1083] Both figures drawn from *I.Priene2014* and *I.Aphrodisias2007*.
[1084] Gerlach (1908) 6-8, 43-50, 107-110, Klaffenbach (1966) 65, Forster (2018) 381, 402-403, Ma (2013) 31-33, and now Heller (2016) 75-79.
[1085] Known honorific decrees for civic notables from western Asia Minor from c. 27 BCE to 100 CE, in roughly chronological order: *SEG* 57.1198, *I.Sardis* 8, *SEG* 32.1243, *I.Kyme* 19, *IG* XII.2 58, 59, Suppl. 124, *GIBM* 892, 893, Cousin and Diehl (1890) 97-98 n. 4, *I.Keramos* 14, *SEG* 28.953, *IGR* IV 144-146, *I.Ephesos* 614b-c, *I.Magnesia* 113, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 11.16, *I.Perge* 23, 66, 67, *TAM* V.1 687, 688, *SEG* 62.917-918, *I.Iasos* 99, *I.Ephesos* 27a, *I.Knidos* 71, 73-75, *I.Assos* 28; see also Quaß (1993) 29 n. 69.

honouring clauses, where priority is given to conveying a brief yet imposing impression of the honorand's achievements; in allowing for long strings of participles, even details of specific benefactions, like building works, can be accommodated alongside generic praise for virtues and civic offices. Such formulas, even lengthier than Teimokles', become a feature of the most distinguished notables in the early empire.[1086] 'Short' honorific formulas of the Hellenistic period continue, of course, but even among these there is a tendency to include specific benefactions.[1087]

Honorific formulas on statue-bases were still fundamentally 'civic', being framed around service to the community, and moral qualities dependent on this. They present civic bodies as authoritative honour-granting institutions, but subtly differ from decrees in doing so. We miss the key features of fully enunciated decrees: the tone is not propositional or adjudicatory, but proclamatory, encomiastic, even axiomatic. The succinctness of long honorific formulas eschews the elongated rhetoric of the late Hellenistic career-decrees, and is of a piece with civic honorific titles and the acclamatory acts they presuppose. Such formulas thus evoke the ritual speech-acts of praise with more directness than decrees, and their relative straightforwardness as linguistic units potentially allowed viewer-readers to recite an honorand's deeds more easily than lengthy decrees, which were often summarised by the proclamations of public heralds. The trend towards inscribed statue-bases over decrees may thereby, ironically, have favoured a more 'democratic' reception of honorific monuments. At the same time, in articulating the individuality of an honorand's deeds extended honorific formulas reduced the force of the 'elsewhere-ness' characteristic of Hellenistic-era statue-captions: the length of these inscriptions meant that one was not invited to think about a decree existing elsewhere, or the civic institutions that underpinned

[1086] E.g. *I.Iasos* 122, *I.Laodikeia am Lykos* 82, *I.Magnesia* 163 *TAM* V.2 991, *IGR* IV 316, *MAMA* IV 142, *I.Perge* 58, *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.1006.
[1087] E.g. *I.Iasos* 114 (left money for oil), *MDAI(A)* 35 (1910) 475 n. 62 (built baths), *I.Labraunda* 65 (built baths).

it, but rather to conceive of them as 'decrees' in themselves, distinctly shaped by the personality of the honorand.[1088] Early imperial honorific statues seem, in this reading, to have been increasingly concerned with presenting individual uniqueness and inimitability, rather than serving as an exemplary model of civic virtue, as had been the case for most of the Hellenistic period.

This is not to suggest that uniqueness or inimitability had not been possible connotations of earlier Hellenistic decrees or honours – indeed, the unusual wave of idiosyncratic career-decrees of the late 2nd century BCE at Priene, Klaros or Sestos, and the inflation of the statue-habit from this time, suggest movements in precisely this direction, even if they are still predominantly centred on producing idealised images of civic behaviour.[1089] What is perhaps distinctive about the statue-base revolution from the 1st century BCE onwards is that the individuality captured in lengthier honorific formulas meant that they came to embody ritual spaces tied to the memory of the benefactor and his benefactions in new ways, potentially blurring the boundaries between 'honour' and 'benefaction'. The statues of G. Stertinius Orpex and his daughter in the agora and stadium at Ephesos, for instance, would be the loci for annual monetary distributions to the council and *gerousia*.[1090] While ritual activity had always taken place at statues, what we know of this in the Hellenistic and classical periods is confined to enactments of the exemplarity of the honorand (e.g. annual crowning, even sometimes cult-offerings); it is only from the 1st century CE onwards that one finds statues having the further role of acting as sites for the re-enactment of individualised forms of generosity tied personally to the honorand. These were still undoubtedly exemplary, but the memorial role is far more pronounced: councillors before Orpex's statues would have continually recalled not only the spirit of generosity he

[1088] 'Elsewhere-ness': Ma (2013) 36-37, 55.
[1089] Forster (2018) 269-326.
[1090] *I.Ephesos* 2113 with Engelmann (2004) 71 ll. 12-19, with Robert and Robert, *BE* 1944 162 pp. 225-226.

embodied, but the sense that 'Orpex' continued to give of his own resources.[1091] While honorific statues in the Hellenistic period largely directed the viewer's attention to the community around them, from the early imperial period onwards they arguably begin to assume a more static, memorial role, concentrating attention on the honorands and their benefactions.

Continuities of familial honour and benefaction at early imperial Aphrodisias

Moreover, honorific statues could also increasingly be conceived as 'belonging' to a family. A remarkable aspect of the honorific epigraphy of Aphrodisias in the early empire, the first major phase of the visibility of such honours in the city's history, is the overwhelming predominance of honours passed at the end of a public career, and posthumously conferred honours – statue-base inscriptions almost invariably feature lengthy honorific formulas outlining a series of civic services, or make the honorand's decease explicit. Of ninety-nine texts from the 1st century BCE to 2nd century CE, only ten clearly honour single benefactions or services.[1092] There are circumstantial reasons for this, in that many of these inscriptions come from the necropolis, and survive as *spolia* in the late antique city wall. The sheer predominance of posthumous or career honours, however, does seem to suggest that this state of preservation reflects mentalities towards civic honouring. In brief, it implies that public honours were conceived primarily as rewards for lengthy periods of service, that, moreover, had lived up to familial traditions in the scale and extent of the office-holding and public distributions they featured.

[1091] Ma (2013) 134, 246 for rituals before statues; benefactions at statues or tombs only from the early empire, e.g. *IGR* IV 661 ll. 4-6; posthumous distributions at statues quite common in the 2nd and 3rd centuries CE, e.g. *I.Ephesos* 2111 ll. 1-5 (2nd CE?), *TAM* V.2 926 ll. 8-13 (3rd CE), *TAM* V.3 1457 ll. 8-17 (2nd CE?).
[1092] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 5.101, 11.409, 12.513, 12.609, 12.646, 12.707, 12.716, 12.802, 15.260, 15.269.

As we saw with Attinas Meliton's decree, the long honorific formula could be understood to represent εὐγενεία, a trait that is also exalted in Teimokles' honours.[1093] It therefore served to embed the honorand within the dual exemplarity to city and family, and encourage competition, or, more accurately, present a picture of competition between such leading families as could afford to engage in it. It is precisely this sort of inter-familial frisson over euergetism that is the hallmark of Aphrodisias' early imperial civic life. While the imposing and numerous decrees and statues of Moschion and Heroides at Priene, for example, did serve as reminders to subsequent generations of politicians – so much so that Zosimos would emulate them, inasmuch as his decrees were inscribed on blocks above theirs – it is uncertain whether they formed 'familial' monuments.[1094] By contrast, the statues of the late 1st-century BCE statesman Kallikrates at Aphrodisias, whose inscriptions present early exemplars of the 'long honorific formula',[1095] were sufficiently regarded as familial monuments that they were restored by his descendant Kallikrates Molossos over a century later in the early 2nd century CE.[1096] That is, honorific statues were intertwined in the dual exemplarity of the early empire, and could become 'benefactions' of later descendants who had to be seen, like Kallikrates Molossos, to be living up to familial honour.

Kallikrates Molossos seems to have been particularly attached to his family's euergetic inheritance, restoring other ancestral dedications that had fallen into oblivion.[1097] The presumption underpinning this activity, that a benefaction continued in principle to remain under the purview of the benefactor's descendants, seems to have been widely held at Aphrodisias.[1098] For one it is noteworthy, as A.-V. Pont has observed, that building dedications here quite regularly present their benefactors as private individuals, often

[1093] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.512 ll. 6-7, 18-19.
[1094] Monumentality of Zosimos' decrees: *I.Priene2014* (vol. 2) pp. 182-183, Kah (2012) 67-68.
[1095] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.103, 12.402, 12.701 and Fröhlich (2013) 267-273.
[1096] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.402 ll. 14-17.
[1097] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 13.116.
[1098] See also *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.312 ll. 8-11, where an Attalos is praised for his ancestors' dedications.

neglecting to mention civic offices.[1099] Office-less dedications become more prevalent across the region, as was suggested above, and are tied undoubtedly to the increasingly dominant role of personal and familial wealth over citizenship in euergetic acts. At Aphrodisias, we also see how this predominance of wealth was corroborated by an insistence on familial continuity, perhaps even over office-holding and civic institutions, as a marker of honourability in the community. Building euergetism may have been particularly significant for its elite, as the epithet attached to some honorands from the late 1st century BCE onwards, that they descended from a 'first family and one that founded the city', would suggest: that is, one of those who contributed to Aphrodisias' *sympoliteia* with Plarasa, and also implicitly to its subsequent monumentalisation (τοῦ γένους συνεκτικότος τὴν πατρίδα).[1100]

The most spectacular manifestation of this attitude in the early 1st century CE would have been the Sebasteion, built by the two families of the brothers Eusebes and Menandros and the couple Menandros and Attalis Apphion, who dedicated the northern and southern porticos respectively. Remarkably, it was the descendants of these same families who restored and re-dedicated the relevant damaged sections after an earthquake under Claudius.[1101] None of these architraval dedications feature civic offices, and only honorific titles at most. Eusebes is also known to have built baths which were named after him.[1102] Such eponymous benefactions do not seem to have been uncommon. A gymnasium called the Diogeneianon was possibly named after the son of the Menandros of the Sebasteion's north portico.[1103] Attalis Apphion of the Sebasteion's south portico left aside money in her

[1099] Pont (2008a), especially 185-191.
[1100] *SEG* 54.1020 ll. 4-5 (Hermogenes), *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.3 ll. 6-9 (Nikoteimos Hierax), 12.4 ll. 4-6 (Adrastos), 12.5 ll. 6-8 (Ammia), 12.306i ll. 5-6, ii ll. 5-7 (Hermias and Apphia), 12.706 ll. 7-9 (Aristokles Molossos), 12.905 l. 8 (Artemon), 12.1006 ll. 3-5 (Iason), 15.262 ll. 7-14 (T. Flavius Apollinarios), with Chaniotis (2004) 382-383 and Reynolds (1982) 164-165.
[1101] For the families of Eusebes and Menandros and Menandros and Attalis, builders of the north and south porticos respectively, Pont (2008a) 185-189; for the restoration dedications: *I.Aphrodisias2007* 9.1, 9.25.
[1102] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 5.6 l. 5.
[1103] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.1111 l. 23, with Pont (2008b) 223.

will for the gymnasiarchy and *stephanephoria*, and can still be found lending her name to eponymous *stephanephoriai* in the 2nd and 3rd centuries.[1104] Yet another leading citizen, Aristokles Molossos, bequeathed a foundation towards annual distributions to the citizens, but also towards benefactions in the theatre: as we learn from the surviving dedications, these funds were named after Molossos (ἐκ τῶν Μολοσσιανῶν προσόδων).[1105] As posthumous dedications we do not find mention of Aristokles' civic offices, which he certainly held.[1106] Their very character as posthumous, and especially monumental architectural benefactions, is nonetheless significant, suggesting a strong desire to maintain the continuity of his family's prominence in public life; they were also commandeered by his foster-son Hermas. It is not coincidental that his son is found even as a member of the equestrian order, a gymnasiarch, and *stephanephoros*.[1107]

The strong familial associations of benefactions attested at Aphrodisias were part of broader trends across Asia, where one finds other examples of 'ancestral' benefactions,[1108] and, increasingly, posthumous foundations towards civic magistracies and benefactions from the 1st century BCE onwards, like those of Attalis Apphion and Aristokles Molossos. In such foundations the public identity of the benefactor is maintained well after death, somewhat in contrast to earlier Hellenistic foundations, which mainly concern private heroic cult organised around family members or specified associations.[1109] At Aphrodisias, however, we can further discern how such perpetuity of honour and benefaction through the family may also have generated conflict between familial and communal commemorative

[1104] E.g. *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.1109 ll. 14-15, 12.525 ll. 14-15, 13.147 ll. 15-17; for full sources, see Bourtzinatkou (2012) 110-111.
[1105] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.803 ll. 28-31; *I.Aphrodisias2007* 8.82, 8.108, 8.111, 8.112, 8.113 for the dedications in the theatre.
[1106] He was at least priest of Augustus: *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.1002i ll. 2-3.
[1107] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.706.
[1108] E.g. *I.Mylasa* 504 (ancestral wells); benefactions completed from a parent's will: *MAMA* VI 251, *I.Ephesos* 259b, 1139, *I.Iasos* 121 ll. 3-9.
[1109] E.g. *I.Kyme* 102, *I.Iasos* 114 ll. 5-6, 121, 245-248; Von Saldern (2006) 335-336 n. 26; for Hellenistic foundations, see most recently Parker (2010) 118-120.

priorities. In the early 2nd century, the people of Aphrodisias even seized the body of the deceased Tatia Attalis, and shouted in unison that she be buried in the city at the tomb of her grandfather Adrastos;[1110] similar acts of seizure and interrupted funerals can be traced in Karia.[1111] In Tatia's case, we are lucky to know her grandfather, Adrastos, of the mid-1st century, and even that his tomb had also faced a similar conflict with civic authorities;[1112] the fact a decree survives to relate this at all further reflects the persistence of familial memory in the city. It is an episode that reveals much about the way that the double pressure of public and private exemplarity was subtly changing the functions and meanings of civic honour.

At the end of an illustrious career the city had decreed burial for Adrastos in a tomb in the public workshops. He did not simply accept this honour, however, but proposed the alternative of burial in his private workshops, so that the city would not incur financial loss.[1113] This was an astute manoeuvre that, whether accepted or rejected, would bring him further praise, implying his modesty and community-mindedness.[1114] Most likely Adrastos' proposal was unsuccessful, and he was ultimately buried in public workshops (hence the inscription);[1115] the very fact the discussion centred on *workshops*, however, suggests a novelty of the early imperial period that contrasts, for instance, with the fixation with the gymnasium as the public burial-site *par excellence* in the late Hellenistic period.[1116] This was still intramural burial, but one that subtly differed in its ideological message. Like Apollonis of Kyzikos, Adrastos would not be buried in the institution most associated with the ideals of citizenship, but rather at a site that reflected his own euergetic personality,

[1110] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.205 ll. 15-16.
[1111] *I.Knidos* 71 l. 10, *I.Kaunos* 30 ll. 2-5; cf. Jones (1999b).
[1112] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 11.16.
[1113] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 11.16 ll. 3-11; Adrastos also honoured in *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.4 and 12.308.
[1114] Kuhn (2017b) 206-209.
[1115] For restoring lines 13-14 ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτῶν/ἑαυτῆς ἐργαστηριοις, instead of ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις ἐργαστηριοις, see Jones (1999b) 597-600.
[1116] See above chapter 2, and Chiricat (2005) and Fröhlich (2013) 259-274.

perhaps as an enterprising businessman. Public intramural burial at monuments and benefactions of the deceased is increasingly common at this time – Sextilius Pollio was buried close to his stoa-basilica at Ephesos, two Thasian brothers were buried close to the stoa they had built, a Prienian benefactor was interred near the theatre in the reign of Claudius.[1117] The familial tombs of Celsus (Ephesos) and Dio Chrysostom (Prousa) at their libraries in the early 2nd century represent only a more advanced stage of this process.[1118] What is significant here is that this reflects not only the domestication of public life, but something akin to its opposite – the publicization of private life, as familial benefactions were, in effect, made the new gymnasia. It is not that Adrastos shirked the gymnasium; in fact, he was honoured by the *neoi*, albeit with a career honorific inscription framed in a long honorific formula highlighting his public exemplarity, as a 'model of virtue',[1119] but an exemplarity expressed in a career that would have been difficult to replicate, as high-priest of the imperial cult, two-times gymnasiarch and *stephanephoros*, thrice *agonothetes*, and four-times *agoranomos*. In Adrastos' insistence on burial in his workshops, then, we observe how the elite family could begin, in the mid-1st century CE, to re-shape civic priorities. This dynamic underpins the success of the later family of Agreophon at Kaunos in turning down burial at the gymnasium,[1120] but also the touching case of a couple from Ephesos, M. Antonius Albus and Laevia Paulla, who both received public funeral rites, but were buried 'in the lands belonging to Albus over the crest.[1121]

[1117] For these cases, see Fröhlich (2013) 285-290.
[1118] Pliny *Ep.* 10.81; Celsus: Pont (2010) 105-106.
[1119] *I.Aphrodisias2007* 12.308 l. 23.
[1120] Agreophon: *I.Kaunos* 30 ll. 2-5, with Jones (1999b) 589-590, Kuhn (2017b) 212-213;
[1121] *I.Ephesos* 614b ll. 19-20 and 614c ll. 24-26.

Epilogue: remembering the benefactor at Kibyra

Aphrodisias' traditions of familial euergetism may have been unique. As a free city in inland Karia, it differs somewhat from the other communities we have encountered in this chapter – coastal entrepots of Asia like Ephesos, Iasos, Perge, Kyzikos – where familial ideology was arguably heightened through the interactions between local citizens and resident Romans. Somewhat in contrast, the honorific prominence of local families at Aphrodisias may derive from a conscious effort to promote such families at the expense of those of resident Romans.[1122] While a Clodia Rufilla could publicly dedicate a propylon in Phrygia,[1123] where resident Romans maintained a vigorous independent identity well into the imperial period, such Roman benefactors at Aphrodisias are exceedingly rare.[1124] Nor do we find at Aphrodisias the sort of personal patronal honorific statues found elsewhere, where the benefactor is privately honoured as benefactor (sometimes as ἴδιος εὐεργέτης) and even πάτρων, which seem to have been confined to honorands of an Italian background, and may well reflect Romanising behaviour.[1125] Aphrodisias does nevertheless raise the spectre of typicality that has haunted much of this chapter, in its attempt to trace developments in euergetic ideology in the early empire. In brief, it has suggested that the elite-driven civic ideology of the late Hellenistic period, centred in large part on the communitarian values of the gymnasium as defined in chapter 3, underwent further development from the mid-1st century BCE onwards, under the pressure of resident Roman populations, the rising role of wealth in public life, and the consequent interest in centring euergetic exemplarity more on

[1122] Its fiscal privileges may also have been dependent on the dominance of local families: Pont (2012b) 324-325.
[1123] *MAMA* VI 251.
[1124] Only two of the late 1st or early 2nd centuries CE: *I.Aphrodisias2007* 11.18, 15.269. Romans in Phrygia: Thonemann (2010) 169-170.
[1125] *IG* XII.6 373, *I.Ephesos* 3031, *SEG* 37.855, *IG* XII.2 549, *IG* XII.4 956, *I.Sardis* II 346; honours as ἴδιος εὐεργέτης: *I.Ephesos* 633, 701, 716, 738, 806, 852, 853; honours as personal patrons: *I.Iasos* 105, Von Saldern (2006) 331-332 n. 18, *I.Ephesos* 1540, 684a-b, 736; the latter are all Italians or high-ranking Roman officials.

the family and private sphere, and less on public ideals alone. Honorific statues become more memorial and commemorative in function, highlighting the exemplarity of the honorand but increasingly also their inimitability, as elite families become the primary actors in civic life and competition, and not citizen bodies as a whole. The precise role of resident Roman populations in these developments in euergetic discourse, as a non-citizen but highly influential and wealthy minority, sometimes cutting across social boundaries (like Potens of Iasos), and who were undoubtedly the major motors of trends towards 'Romanisation', remains difficult to pinpoint, as intermarriage and integration with local families became more common in the 1st century CE. Their relative absence at Aphrodisias may suggest their overall insignificance, but the impressive examples of the families of Sextilius Pollio and the Julii Cornuti, or the conflicts with Romans at Kyzikos, suggest the opposite, and that we need to read cases like Aphrodisias against this context. The statue of G. Julius Epikrates at Miletos, commemorating the leading statesman of the late Republic and re-erected in the 1st century CE by a descendant, may perhaps furnish the best metaphor for the subtle, yet potent influence of ambitious Italian families. Comprising a long honorific formula highlighting Epikrates' unparalleled accomplishments as a leading Milesian, the dedicator is careful to note, in the first two lines, that the honorand was the grand-uncle to Gn. Vergilius Capito – a highly specific and deliberate genealogical reference that brought unexpected attention to the leading resident Roman of the mid-1st century.[1126]

The earlier version of Epikrates' statue had been destroyed in a fire at the gymnasium.[1127] This event furnishes another metaphor for the shift away from the gymnasium that, as I have argued, forms a major strand in euergetic ideology of this period, and with whose beginnings in Zosimos' gymnasiarchy this chapter began. It is apposite at its end to consider how the gymnasiarchy as the premier object of euergetic outlay had

[1126] *SEG* 44.938 ll. 1-2.
[1127] *SEG* 44.938 ll. 18-19.

changed by the later 1st century CE. Some insight into this is offered by the series of decrees inscribed on the rear wall of the diazoma of Kibyra's theatre recording the achievements of Q. Veranius Philagros, a leading citizen who had served as priest of Virtue, ambassador, regained lost public property and made donations and public loans towards the city's reconstruction (probably after the earthquake of 23 CE).[1128] He also quashed a grain-conspiracy that had annually extorted 3000 drachmas from the city by appealing to the emperor Claudius himself.[1129] No mention is made here, however, of his donation of a foundation of 400,000 Rhodian drachmas (250,000 denarii) towards a perpetual gymnasiarchy, commemorated on the six other decrees on the diazoma-wall,[1130] although this was clearly his crowning service and entirely of a piece with his earlier contributions. Philagros himself held the gymnasiarchy for twelve straight years, so that it is likely we are dealing with a fund whose primary purpose was the provision of oil, and not athletic training and contest-provision.[1131] This impression is corroborated by the provision that, in years where the gymnasiarch should choose to pay for his own office, the remaining funds would be spent on acquiring grain-land, which would be named after Philagros as γυμνασιαρχικαὶ Φιλαγριαναί –[1132] that is, this was a gymnasiarchy that was tied intrinsically to the personality of the benefactor, and in this case even to the memory of his earlier service of saving Kibyra from a grain cartel, against which possible recurrence it would now safeguard.

We should not doubt that the gymnasium at Kibyra was still very much a live force. It was, nonetheless, one now very much shaped by a powerful individual, whose economic sway could even shape its rituals: so, the youths were to swear an ancestral oath to protect

[1128] *I.Kibyra* 41-43. For the earthquake, Tac. *Ann.* 4.13 and *I.Kibyra* 36.
[1129] *I.Kibyra* 41 ll. 9-13, with Kokkinia (2008b).
[1130] *I.Kibyra* 42a-e, 43.
[1131] The foundation also received the legal protection of the emperor and Senate: *I.Kibyra* 43 ll. 3, 11-17, 24-27 with Herrmann (1980) 348-350.
[1132] *I.Kibyra* 43 ll. 19-29.

the foundations' provisions.[1133] Philagros' statues were still intended, in principle, to demonstrate what a 'good Kibyran' constituted. Their inscriptions all make clear to outline, however, the precise conversion rate from Rhodian drachma to denarius: that is, the statues were also, perhaps even primarily intended, as legal safeguards against corrupt mismanagement.[1134] Thus, they replayed and enacted the goodwill that Philagros had otherwise demonstrated. Yet this very legal specificity tied the statues to Philagros' own conception of exemplarity, and not the city's alone. The Kibyrans were therefore arguably keener to preserve the individual, irreplicable memory of Philagros – as we see in the central decree – than his exemplary role as a high-achieving Kibyran, and this made all the difference.

[1133] *I.Kibyra* 43 ll. 5-7.
[1134] *I.Kibyra* 42a ll. 12-13. For another honorific statue serving as legal protection (also of the 1st century CE), see *I.Nysa* 405.

Conclusion

The rise of Roman power in western Asia Minor can be narrated in different ways. The approach taken in this study has been to do so by considering change in the ideas of honourability promoted by the many Greek city-states of the region. This final overview presents two key themes underpinning such change over the three-century period considered here.

The first is that the honorific status accorded to benefactors, and hence the euergetic pressures and expectations placed on them, must be studied as part of a wider system in which the reciprocities with rulers interlocked with those of local elites. The period of this study evinces much disruptiveness in this regard, as was explored in chapters 1, 2 and 4 in particular. The end of Seleukid power and its monarchical euergetic ideology in 188 was not replaced by an equivalent under the hegemony of the Romans, who were instead regarded more vaguely as universal benefactors. This determined the behaviour and status of late Attalid kings, who promoted an intrusive euergetic persona to compensate for their weakness. It also simultaneously encouraged cities, however, to magnify the honorific status of civic ambassadors (particularly after 133): figures like Eirenias of Miletos, Menippos of Klaros, or Pergamon's Diodoros Pasparos. Honours for individual Roman officials, which multiply noticeably after 85, form variations on this theme, with their very offices presenting them as 'ambassadors' of Rome, rather than 'the Roman power' itself; 'super-ambassadors', local friends of powerful Roman generals (e.g. Theophanes of Mytilene), appeared in these post-85 decades as a result of competitive tension with such Roman honorands. As chapter 3 showed, the indirect character of Roman hegemony (particularly from 188-85), which encouraged fiercer inter-city competition, also heightened the ideological role of citizens as ambassadors of *polis*-hood between cities. Even the emergence of cult for the emperor,

where the Roman power was honoured as a euergetic personality for the first time, proceeds in tandem with the prominent status of civic intermediaries: elite citizens like Menogenes of Sardeis led provincial and civic cults, enacted these through actual embassies, and deployed imperial cult as 'euergetic space', where reciprocities between emperor and cities became opportunities for reciprocities with citizens to emerge, in ways unparalleled in the Seleukid period. The prevalence of the ambassador-figure in euergetic epigraphy in our period, what one might term 'ambassadoriality', thus formed a forceful civic ideology of what the 'Roman empire' constituted: namely, an imperial power that gained this quality only when one mediated with it, and that in turn encouraged competitive interaction between cities over such mediation (e.g. Metropolis and Klaros in chapter 3). This is only one vision of the Roman state, driven by the *poleis*, but one that differs from that of earlier Hellenistic monarchies (based on individual charismatic rulers), and one that maintained the emphasis on ambassadorial interaction even when Roman became monarchical under Augustus. 'Ambassadoriality' as an euergetic aesthetic in these three centuries consequently nuances P. Gauthier's conception of late Hellenistic euergetism as a transition from kings to citizens – rather, instead of becoming new kings or imperial rulers, citizens became intermediaries between Rome and the cities. In this regard, euergetic ideology contributed to the character of Roman rule in western Asia Minor as an empire of 'subordination',[1135] which maintained cultural differences between the ruling senatorial elite and local notables well into the high empire, as the careers of a Polemon of Smyrna or Aelius Aristides attest only too well.

Secondly, change in euergetic ideology must be seen not only as a product of the socio-political forces shaping imperial power – even if this has been a large part of this study – but also as cultural change in itself, as the creation of honorific standards set precedents for certain kinds of euergetic behaviour and honours, and stood to shape future such

[1135] As opposed to 'assimilation': Lavan, Payne and Weisweiler (2016) 6-7, Lavan (2016).

behaviour and honours. The notion of the Romans as universal benefactors established a new conception of imperial power that would foreground the later universalist, pan-human rhetoric applied to the *princeps* in imperial cult: these latter honours were thus not simply revivals of Hellenistic ruler-cult, but the product of ideological developments over the last century and a half. Indeed, provincial imperial cult itself can also be seen as the culmination of the gradually inflating euergetic profile of local citizens in this period, with statue-honours becoming more prominent after 188, and honorific monumentality reaching new heights in the late 2nd and early 1st centuries in lengthy individualising decrees and multiple statue-honours. This inflation of honours led to the creation of new arenas for euergetism, like the province, resulting in the concretisation of the *koinon* and its symbiosis of imperial and local euergetism in the imperial cult, founded in 29 BCE. Imperial cult in turn had further ramifications in intensifying interest in honorific hierarchies and titles, thereby encouraging elite involvement in Roman imperial administration as a source of titular honour, and underpinning 'Romanising' euergetism at home, as the career and benefactions of Capito of Miletos demonstrate. Moreover, change in euergetic ideology was embedded in socio-economic and cultural developments, as rising inequalities between citizens and non-citizens in the 2nd century meant the inclusion of non-citizens in public distributions; from the 1st century onwards, with growing economic inequality within citizen bodies joined by the influx of resident Roman populations, non-citizens could become benefactors themselves, as wealth and family increasingly became grounds for civic honourability, beyond citizenship and office-holding alone. The result is the emergence, by the early empire, of a subtly different ethos for civic honouring, reflected in the popularity of statue-base inscriptions over decrees as the preferred form of commemorating euergetic activity, whereby individual memorability came to predominate as the motivation for setting up

honorific monuments, over the traditional emphasis on presenting exemplary models for imitation.

In the final analysis, then, this study has been an attempt to set the phenomenon of civic giving and honouring, so often seen mainly as a feature confined to the city alone, in its broader historical contexts. In our period, indeed, civic euergetism arguably became more of a world-historical force than ever before, as the far-travelling decrees and honours for Roman magistrates – serving as career testimonia with impacts on Roman political history –[1136] or indeed the astonishing display of the Mytilenians' decree of imperial cult for Augustus at Tarraco in Spain, quietly adumbrate.[1137] This larger scale shaped in turn the ideals around generosity back in the cities, of which we have sampled traces here, in the Milesians' pride in Eirenias' widespread Seleukid and Attalid contacts, the Pergamenes' praise for a Diodoros Pasparos as friend of the Romans, or even the dedication of the southern portico of the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias by the family of Menandros and Attalis Apphion. When, therefore, Plutarch in his *Precepts of Statescraft* urged his friend Menemachos to exercise restraint when seeking civic honours, he advised him also to eschew Roman offices like procuratorships or governorships.[1138] Here, at Menemachos' Sardeis, the outer world was contributing to a culture by which honourability in the city was increasingly a mark of personal pride, and not only a source of exemplary behaviour for others (as the last chapter showed), as powerful notables cheapened and commodified office-holding and honours in their competition for them; civic generosity and service were therefore beginning to pose an ethical problem for intellectuals.[1139] This brings us, however, to the end of our period, and the cusp of the age of euergetism's full flowering – one in which it would also have to co-exist with its critics.

[1136] E.g. *IG* XIV 1121, *CIL* VI 31742/31743.
[1137] *IG* XII.2 58a l. 13.
[1138] *Mor.* 814c-e.
[1139] Plut. *Mor.* 819f-821a, especially 820e; see also Dio Chrys. *Or.* 66.1-6.

Bibliography

Adams, J. P. 'Aristonikos and the Cistophori', *Historia* 29.3 (1980) 302-314.

Akdoğu Arca, E. N. 'Nysa ad Maeandrum kenti Plouton-Kore tapinağı'na ilişkin haklarin yeniden değerlendirilmesi', *Cedrus* 5 (2017) 185-198.

Akkan, Y., Tavukçu, A. Y., Temür, A., Aydin Tavukçu, Z., Ceylan, M., Coşkun, S., Atalay, A. 'Alabanda 2015' *Kazi Sonuçlari Toplantisi* 38.1 (2016) 305-328.

Altenhöfer, E. 'Das erste römische Bühnengebäude des Theaters von Milet', in W. Müller-Wiener ed. *Milet 1899-1980. Ergebnisse, Probleme und Perspektiven einer Ausgrabung. Kolloquium Frankfurt am Main 1980*, Tübingen, 1986, 165-173.

Alzinger, W. *Augusteische Architektur in Ephesos*, Vienna, 1974.

Ampolo, C. 'Onori per Artemidoro di Efeso: la statua di bronzo "dorata"', *PP* 63 (2008) 361-370.

Ando, C. 'The Political Economy of the Hellenistic Polis: Comparative and Modern Perspectives', in H. Börm and N. Luraghi eds. *The Polis in the Hellenistic World*, Stuttgart, 2018, 9-26.

Andreau, J., Schmitt, P. and Schnapp, A. 'Paul Veyne et l'évergétisme', *Annales (HSS)* 33 (1978) 307-325.

Appiah, K. A. *The Honor Code. How Moral Revolutions Happen*, New York, 2010.

Arena, G. *Il farmaco e l'unguento: la produzione di Priene fra ellenismo e impero*, Rome, 2013.

Ashton, R. H. J. 'A New Silver Issue from Mylasa', *NC* 150 (1990) 224-225.

Ashton, R. H. J. 'The Hellenistic World: The Cities of Mainland Greece and Asia Minor', in W. E. Metcalf *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Coinage*, Oxford, 2012, 191-205.

Balty, J.-C. 'Groupes statuaires impériaux et privés de l'époque julio-claudienne', in N. Boncasa and G. Rizza, eds. *Ritratto ufficiale e ritratto privato*, Rome, 1988, 31-46.

Barresi, P. 'Architettura pubblica e munificenza in Asia Minore', *MediterrAnt* 3.1 (2000) 309-368.

Barresi, P. *Province dell'asia minore. Costo dei marmi, architettura pubblica e committenza*, Rome, 2003.

Barresi, P. ‘Il sofista Flavio Damiano di Efeso e la costruzione di terme-ginnasi nell’Asia Minore romana di età imperiale’, in O. D. Cordovana and M. Galli eds. *Arte e memoria culturale nell’età della Seconda Sofistica*, Catania, 2007, 137-151.

Beck, M. *Der politische Euergetismus und dessen vor allem nichtbürgerliche Rezipienten im hellenistischen und kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien sowie dem ägäischen Raum*, Rahden, 2015.

Behrwald, R. *Der Lykische Bund. Untersuchungen zu Geschichte und Verfassung*, Bonn, 2000.

Bencivenni, A. ‘The King’s Words: Hellenistic Royal Letters in Inscriptions’, in K. Radner ed. *State Correspondence in the Ancient World*, Oxford, 2014, 141-171.

Bernhardt, R. ‘Imperium und Eleutheria. Die römische Politik gegenüber den freien Städten des griechischen Ostens’, Diss. Universität Hamburg, Hamburg, 1971.

Bernhardt, R. *Rom und die Städte des hellenistischen Ostens (3.-1. Jahrhundert v. Chr.)*, Munich, 1998.

Bertrand, J.-M. ‘À propos des πάροικοι dans les cités d’Asie Mineure’, in P. Fröhlich and C. Müller eds. *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique*, Geneva, 2005, 40-49.

Biard, G. *La représentation honorifique dans les cités grecques aux époques classique et hellénistique*, Paris, 2017.

Bielfeldt, R. ‘Wo nur sind die Bürger von Pergamon? Eine Phänomenologie bürgerlicher Unscheinbarkeit im städtischen Raum der Königsresidenz’, *MDAI(I)* 60 (2010) 117–201.

Bielfeldt, R. ‘Polis Made Manifest: The Physiognomy of the Public in the Hellenistic City with a Case Study on the Agora in Priene’, in C. Kuhn ed. *Politische Kommunikation und öffentliche Meinung in der antiken Welt*, Stuttgart, 2012, 87-122.

Bikerman, É. ‘Notes sur Polybe’, *REG* 50 (1937) 217-239.

Billows, R.A. *Kings and Colonists. Aspects of Macedonian imperialism*, Leiden-New York-Cologne, 1995.

Bingöl, O. ‘Der Oberbau des Smintheion in der Troas’, in W. Hoepfner and E. L. Schwandner eds. *Hermogenes und die hochhellenistische Architektur, Internationales Kolloquium in Berlin vom 28. bis 29 Juli 1988*, Mainz, 1990, 45-50.

Bloy, D. ‘Roman Patrons of Greek Communities before the Title πάτρων’, *Historia* 61.2 (2012) 168-201.

Blümel, W. ‘Ein dritter Teil des Kultgesetzes aus Bargylia’, *EA* 32 (2000) 89-94.

Bosnakis, D. and Hallof, K. 'Alte und neue Inschriften aus Kos IV', *Chiron* 40 (2010) 323-358.

Boulanger, A. *Aelius Aristide et la sophistique dans la province d'Asie au IIe siècle de notre ère*. Paris, 1923.

Boulay, T. 'Le tableau d'honneurs d'Antioche du Maeandre', in A. Heller and A.-V. Pont eds. *Patrie d'origine et patries électives*, Paris, 2012, 61-77.

Boulay, T. and Pont, A.-V. *Chalkètôr en Carie*, Paris, 2014.

Boulvert, G. *Domestique et fonctionnaire sous le haut-empire romain*, Paris, 1974.

Bourtzinatkou, I. 'Die Prosopographie von Aphrodisias', Diss. Ruprecht-Karls-Universität, Heidelberg, 2012.

Bowersock, G. *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford, 1965.

Bowie, E. 'Becoming wolf, staying sheep', in J. M. Madsen and R. Rees eds. *Roman Rule in Greek and Latin Writing. Double Vision*, Leiden, 2014, 39-78.

Brélaz, C. 'Les bienfaiteurs, "sauvateurs" et "fossoyeurs" de la cité hellénistique? Une approche historiographique de l'évergétisme', in O. Curty ed. *L'huile et 'l'argent. Actes du colloque tenu à Fribourg du 13 au 15 octobre 2005*, Paris, 2009, 37-56.

Brélaz C. 'La vie démocratique dans les cités grecques à l'époque impériale. Notes de lectures et orientations de la recherche', *Topoi(Lyon)* 18.2 (2013) 367-399.

Brennan, G. and Pettit, P. *The Economy of Esteem*, Oxford, 2004.

Bringmann, K. and Steuben, H. von eds. *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer*, 2 vols, Berlin, 1995-2000.

Broughton, T. R. S. 'Roman Landholding in Asia Minor', *TAPhA* 65 (1934) 207-239.

Broughton, T. R. S. 'Roman Asia Minor', in T. Frank ed. *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, vol. 4, Baltimore, 1938, 499-918.

Bru, H., Demirer, Ü. and Tüner Önen, N. 'Inscriptions de Pergè', *ZPE* 199 (2016) 65-82.

Bruns-Özgan, C. 'Eine feine Familie: Theopompos von Knidos und seine Nachkommen', *EA* 42 (2009) 103-134.

Brunt, P. A. *Italian Manpower 225 B.C.-A.D. 14*, Oxford, 1971.

Brunt, P. A. *Roman Imperial Themes*, Oxford, 1990.

Buckler, W. H. and Robinson, D. M. 'Greek Inscriptions from Sardes V: Decrees of League of the Greeks in Asia and of Sardians Honoring Menogenes', *AJA* 18.3 (1914) 321-362.

Buraselis, K. *Kos between Hellenism and Rome*, Philadelphia, 2000.

Buraselis, K. 'On the Rhetoric of Imperial Majesty: Elements of the Ideological Interaction between Emperor and Imperial Society on the Basis of Civic Decrees, Imperial Pronouncements and Literary Testimonies in the Greek East', in A. Heller and O. M. van Nijf eds. *The Politics of Honour in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire*, Leiden, 2017, 386-396.

Burckhardt, L. 'Die attische Ephebie in hellenistischer Zeit', in D. Kah and P. Scholz eds. *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*, Berlin, 2004, 193-206.

Buresch, K. 'Die griechische Trostbeschlüsse', *RhM* 49 (1894) 424-460.

Burrell, B. *Neokoroi. Greek Cities and Roman Emperors*, Leiden, 2004.

Burrell, B. 'Reading, Hearing, and Looking at Ephesos', in W. A. Johnson and H. N. Parker eds. *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, Oxford, 2011, 69-95.

Burton, P. J. *Friendship and Empire. Roman Diplomacy and Imperialism in the Middle Republic (353–146 BC)*, Cambridge, 2011.

Cairns, D. 'Honour and shame: modern controversies and ancient values', *Critical Quarterly* 53.1 (2011) 23-41.

Campanile, M. D. *I sacerdoti del koinon d'Asia (I sec. a.C.-III sec. d.C.)*, Pisa, 1994.

Campanile, M. D. 'Tiberio e la prima neocoria di Smirne', *SCO* 46.2 (1998) 485-494.

Campanile, M. D. 'Ancora sul culto imperiale in Asia', *MediterrAnt* 4.2 (2001) 473-488.

Campanile, M. D. 'Sommi sacerdoti, asiarchi e culto imperiale: un aggiornamento', *Studi Ellenistici* 19 (2006) 523-584.

Campanile, M. D. 'L'assemblea provinciale d'Asia in età repubblicana', in G. Urso ed. *Tra Oriente e Occidente. Indigeni, Greci e Romani in Asia Minore. Atti del convegno internazionale, Cividale del Friuli, 28-30 settembre 2006*, Pisa, 2007, 129-140.

Campanile, M. D. 'Cheremone, Pitodoro, Pitodoride', in M. Cassia, C. Giuffrida, C. Molè and A. Pinzone eds. *Pignora amicitiae. Scritti di storia antica e di storiografia offerti a Mario Mazza*, Rome, 2012, 231-257.

Campbell, J. *Honour, family, and patronage: a study of institutions and moral values in a Greek mountain community*, Oxford, 1964.

Canali de Rossi, F. *Le ambascerie dal mondo greco a Roma in età repubblicana*, Rome, 1997.

Canali de Rossi, F. *Il ruolo dei patroni nelle relazioni politiche fra il mondo greco e Roma in età repubblicana ed augustea*, München, 2001.

Canali de Rossi, F. *Filius publicus: υἱὸς τῆς πόλεως e titoli affini in iscrizioni greche di età imperiale*, Rome, 2007.

Caneva, S. G. 'Queens and Ruler Cults in Early Hellenism. Festivals, Administration, and Ideology', *Kernos* 25 (2012) 75-101.

Caneva, S. G. 'Courtly love, stars and power. The Queen in 3rd-century royal couples, through poetry and epigraphic texts', in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit and G. C. Wakker eds. *Hellenistic Poetry in Context*, Leuven, 2014, 25-57.

Caneva, S. G. 'Le retour d'Attale III à Pergame. Un réexamen du décret IvP I 246', *EA* 51 (2018) 109-123.

Carlà, F. and Gori, M. eds. *Gift Giving and the 'Embedded' Economy in the Ancient World*, Heidelberg, 2014.

Carlsson, S. *Hellenistic Democracies. Freedom, Independence and Political Procedure in Some East Greek City-States*, Stuttgart, 2010.

Carrera, A. 'Prevention or Cure? Tax Exemptions in a Warfare Context: Miletus and the Low Valley of the Maeander (early second century BCE)', *CHS Research Bulletin* 2.2 (2014) online: http://www.chs-fellows.org/author/acarrara/

Cassayre, A. *La Justice dans les cités grecques. De la formation des royaumes hellénistiques au legs d'Attale*, Rennes, 2010.

Cassola, F. 'Romani e Italici in Oriente', *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 4-5 (1970-1971) 305-322 (= *Scritti di storia antica: istituzioni e politica*, 2 vols, Rome, 1993-1994, 2.197-212).

Ceccarelli, P. 'Letters and Decrees: Diplomatic Protocols in the Hellenistic Period'. In P. Ceccarelli, L. Doering, T. Fögen and I. Gildenhard eds. *Letters and communities. Studies in the socio-political dimensions of ancient epistolography*, Oxford, 2018, 148-183.

Ceylan, A. and Ritti, T. 'L. Antonius Zenon', *Epigraphica* 49 (1987) 77-98.

Chaniotis, A. 'New Inscriptions from Aphrodisias (1995-2001)', *AJA* 108.3 (2004) 377-416.

Chankowski, A. S. 'La procédure législative à Pergame au Ier siècle au J.-C.: à propos de la chronologie relative des décrets en l'honneur de Diodoros Pasparos', *BCH* 122.1 (1998) 159-199.

Chankowski, A. ‘L’entraînement militaire des éphèbes’, in J.-C. Couvenhes and H.-L. Fernoux eds. *Les cités greques et la guerre*, Paris, 2004, 55-76.

Charlesworth, M. P. ‘The Refusal of Divine Honours: An Augustan Formula’, *PBSR* 15 (1939) 1-10.

Chin, M. J.-H. ‘*OGIS* 332 and Civic Authority at Pergamon in the Reign of Attalos III’, *ZPE* 208 (2018) 121-137.

Chiricat, E. ‘Funérailles publiques et enterrement au gymnase à l’époque hellénistique’, in P. Fröhlich and C. Müller eds. *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique*, Geneva, 2005, 207-223.

Claudon, F. ‘Les ambassades des cités grecques d’Asie Mineure auprès des autorités romaines. De la libération des Grecs à la fin du Haut-Empire (196 av. J.-C. - 235 apr. J.-C.)’, Diss. École doctorale de l’École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris, 2015.

Coles, A. ‘Between Patronage and Prejudice: Freedman Magistrates in the Late Roman Republic and Empire’, *TAPA* 147 (2017) 179-208.

Coloru, O. ‘The Language of the Oikos and the Language of Power in the Seleucid Kingdom’, in R. Laurence ed. *Families in the Greco-Roman World*, London, 2012.

Colpaert, S. ‘Euergetism and the Gift’, in F. Carlà and M. Gori eds. *Gift Giving and the ‘Embedded’ Economy in the Ancient World*, Heidelberg, 2014, 181-201.

Conti, S. ‘Provvedimenti imperiali per comunita` colpite da terremoti nel I–II sec. d. C.’, *Klio* 90.2 (2008) 374-386.

Cooley, A. E. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti. Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Cambridge, 2009.

Coqueugniot, G. ‘Des bibliothèques pour le public... et à la gloire de leurs fondateurs. Les motivations des fondateurs de bibliothèques dans les provinces orientales de l’empire romain, de César à Hadrien’, in Y. Perrin ed. *Neronia VIII Bibliothèques, livres et culture écrite dans l’empire romain de César à Hadrien. Actes du VIIIe Colloque international de la SIEN (Paris, 2-4 octobre 2008)*, Brussels, 2010, 41-53.

Coudry, M. and Kirbihler, F. ‘La *lex Cornelia*, une *lex provinciae* de Sylla pour l’Asie’, in N. Barrandon and F. Kirbihler eds. *Administrer les provinces de la République romaine*, Rennes, 2010, 133-169.

Cousin, G. and Diehl, C. ‘Inscriptions d’Halicarnasse’, *BCH* 14 (1890) 90-121.

Cramme, S. ‘Die Bedeutung des Euergetismus für die Finanzierung städtischer Aufgaben in der Provinz Asia’, Diss. Universität zu Köln, Cologne, 2001.

Crawford, M. H. *Coinage and money under the Roman Republic: Italy and the Mediterranean economy*, London, 1985.

Crowther, C. ‘Foreign Judges and Regional Variations in Hellenistic Asia Minor’, in H. Elton and G. Reger eds. *Regionalism in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Paris, 2007, 53-59.

Crowther, N. B. ‘Euexia, Eutaxia, Philoponia: Three Contests of the Greek Gymnasium’, *ZPE* 85 (1991) 301-304.

Culasso Gastaldi, E. ‘La ginnasiarchia ad Atene. Istituzioni, ruoli e personaggi dal IV sec. all’età ellenistica’, in O. Curty ed. *L’huile et l’argent. Gymnasiarchie et évergétisme dans la Grèce hellénistique*, Fribourg, 2009, 115-142.

Curty, O. *Les parentés legendaires entre cités grecques*, Geneva, 1995.

Curty, O. *Gymnasiarchika. Recueil et analyse des inscriptions de l’époque hellénistique en l’honneur des gymnasiarques*, Paris, 2015.

Dalla Rosa, A. ‘Propriété familiale, pouvoir imperial : origine et gestion du *patrimonium* d’Auguste en Asie Mineure’, in L. Cavalier, M.-C. Ferriès and F. Delrieux eds. *Auguste et l’Asie Mineure*, Bordeaux, 2017, 101-116.

D’Amore, L. ‘Il ginnasio ellenistico e l’evergetismo dei sovrani’, *IncidAntico* 4 (2006) 169-192.

D’Amore, L. ‘Ginnasio e difesa civica nelle *poleis* d’asia minore (IV-I sec. a.C.)’, *REA* 109 (2007) 147-173.

D’Andria, F. *Hierapolis of Phrygia (Pamukkale). An Archaeological Guide*, Istanbul, 2010.

Daubner, F. *Bellum Asiaticum. Der Krieg der Römer gegen Aristonikos von Pergamon und die Einrichtung der Provinz Asia*, München, 2006.

Daubner, F. ‘Gymnasia: Aspects of a Greek institution in the hellenistic and Roman near east’, in M. Blömer, A. Lichtenberger and R. Raja eds. *Religious Identities in the Levant from Alexander to Muhammed. Continuity and Change*, Turnhout, 2015, 33-46.

Daux, G. ‘Concours des Titeia dans un décret d’Argos’, *BCH* 88.2 (1964) 569-576.

Davenport, C. *A History of the Roman Equestrian Order*, Cambridge, 2019.

Davies, J. K. ‘The interpenetration of hellenistic sovereignties’, in D. Ogden ed. *The Hellenistic World. New Perspectives*, Swansea, 2002, 1-22.

De Callataÿ, F. ‘The Coinages of the Attalids and their Neighbours: A Quantified Overview’, in P. Thonemann ed. *Attalid Asia Minor: Money, International Relations, and the State*, Oxford, 2013, 207-244.

Deininger, J. *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Munich and Berlin, 1965.

De la Genière, J. ‘Le sanctuaire d’Apollon à Claros, découvertes récentes’, *CRAI* 136.1 (1992) 195-210.

Delorme, J. *Gymnasion: étude sur les monuments consacrés a l’éducation en Grèce (des origines à l’empire romain)*, Paris, 1960.

Delplace, C. ‘Publicains, trafiquants et financiers dans les provinces d’Asie Mineure sous la République’, *Ktema* 2 (1977) 233-252.

Delrieux, F. ‘La crise financière des cités grecques d’Asie Mineure au Ier siècle a.C. et la lettre de Cicéron à Q. Minucius Thermus (*Fam.* 13.56)’, in R. van Bremen and J.-M. Carbon eds. *Hellenistic Karia*, Bordeaux, 2010, 505-526.

Delrieux, F. and Ferriès, M.-C. ‘Euthydème, Hybréas et Mylasa: une cité grecque de Carie dans les conflits romains de la fin du I^{er} siècle a.C.’, *REA* 106.1 (2004) 49-71. (2004a)

Delrieux, F. and Ferriès, M.-C. ‘Euthydème, Hybréas et Mylasa: une cité grecque de Carie dans les conflits romains de la fin du I^{er} siècle a.C. (deuxième partie)’, *REA* 106.2 (2004) 494-515. (2004b)

Demougin, S. *Prosopographie des chevaliers romains julio-claudiens (43 av. J.-C.-70 ap. J.-C.)*, Rome, 1992.

Demougin, S. ‘L’ordre équestre en Asie mineure’, in S. Demougin, H. Devijver and M.-T. Raepsaet-Charlier, eds. *L’ordre équestre, histoire d’une aristocratie (Ier siècle av. J.-C. - IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.). Actes du colloque de Bruxelles-Leuven (octobre 1995)*, Rome, 1999, 579-612.

Derow, P. S. and Forrest, W. G. ‘An Inscription from Chios’, *ABSA* 77 (1982) 79-92.

Des Courtils, J. ‘Xanthos et le Lètôon au II^{e} siècle a.C.’, in A. Bresson and R. Descat eds. *Les cités d’Asie Mineure occidentale au II^{e} siècle av. J.-C.*, Bordeaux, 2001, 213-224.

Des Gagniers, J. ed. *Laodicée du Lycos: le nymphée, campagnes 1961-1963*, Quebec, 1969.

Deshours, N. *L’été indien de la religion civique: études sur les cultes civiques dans le monde égéen à l’époque hellénistique tardive*, Paris, 2010.

Devijver, H. ‘Die Aufgabe eines Offiziers im römischen Heer. Kommentar zur Aemilius Macer, Dig. XLIX, XVI, 12.2’, in W. Peremans ed. *Antidorum W. Peremans sexagenario ab alumnis oblatum*, Leuven, 1968, 23-37.

Devijver, H. ‘Equestrian Officers from the East’, in P. Freeman and D. Kennedy eds. *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East*, Oxford, 1986, 109-225.

Dignas, B. *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Oxford, 2002.

Dillon, S. *The Female Portrait Statue in the Greek World*, Cambridge, 2010.

Dimopoulou, A. ‘Lesbos sous Auguste. Du renouveau des traités à l’apothéose’, in L. Cavalier, M.-C. Ferriès and F. Delrieux eds. *Auguste et l’Asie Mineure*, Bordeaux, 2017, 399-412.

Dittmann-Schöne, I. *Die Berufsvereine in den Städten des kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasiens*, Regensburg, 2010.

Dmitriev, S. ‘The History and Geography of the Province of Asia during its First Hundred Years and the Provincialization of Asia Minor’, *Athenaeum* 93 (2005) 71-133. (2005a)

Dmitriev, S. *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Oxford, 2005. (2005b)

Dmitriev, S. *The Greek slogan of freedom and early Roman politics in Greece*, Oxford, 2011.

Domingo-Gygax, M. ‘Euergetismus und Gabentausch’, *Métis* 1 (2003) 181-200.

Domingo-Gygax, M. ‘Les origines de l’évergétisme. Échanges et identités sociales dans la cité grecque’, *Métis* 4 (2006) 269-295.

Domingo-Gygax, M. ‘Proleptic Honours in Greek Euergetism’, *Chiron* 39 (2009) 162-191.

Domingo-Gygax, M. ‘Gift-Giving and Power Relationships in Greek Social Praxis and Public Discourse’, in M. L. Satlow ed. *The Gift in Antiquity*, Chichester, 2013, 45-60.

Domingo-Gygax, M. *Benefaction and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City: The Origins of Euergetism*, Cambridge, 2016.

Domingo-Gygax, M. and Zuiderhoek, A. eds. *Benefactors and the Polis. The Public Gift in the Greek Cities from the Homeric World to Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, 2020.

Dorandi, T. *Filodemo. Storia dei filosofi: La Stoa da Zenone a Panezio (PHerc. 1018)*, Leiden, 1994.

Dorl-Klingenschmid, C. ‘Brunnenbauten als Medium des interkommunalen Wettbewerbs’, in G. Wiplinger ed. *Cura Aquarum in Ephesus. Proceedings of the Twelth International Congress on the History of Water Management and Hydraulic Engineering in the Mediterranean Region. Ephesus/Selçuk, Turkey, October 2-10, 2004*, 2 vols, Leuven, 2006, 2.381-386.

Drew-Bear, T. ‘Deux décrets hellénistiques d’Asie Mineure’, *BCH* 96.1 (1972) 435-471.

Dunand, F. ‘Sens et fonction de la fête dans la Grèce hellénistique. Les cérémonies en l’honneur d’Artémis Leucophryéné’, *DHA* 4 (1978) 201-218.

Eberle, L. P. ‘Making Roman Subjects: Citizenship and Empire before and after Augustus’, *TAPhA* 147 (2017) 321-370.

Eberle, L. P. and Le Quéré, E. ‘Landed Traders, Trading Agriculturalists? Land in the Economy of the Italian Diaspora in the Greek East’, *JRS* 107 (2017) 27-59.

Eck, W. ‘Prosopographica II’, *ZPE* 106 (1995) 249-254.

Edelmann-Singer, B. ‘Herrscherfrauen als Leitfguren: Iulia Severa, Poppaea und die „Matronage“ der jüdischen Religion’, in C. Kunst ed. *Matronage. Handlungsstrategien und soziale Netzwerke von Herrscherfrauen im Altertum in diachroner Perspektive*, Rahden and Westfalen, 2013, 89-99.

Edelmann-Singer, B. *Koina und Concilia. Genese, Organisation und sozioökonomische Funktion der Provinziallandtage im römischen Reich*, Stuttgart, 2015.

Ehrhardt, N. ‘Tod, Trost und Trauer. Zur Funktion griechischer Trostbeschlüsse und Ehrendekrete post mortem’, in H.-J. Drexhage and J. S. Thompson eds. *Tod, Bestattung und Jenseits in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, Münster, 1994, 38-55.

Ehrhardt, N. ‘Der Bürger als Heros: Staatsbegräbnis und Öffentlichkeit in Kyzikos’, in W. Engelbert ed. *Vom Euphrat bis zum Bosporus. Festschrift für Elmar Schwertheim zum 65. Geburtstag*, Bonn, 2008, 187-196.

Eilers, C. *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities*, Oxford, 2002.

Ellis-Evans, A. ‘The Koinon of Athena Ilias and its Coinage’, *AJN* 28 (2016) 105-158.

Ellis-Evans, A. *The Kingdom of Priam. Lesbos and the Troad between Anatolia and the Aegean*, Oxford, 2019.

Ellis-Evans, A. ‘The Late Hellenistic Tetradrachms of Parion and Lampsakos’, *AJN* 32 (2020) 93-125.

Engelmann, H. ‘Ephesisiche Inschriften’, *ZPE* 84 (1990) 89-94.

Engelmann, H. ‘Zum Stadion von Ephesos (IvE 2113)’, *ZPE* 149 (2004) 71-72.

Erkelenz, D. ‘Cicero, pro Flacco 55–59. Zur Finanzierung von Staathalterfesten in der Frühphase des Koinon von Asia’, *Chiron* 29 (1999) 43-57.

Erkelenz, D. *Optimo Praesidi. Untersuchungen zu den Ehrenmonumenten für Amtsträger der römischen Provinzen in Republik und Kaiserzeit*, Bonn, 2003.

Errington, R. M. ‘Aspects of Roman Acculturation in the East under the Republic’, in P. Kneissel and V. Losemann eds. *Alter Geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Festschrift für Karl Christ zum 65. Geburtstag*, Darmstadt, 1988, 140-157.

Errington, M. ‘The Peace Treaty between Miletus and Magnesia (I.Milet 148)’, *Chiron* 19 (1989) 279-288.

Erskine, A. ‘The Romans as Common Benefactors’, *Historia* 43.1 (1994) 70-87.

Erskine, A. ‘Greekness and Uniqueness: The Cult of the Senate in the Greek East’, *Phoenix* 51.1 (1997) 25-37.

Fabiani, R. and Nafissi, M. ‘La pubblicazione dei decreti a Iasos: cronologia e topografia’, in D. Baldoni, F. Berti and M. Giuman eds. *Iasos e il suo territorio. Atti del convegno internazionale per i cinquanta anni della Missione Archeologica Italiana (Istanbul, 26-28 Febbraio 2011)*, Rome, 2013, 37-60.

Famerie, E. ‘Le traité d’alliance romano-cnidien de 45 av. J.-C.’, *CCG* 20 (2009) 265-280.

Fernoux, H.-L. ‘L’exemplarité sociable chez les notables des cités d’Asie mineure à l’époque impériale’, in H.-L. Fernoux and C. Stein eds. *Aristocratie antique. Modèles et exemplarité sociale*, Dijon, 2007, 175-200.

Fernoux, H.-L. *Le Demos et la Cité. Communautés et assemblées populaires en Asie Mineure à l’époque impériale*, Rennes, 2011.

Fernoux, H.-L. ‘La gestion des statues honorifiques à Rhodes à la fin du I^er^ siècle ap. J.-C. d’après le *Rhodiakos* de Dion de Pruse (*Or.* XXXI)’, in A. Heller and O. M. van Nijf eds. *The Politics of Honour in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire*, Leiden, 2017, 81-108.

Ferrary, J.-L. *Philhellénisme et impérialisme. Aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique, de la seconde guerre de Macédoine à la guerre contre Mithridate*, Paris, 1988.

Ferrary, J.-L. ‘Le statut des cités libres dans l’Empire romain à la lumière des inscriptions de Claros’, *CRAI* 135.3 (1991) 557-577.

Ferrary, J.-L. ‘De l’évergétisme hellénistique à l’évergétisme romain’, in M. Christol and O. Masson eds. *Actes du Xe congrès International d’épigraphie grecque et latine (Nîmes, 4-9 octobre 1992)*, Paris, 1997, 199-225. (1997a)

Ferrary, J.-L. ‘The Hellenistic World and Roman Political Patronage’, in P. Cartledge, P. Garnsey and E. S. Gruen eds. *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in Culture, History, and Historiography*, Berkeley, 1997, 105-119. (1997b)

Ferrary, J.-L. ‘Les inscriptions du sanctuaire de Claros en l’honneur de Romains’, *BCH* 124.1 (2000) 331-376. (2000a)

Ferrary, J.-L. ‘Les gouverneurs des provinces romaines d’Asie Mineure (Asie et Cilicie), depuis l’organisation de la province d’Asie jusqu’à la premiere guerre de Mithridate (126-88 av. J.-C.)’, *Chiron* 30 (2000) 161-193. (2000b)

Ferrary, J.-L. ‘Rome et la géographie de l’hellénisme: réflexions sur “hellenes” et “panhellènes” dans les inscriptions d’époque romaine’, in O. Salomies ed. *The Greek East in the Roman Context. Proceedings of a Colloquium Organised by the Finnish Institute at Athens May 21 and 22, 1999*, Helsinki, 2001, 19-35. (2001a)

Ferrary, J.-L. ‘Rome et les cités grecques d’Asie Mineure au IIe siècle av. J.-C.’, in A. Bresson and R. Descat eds. *Les cités d’Asie Mineure occidentale au IIe siècle av. J.-C.*, Bordeaux, 2001, 93-106. (2001b)

Ferrary, J.-L. ‘Le roi Archélaos de Cappadoce à Délos’, *CRAI* 145.2 (2001) 799-815. (2001c)

Ferrary, J.-L. ‘La création de la province d’Asie et la présence italienne en Asie Mineure’, in C. Hasenohr and C. Müller eds. *Les Italiens dans le monde grec (IIe siècle av. J.-C. - Ier siècle ap. J.-C.)*, Paris, 2002, 133-146.

Ferrary, J.-L. ‘Les Grecs des cités et l’obtention de la *ciuitas Romana*’, in P. Fröhlich and C. Müller eds. *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique*, Geneva, 2005, 51-75.

Ferrary, J.-L. ‘After the embassy to Rome: Publication and Implementation’, in C. Eilers ed. *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*, 2008, 127-142.

Ferrary, J.-L. and Verger, S. ‘Contribution à l’histoire du sanctuaire de Claros à la fin du II^{e} et au I^{er} siècle av. J.-C. : l’apport des inscriptions en l’honneur des Romains et des fouilles de 1994-1997’, *CRAI* 143.3 (1999) 811-850.

Ferriès, M.-C. and Delrieux, F. ‘Quintus Mucius Scaevola, un gouverneur modèle pour les Grecs de la province d’Asie?’, in N. Barrandon and F. Kirbihler eds. *Les gouverneurs et les provinciaux sous la république romaine*, Rennes, 2011, 207-230.

Fishwick, D. *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West. Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire*, vol. 1.1, Leiden, 1987.

Flashar, M. ‘Panhellenische Feste und Asyl — Parameter lokaler Identitätsstiftung in Klaros und Kolophon’ *Klio* 81.2 (1999) 412-436.

Fontenrose, J. *Didyma. Apollo’s Oracle, Cult and Campanions*, Berkeley, 1988.

Forster, F. R. *Die Polis im Wandel. Ehrendekrete für eigene Bürger im Kontext der hellenistischen Polisgesellschaft*, Göttingen, 2018.

Fournier, J. *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, 2010.

Fournier, J. ‘Cyzique à l’époque de l’hégémonie romaine (1er siècle av. J.-C. – II^{e} siècle apr. J.-C.) : un modèle d’intégration provinciale’, in M. Sève and P. Schlosser eds. *Cyzique, cité majeure et méconnue de la Propontide antique,* Metz, 2014, 309-338.

Friesen, S. J. *Twice Neokoros. Ephesus, Asia and the Cult of the Flavian Imperial Family*, Leiden, 1993.

Frija, G. *Les prêtres des empereurs. Le culte impériale civique dans la province romaine d'Asie*, Rennes, 2012. (2012a)

Frija, G. 'Nommer les empereurs divinisés. Epiclèses et assimilations dans le culte impérial des cités grecques d'Asie à l'époque julio-claudienne', *ARG* 12.1 (2012) 41-64. (2012b)

Frija, G. 'Les Grecs et l'autorités romaines au I^er^ siècle av. J.-C.: réflexions sur l'évolution du langage honorifique', in J. Dubouloz, S. Pittia and G. Sabatini eds. *L'imperium Romanum en perspective. Les savoirs d'empire dans la République romaine et leur héritage dans l'Europe médiévale et moderne*, Paris, 2014, 81-94.

Frisch, P. 'Nemeseia und Barbilleia in Smyrna', *ZPE* 15 (1974) 162.

Fröhlich, P. 'Les magistrats des cités grecques: image et réalité du pouvoir (IIe s. *a.C.* – Ier s. *p.C.*)', in H. Inglebert ed. *Les idéologies et valeurs civiques dans le monde romain. Hommage à Claude Lepelley*, 2002, 75-92.

Fröhlich, P. *Les cités grecques et le contrôle des magistrats (IVe-Ier siècle avant J.-C.)*, Geneva, 2004.

Fröhlich, P. 'Dépenses publiques et évergétisme des citoyens dans l'exercice des charges publiques à Priène à la basse époque hellénistique', in P. Fröhlich and C. Müller eds. *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique*, Geneva, 2005, 225-256.

Fröhlich, P. 'Les activités évergétiques des gymnasiarques à l'époque hellénistique tardive: la fourniture de l'huile', in O. Curty ed. *L'huile et l'argent. Gymnasiarchie et évergétisme dans la Grèce hellénistique*, Fribourg, 2009, 57-94.

Fröhlich, P. 'Funérailles publiques et tombeaux monumentaux intra-muros dans les cités grecques à l'époque hellénistique', in M.-C. Ferriès, M. P. Castiglioni and F. Létoublon eds. *Forgerons, élites et voyageurs d'Homère à nos jours. Hommages en mémoire d'Isabelle Ratinaud-Lachkar*, Grenoble, 2013, 227-309.

Fröhlich, P. '*Philanthropia* in Context: Civic Virtues and Praise of Officials in the *Poleis* of Hellenistic Asia Minor', in O. Tekin, C. H. Roosevelt and E. Akyürek eds. *Philanthropy in Anatolia through the Ages. Proceedings of the First International Suna & İnan Kıraç Symposium on Mediterranean Civilizations (Antalya March 26-29.03 2019)*, Istanbul 2020, 13-28.

Fröhlich, P. and Müller, C. eds. *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique*, Geneva, 2005.

Gagliardi, L. 'I paroikoi delle città dell'asia minore in età ellenistica e nella prima età romana', *Dike* 12-13 (2009-2010) 303-322.

Gauthier, P. 'Les honneurs de l'officier Séleucide Larichos à Priène', *JS* (1980) 35-50. (1980a)

Gauthier, P. 'Études sur des inscriptions d'Amorgos', *BCH* 104.1 (1980) 197-220. (1980b)

Gauthier, P. ‘Notes sur trois décrets honorant des citoyens bienfaiteurs’, *RPh* 56 (1982) 215-231.

Gauthier, P. *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*, Paris, 1985.

Gauthier, P. ‘Ἀτέλεια τοῦ σώματος’, *Chiron* 21 (1991) 49-68.

Gauthier, P. ‘Notes sur le rôle du gymnase dans les cités hellénistiques’, in M. Wörrle and P. Zanker eds. *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus*, Munich, 1995, 1-11.

Gauthier, P. ‘Bienfaiteurs du gymnase au Létôon de Xanthos’, *REG* 109 (1996) 1-34.

Gauthier, P. ‘Le décret de Thessalonique pour Parnassos. L’évergète et la dépense pour sa statue à la basse époque hellénistique’ *Tekmeria* 5 (2000) 39-62.

Gauthier, P. ‘Introduction’, in P. Fröhlich and C. Müller eds. *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique*, Geneva, 2005, 1-6. (2005a)

Gauthier, P. ‘Trois exemples méconnus d’intervenants dans ces décrets de la basse époque hellénistique’, in P. Fröhlich and C. Müller eds. *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique*, Geneva, 2005, 79-93. (2005b)

Gauthier, P. ‘Les décrets de Colophon-sur-Mer en l’honneur des Attalides Athènaios et Philétairos’, *REG* 119 (2006) 473-503.

Gerlach, G. *Griechische Ehreninschriften*, Halle, 1908.

Giannakopoulos, N. ‘Remarks on the Honorary Titles υἱὸς βουλῆς, υἱὸς δήμου and υἱὸς πόλεως in Roman Asia Minor’, in A. D. Rizakis and F. Camia eds. *Pathways to Power. Civic Elites in the Eastern Part of the Roman Empire. Proceedings of the International Workshop held at Athens, Scuola Archaeologica Italiana di Atene*, 19 December 2005, Athens, 2008, 251-268.

Gold, B. K. ‘Pompey and Theophanes of Mytilene’, *AJP* 106.3 (1985) 312-327.

González, J. ‘The First Oath Pro Salvte Avgvsti Found in Baetica’, *ZPE* 72 (1988) 113-127.

Gray, B. ‘Philosophy of Education and the Later Hellenistic Polis’, in P. Martzavou and N. Papazarkadas eds. *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis, Fourth Century BC-Second Century AD*, Oxford, 2012, 233-254.

Gray, B. ‘The Polis Becomes Humane? Φιλανθρωπία as a Cardinal Civic Virtue in Later Hellenistic Honorific Epigraphy and Historiography’, *Studi Ellenistici* 27 (2013) 137-162.

Gray, B. Stasis *and Stability. Exile, the Polis, and Political Thought,* c.*404-146 BC*, Oxford, 2015.

Gray, B. ‘Freedom, ethical choice and the Hellenistic polis’, *History of European Ideas* 44.6 (2018) 719-742. (2018a)

Gray, B. ‘A Later Hellenistic Debate about the Value of Classical Athenian Civic Ideals?’, in M. Canevaro and B. Gray eds. *The Hellenistic Reception of Classical Athenian Democracy and Political Thought*, Oxford, 2018, 139-176. (2018b)

Gray, B. ‘A Civic Alternative to Stoicism: The Ethics of Hellenistic Honorary Decrees’, *ClAnt* 37.2 (2018) 187-235. (2018c)

Grieb, V. *Hellenistische Demokratie. Politische Organisation und Struktur in freien griechischen Poleis nach Alexander dem Grossen*, Stuttgart, 2008.

Grimm, G. ‘“Der als Gott erscheint”. Gnaeus Pompeius Theophanes von Mytilene – ein wenig bekannter Wohltäter Griechenlands’, *AW* 35.1 (2004) 63-70.

Gruen, E. S. ‘Rome and Rhodes in the Second Century B. C.: A Historiographical Inquiry’, *CQ* 25.1 (1975) 58-81.

Gruen, E. S. *The Hellenistic world and the coming of Rome*, Berkeley and London, 1984.

Gruen, E. S. ‘Culture as Policy: The Attalids of Pergamon’, in N. T. de Grummon and B. S. Ridgway eds. *From Pergamon to Sperlonga. Sculpture and Context*, London, 2000, 17-31.

Günther, W. ‘Analecta Didymea’, *ZPE* 192 (2014) 159-166.

Guerber, E. *Les cités grecques dans l’empire romain : les privilèges et les titres des cités de l’orient hellénophone d’Octave Auguste à Dioclétien*, Rennes, 2009.

Haake, M. *Der Philosoph in der Stadt. Untersuchungen zur öffentlichen Rede über Philosophen und Philosophie in den hellenistischen Poleis*, Munich, 2007.

Habicht, C. *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*, Munich, 1970.

Habicht, C. ‘Ist ein “Honoratiorenregime” das Kennzeichen der Stadt im späteren Hellenismus?’, in M. Wörrle and P. Zanker eds. *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus*, Munich, 1995, 87-92.

Habicht, C. ‘«Zur ewig währenden Erinnerung». Ein auf das Nachleben zielender Topos’, *Chiron* 28 (1998) 35-41.

Habicht, C. ‘Zum Gesandtschaftsverkehr griechischer Gemeinden mit römischen Instanzen während der Kaiserzeit’, *Archaiognosia* 11 (2002) 11-28.

Haddad, C. J. ‘A Linguistic Analysis of Roman Republican Official Letters in Greek’, Diss. Macquarie University, Sydney, 2018.

Halfmann, H. *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jh. n. Chr.*, Göttingen, 1979.

Halfmann, H. *Städtebau und Bauherren im römischen Kleinasien: Ein Vergleich zwischen Pergamon und Ephesos*, Tübingen, 2001.

Hallmannsecker, M. 'The Ionian Koinon and the Koinon of the 13 Cities at Sardis', *Chiron* 50 (2020) 1-27.

Hamon, P. 'Le Conseil et la participation des citoyens: les mutations de la basse époque hellénistique', in P. Fröhlich and C. Müller eds. *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique*, Geneva, 2005, 121-144.

Hamon, P. 'Élites dirigeantes et processus d'aristocratisation à l'époque hellénistique', in H.-L. Fernoux and C. Stein eds. *Aristocratie antique. Modèles et exemplarité sociale*, Dijon, 2007, 79-100.

Hamon, P. 'Démocraties grecques après Alexandre. À propos de trois ouvrages récents', *Topoi(Lyon)* 16.2 (2009) 347-382.

Hamon, P. 'Gleichheit, Ungleichheit und Euergetismus: die *isotes* in den kleinasiatischen Poleis der hellenistischen Zeit', in C. Mann and P. Scholz eds. *"Demokratie" im Hellenismus von der herrschaft des Volkes zur Herrschaft der Honoratioren*, Mannheim, 2012, 56-73. (2012a)

Hamon, P. 'Mander des juges dans la cité : notes sur l'organisation des missions judiciaires à l'époque hellénistique', *CCG* 23 (2012) 195-222. (2012b)

Harland, P. A. 'The Declining *Polis*? Religious Rivalries in Ancient Civic Context', in L. E. Vaage ed. *Religious rivalries in the early Roman empire and the rise of Christianity*, Waterloo, 2006, 21-49.

Hasenohr, C. and Müller, C. eds. *Les Italiens dans le monde grec (IIe siècle av. J.-C. - Ier siècle ap. J.-C.)*, Paris, 2002.

Hatzfeld, J. *Les trafiquants italiens dans l'orient hellénique*, Paris, 1919.

Hatzopoulos, M. B. 'La formation militaire dans les gymnases hellénistiques', in D. Kah and P. Scholz eds. *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*, Berlin, 2004, 91-96.

Hatzopoulos, M. B. and Gauthier, P. *La loi gymnasiarchique de Beroia*, Paris, 1993.

Haussoulier, B. *Études sur l'histoire de Milet et du Didyméion*, Paris, 1902.

Heinen, H. 'Mithradates von Pergamon und Caesars bosporanische Pläne', in R. Günther and S. Rebenich eds. *E fontibus haurire: Beiträge zur römischen Geschichte und zu ihren Hilfswissenschaften*, Paderborn, 1994, 63-79.

Heller, A. *Les bêtises des grecs. Conflits et rivalités entre cités d'Asie et de Bithynie à l'époque romaine (129 a.C.-235 p.C.)*, Bordeaux, 2006.

Heller, A. 'La cité grecque d'époque impériale : vers une société d'ordres?', *Annales (HSS)* 64.2 (2009) 341-373.

Heller, A. Review of Canali de Rossi (2007), *Gnomon* 82.3 (2010) 240-243.

Heller, A. 'Les institutions civiques grecques sous l'Empire: romanisation ou aristocratisation?', in P. Schubert, P. Ducrey and P. Derron eds. *Les Grecs héritiers des romains*, Geneva, 2013, 203-232.

Heller, A. 'Domination subie, domination choisie: les cités d'Asie Mineure face au pouvoir romain, de la République à l'Empire', *Pallas* 96 (2014) 217-232.

Heller, A. 'Le I^{er} siècle av. J.-C. en Asie Mineure : epigraphic habit et transition en histoire ancienne', in C. Müller and M. Heintz eds. *Transitions historiques*, Paris, 2016, 69-80.

Heller, A. 'Priesthoods and Civic Ideology: Honorific Titles for *Hiereis* and *Archiereis* in Roman Asia Minor', in in: E. Muñiz Grijalvo, J. Manuel Cortés Copete and F. Lozano Gómez eds. *Empire and Religion: Religious Change in Greek Cities under Roman Rule*, Leiden and Boston, 2017, 1-20.

Heller, A. *L'âge d'or des bienfaiteurs. Titres honorifiques et sociétés civiques dans l'Asie Mineure d'époque romaine (Ier s. av. J.-C. – IIIe s. ap. J.-C.)*, Paris, 2020.

Heller, A. and Van Nijf, O. M. eds. *The Politics of Honour in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire*, Leiden, 2017. (2017a)

Heller, A. and Van Nijf, O. M. 'Introduction: Civic Honours, from Classical to Roman Times', in eds. *The Politics of Honour in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire*, Leiden, 2017, 1-27. (2017b)

Helly, B. 'ΠΡΟΕΙΣΦΕΡΕΙΝ: une inscription de Kiérion en Thessalie', *RA* 1 (1971) 15-28.

Hepding, H. 'Mithradates von Pergamon', *MDAI(A)* 34 (1909) 329-340.

Herrmann, P. 'Die Inschriften römischer Zeit aus dem Heraion von Samos', *MDAI(A)* 75 (1960) 68-183.

Herrmann, P. 'Neue Urkunden zur Geschichte von Milet im 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr.', *MDAI(I)* 15 (1965) 71-117.

Herrmann, P. *Der römische Kaisereid*, Göttingen, 1968.

Herrmann, P. 'Kaiserliche Garantie für private Stiftungen. Ein Beitrag zum Thema "Kaiser und städtische Finanzen"', in W. Eck, H. Galsterer and H. Wolff eds. *Studien zur antiken Sozialgeschichte. Festschrift Friedrich Vittinghoff*, Cologne, 1980, 339-356.

Herrmann, P. ‘Die Weihinschrift der ersten römischen Bühne in Milet’, in W. Müller-Wiener ed. *Milet 1899-1980. Ergebnisse, Probleme und Perspektiven einer Ausgrabung. Kolloquium, Frankfurt am Main 1980*, Tübingen, 1986, 175-189.

Herrmann, P. ‘Milesier am Seleukidenhof. Prosopographische Beiträge zur Geschichte Milets im 2. Jhdt. v.Chr.’, *Chiron* 17 (1987) 171-192.

Herrmann, P. ‘Chresimus, procurator lapicidinarum. Zur Verwaltung der kaiserzeitlichen Steinbrüche in der Provinz Asia’, *Tyche* 3 (1988) 119-128.

Herrmann, P. ‘Milet unter Augustus. C. Iulius Epikrates und die Anfänge des Kaiserkults’, *MDAI(I)* 44 (1994) 203-236.

Herrmann, P. ‘Sardeis zur Zeit der iulisch-claudischen Kaiser’, in E. Schwertheim ed. *Forschungen in Lydien*, Bonn, 1995, 21-36.

Herrmann, P. ‘Milet au IIe siècle a.C.’, in A. Bresson and R. Descat eds. *Les cités d’Asie Mineure occidentale au II^e^ siècle av. J.-C.*, Bordeaux, 2001, 109-116.

Herrmann, P. ‘Italiker und Römer in Sardeis. Überlegungen zu zwei inschriftlichen Zeugnissen’, in J. Spielvogel ed. *Res publica reperta. Zur Verfassung und Gesellschaft der römischen Republik und des frühen Prinzipats. Festschrift für Jochen Bleicken zum 65. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart 2002, 36-44.

Herzog, R. ‘Nikias und Xenophon von Kos. Zwei Charakterköpfe aus der griechisch-römischen Geschichte’, *HZ* 125.2 (1922) 189-247.

Hintzen-Bohlen, B. ‘Die Familiengruppe: ein Mittel zur Selbstdarstellung hellenistischer Herrscher’, *JDAI* 105 (1990) 129-154.

Hodot, R. ‘Décret de Kymè en l’honneur du Prytane Kléanax’, *GMusJ* 10 (1982) 165-180.

Højte, J. M. *Roman Imperial Statue Bases: From Augustus to Commodus*, Aarhus, 2005.

Hoepfner, W. ‘Bauten und Bedeutung des Hermogenes’, in W. Hoepfner and E. L. Schwandner eds. *Hermogenes und die hochhellenistische Architektur, Internationales Kolloquium in Berlin vom 28. bis 29 Juli 1988*, Mainz, 1990, 1-34.

Holleaux, M. *Études d’épigraphie et d’histoire grecques*, 6 vols, Paris, 1938-1968.

Holtheide, B. *Römische Bürgerrechtspolitik und römische Neubürger in der Provinz Asia*, Freiburg, 1983.

Homolle, T. ‘Dédicaces déliennes’, *BCH* 3 (1879) 360-381.

Hopp, J. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der letzten Attaliden*, Munich, 1977.

Horden, P. and Purcell, N. *The corrupting sea: a study of Mediterranean history*, Oxford, 2000.

Jones, C. P. ‘Diodoros Pasparos and the Nikephoria of Pergamon’, *Chiron* 4 (1974) 183-205.

Jones, C. P. ‘The Rhodian Oration Ascribed to Aelius Aristides’, *CQ* 40.2 (1990) 514-522.

Jones, C. P. ‘Old and New in the Inscriptions of Perge’, *EA* (1999) 8-17. (1999a)

Jones, C. P. ‘Interrupted Funerals’, *PAPhS* 143.4 (1999) 588-600. (1999b)

Jones, C. P. ‘Diodoros Pasparos Revisited’, *Chiron* 30 (2000) 1-14.

Jones, C. P. ‘Events surrounding the bequest of Pergamon to Rome and the Revolt of Aristonicos: new inscriptions from Metropolis’, *JRA* 17 (2004) 469-485.

Jones, C. P. *New Heroes in Antiquity: From Achilles to Antinoos*, Cambridge and London, 2010.

Jones, C. P. ‘An Inscription seen by Agathias’, *ZPE* 179 (2011) 107-115.

Jones, C. P. ‘Earthquakes and Emperors’, in A. Kolb ed. *Infrastruktur und Herrschaftsorganisation im Imperium Romanum*, Berlin, 2014, 52-65.

Jones, C. P. ‘The Earthquake of 26 BCE in Decrees of Mytilene and Chios’, *Chiron* 45 (2015) 101-122.

Jonnes, L. and Ricl, M. ‘A New Royal Inscription from Phrygia Paroreios: Eumenes II Grants Tyriaion the Status of a *polis*,’, *EA* 29 (1997) 1-30.

Jordan, B. ‘Imperialism and Localism in provincia Asia: The Development of Roman Provincial Administration, 133 BCE – c. 20 CE’, Diss. Oxford University, Oxford, 2019.

Kah, D. ‘Militärische Ausbildung im hellenistischen Gymnasion’, in D. Kah and P. Scholz eds. *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*, Berlin, 2004, 47-90.

Kah, D. ‘*Paroikoi* und Neubürger in Priene’, in L.-M. Günther ed. *Migration und Bürgerrecht in der hellenistischen Welt*, Göttingen, 2012, 51-71.

Kah, D. ‘Demokratie in der Kleinstadt. Überlegungen zu Demographie und Partizipation am Beispiel des hellenistischen Priene’, in A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann eds. *Stadtkultur im Hellenismus*, Heidelberg, 2014, 148-172.

Kah, D. ‘The Gymnasiarchia from the Hellenistic Age to the Roman Empire: the Example of Rhodes’, in U. Mania and M. Trümper eds. *Development of Gymnasia and Graeco-Roman Cityscapes*, Berlin, 2018, 273-300.

Kajava, M. ‘Eresian Memories’, *ZPE* 139 (2002) 89-107.

Kalinowski, A. ‘The Vedii Antonini: Aspects of Patronage and Benefaction in Second-Century Ephesos’, *Phoenix* 56.1-2 (2002) 109-149.

Kallet-Marx, R. M. *Hegemony to Empire. The Development of the Roman* Imperium *in the East from 148 to 62 B.C.*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1995.

Kampmann, U. *Die Homonoia-Verbindungen der Stadt Pergamon*, Saarbrucken, 1996.

Kantirea, M. *Les dieux et les dieux augustes : le culte imperial en Grèce sous les Julio-claudiens et les Flaviens : études épigraphiques et archéologiques*, Athens, 2007.

Kantirea, M. ‘Non-elite Benefactors in the Roman East: Building Activity by Freedmen, Slaves, Craftsmen and Traders’, in Y. Hazırlayanlar, B. Takmer, E. N. Akdoğu Arca and N. Gökalp Özdil eds. *Vir Doctus Anatolicus. Studies in Memory of Sencer Şahin. Sencer Şahin Anısına Yazılar*, Istanbul, 2016, 471-493.

Kay, P. *Rome’s Economic Revolution*, Oxford, 2014.

Kaye, N. ‘“The Skeleton of the State”: The Fiscal Politics of Pergamon, 188-133 B.C.E.’, Diss. University of California, Berkeley, 2012.

Kaye, N. and Souza, R. ‘New Readings of the Decree for Asklepides Son of Theophilos Περγαμηνός from Kadıköy (SE Lydia)’, *EA* 46 (2013) 91-100.

Kearsley, R. A. ‘The Milyas and the Attalids: A Decree of the City of Olbasa and a New Royal Letter of the Second Century B.C.’, *AS* 44 (1994) 47-57. (1994a)

Kearsley, R. A. ‘A Civic Benefactor of the First Century in Asia Minor’, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* 7 (1994) 233-241. (1994b)

Kearsley, R. A. ‘Epigraphic Evidence for the Social Impact of Roman Government in Laodicea and Hierapolis’, in A. H. Cadwallader and M. Trainor eds. *Colossae in Space and Time. Linking to an Ancient City*, Göttingen, 2011, 130-150.

Kennell, N. ‘Most Necessary for the Bodies of Men: Olive Oil and its By-Products in the Later Greek Gymnasium’, in M. Joyal ed. *In Altum: Seventy-five years of Classics in Newfoundland*, St. John’s, 2001, 119-133.

Kinns, P. ‘Asia Minor’, in A. M. Burnett and M. H. Crawford eds. *The Coinage of the Roman World in the Late Republic*, Oxford, 1987, 105-119.

Kirbihler, F. ‘Les femmes magistrats et liturges en Asie mineure’, *Ktema* 19 (1994) 51-75.

Kirbihler, F. ‘Die Italiker in Kleinasien, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Ephesos (133 v. Chr. – 1. Jh. n. Chr.)’, in M. Meyer ed. *Neue Zeiten – neue Sitten: Zu Rezeption und Integration römischen und italischen Kulturguts in Kleinasien*, Vienna, 2007, 19-35.

Kirbihler, F. ‘César, Auguste et l’Asie : continuités et évolutions de deux politiques’, in O. Devillers and K. Sion-Jenkis eds. *César sous Auguste*, Bordeaux, 2012, 125-144.

Kirbihler, F. ‘Brutus et Cassius et les impositions, spoliations et confiscations en Asie mineure durant les guerres civiles (44-42 a.C.)’, in M.-C. Ferriès and F. Delrieux eds. *Spolier et confisquer dans les mondes grec et romain*, Chambéry, 2013, 345-366.

Kirbihler, F. *Des Grecs et des Italiens à Éphèse. Histoire d’une intégration croisée (133 a.C.-48 p. C.)*, Bordeaux, 2016.

Kirbihler, F. ‘Les problèmes d’une mission publique entre République et Empire : P. Vedius Pollio en Asie’, in L. Cavalier, M.-C. Ferriès and F. Delrieux eds. *Auguste et l’Asie Mineure*, Bordeaux, 2017, 129-152.

Klaffenbach G. *Griechische Epigraphik*, Göttingen, 1966.

Kleijwegt, M. *Ancient Youth. The Ambiguity of Youth and the Absence of Adolescence in Greco-Roman Society*, Amsterdam, 1991.

Kohl, M. ‘Das Nikephorien von Pergamon’, *RA* (2002) 227-253.

Kokkinia, C. *Die Opramoas-Inschrift von Rhodiapolis. Euergetismus und soziale Elite in Lykien*, Bonn, 2000.

Kokkinia, C. ‘Junge Honoratioren in Lykien und eine neue Ehreninschrift aus Bubon’, in C. Schuler ed. *Griechische Epigraphik in Lykien: eine Zwischenbilanz*, Vienna, 2007, 165-174.

Kokkinia, C. *Boubon. The inscriptions and archaeological remains. A survey 2004-2006*, Athens, 2008. (2008a)

Kokkinia, C. ‘Grain for Cibyra. Veranius Philagros and the “Great Conspiracy”’, in K. Dörtlük and T. Kahya eds. *III. Uluslararasi Likya Sempozyumu. 07-10 Kasim 2005 Antalya. Sempozyum bildirileri*, Istanbul, 2007, 355-364 (= in R. Alston and O. M. van Nijf, eds. *Feeding the Ancient Greek City*, Leuven, 2008, 143-158). (2008b)

Kokkinia, C. ‘Games vs Buildings as Euergetic Choices’, in K. Coleman and J. Nelis-Clément eds. *L’organisation des spectacles dans le monde romain*, Geneva, 2011, 97-124.

Kokkinia, C. ‘The god-emperor. Fragments of a discourse between Greek cities and provincial governors’, in C. Feyel, J. Fournier, L. Graslin-Thomé and F. Kirbihler eds. *Communautés locales et pouvoir central dans l’Orient hellénistique et romain*, 2012, 499-516.

Kokkinia, C. ‘*Martyriai*: Civic Honours and Imperial Government’, in A. Heller and O. M. van Nijf eds. *The Politics of Honour in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire*, Leiden, 2017, 373-385.

Kotsidu, H. *TIMH KAI ΔOΞA. Ehrungen für hellenistische Herrscher im griechischen Mutterland und in Kleinasien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der archäologischen Denkmäler*, Berlin, 2000.

Kreeb, M. ‘Hermogenes – Quellen- und Datierungsprobleme’, in W. Hoepfner and E. L. Schwandner eds. *Hermogenes und die hochhellenistische Architektur, Internationales Kolloquium in Berlin vom 28. bis 29 Juli 1988*, Mainz, 1990, 103-113.

Kreißig, H. ‘Landed property in the “Hellenistic” Orient’, *Eirene* 15 (1977) 5-26.

Kuhn, C. T. ‘The Castricii in Cicero: Some Observations on *Pro Flacc.* 75’, *MH* 74.1 (2017) 6-18. (2017a)

Kuhn, C. T. ‘The Refusal of the Highest Honours by Members of the Urban Elite in Roman Asia Minor’, in A. Heller and O. M. van Nijf eds. *The Politics of Honour in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire*, Leiden, 2017, 199-219. (2017b)

Labarre, G. *Les cités de Lesbos aux époques hellénistique et impériale*, Lyon, 1996. (1996a)

Labarre, G. ‘Théophane et l’octroi de la liberté à Mytilène: Question de methode’, *Tekmeria* 2 (1996) 44-54. (1996b)

Labarre, G., Özsait, M., Özsait, N., Güceren İ. ‘La collection du Musée d’Uluborlu : nouvelles inscriptions d’Apollonia Mordiaon’, *Anatolica Antiqua* 20 (2012) 121-146.

Laffi, U. ‘Cittadini romani di fronte ai tribunali di comunità alleate o libere dell’Oriente greco in età repubblicana’, in B. Santalucia ed. *La repressione criminale nella Roma repubblicana fra norma e persuasione*, Pavia, 2009, 127-167.

Lafond, Y. *La mémoire des cités dans le Péloponnèse d’époque romaine (IIe siècle avant J.-C.-IIIe siècle après J.-C.)*, Rennes, 2006.

Lambert, S. D. ‘What was the Point of Inscribed Honorific Decrees in Classical Athens?’, in ed. *Sociable Man. Studies in Ancient Greek Social Behaviour in Honour of Nick Fisher*, Swansea, 2011, 193-214.

Laronde, A. ‘Huios tès poléôs’, in F. Poli and G. Vottero eds. *Études grecques et latines offertes à Catherine Dobias-Lalou*, Nancy, 2005, 149-159.

Laum, B. *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike*, 2 vols, Berlin, 1914.

Laumonier, A. ‘Recherches sur la chronologie des prêtres de Panamara’, *BCH* 61 (1937) 236-298.

Lavan, M. ‘“Father of the Whole Human Race”: Ecumenical Language and the Limits of Elite Integration in the Early Roman Empire’, in M. Lavan, R. E. Payne and J. Weisweiler eds. *Cosmopolitanism and Empire. Universal Rulers, Local Elites, and Cultural Integration in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean*, Oxford, 2016, 153-168.

Lavan, M., Payne, R. E. and Weisweiler, J. ‘Cosmopolitan Politics: The Assimilation and Subordination of Elite Cultures’, in eds. *Cosmopolitanism and Empire. Universal*

Rulers, Local Elites, and Cultural Integration in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean, Oxford, 2016, 1-28.

Le Guen, B. 'Kraton, Son of Zotichos: Artists' Associations and Monarchic Power in the Hellenistic Period Period', in P. Wilson ed. *The Greek Theatre and Festivals. Documentary Studies*, Oxford, 2007, 246-278.

Lehmann, G. A. *"Römischer Tod" in Kolophon-Klaros. Neue Quellen zum Status der freien Polisstaaten an der Westküste Kleinasiens im späten zweiten Jahrhundert v.Chr.*, Göttingen, 1998.

Lehmann, G. A. 'Ανδρολήψιον: Rom und der "Menschenfang"-Streit zwischen Kolophon und Metropolis', *ZPE* 144 (2003) 79-86.

Lendon, J. E. *Empire of Honour*, Oxford, 2001.

Lendon, J. E. 'Rhetoric and Nymphaea in the Roman Empire', *Chiron* 45 (2015) 123-149.

Le Rider, G. 'Sur un aspect du comportement monétaire des villes libres d'Asie Mineure occidentale au II^{e} siècle', in A. Bresson and R. Descat eds. *Les cités d'Asie Mineure occidentale au II^{e} siècle av. J.-C.*, Bordeaux, 2001, 37-59.

Le Teuff, B. 'La fiscalité de la province d'Asie au tournant de l'ère augustéenne : un bilan', in L. Cavalier, M.-C. Ferriès and F. Delrieux eds. *Auguste et l'Asie Mineure*, Bordeaux, 2017, 61-73.

Levick, B. 'Some Augustan Oaths', in S. Cagnazzi, M. Chelotti, A. Favuzzi, F. F. Troisi, D. P. Orsi, M. Silvestrini and E. Todisco eds. *Scritti di storia per Mario Pani*, Bari, 2011, 245-256.

Lewin, A. *Assemblee popolari e lotta politica nelle città dell'impero romano*, Florence, 1995.

Liddel, P. 'Epigraphy, Legislation, and Power within the Athenian Empire', *BICS* 53.1 (2010) 99-128.

Liebenam, W. *Städteverwaltung im römischen Kaiserreiche*, Leipzig, 1900.

Lomas, K. and Cornell, T. eds. *Bread and circuses: euergetism and municipal patronage in Roman Italy*, London, 2003.

Longfellow, B. *Roman Imperialism and Civic Patronage: Form, Meaning, and Ideology in Monumental Fountain Complexes*, Cambridge, 2011.

Lorber, C. C. and Hoover, O. D. 'An Unpublished Tetradrachm Issued by the Artists of Dionysos', *NC* 163 (2003) 59-68.

Love, I. C. 'A Preliminary Report of the Excavations at Knidos, 1972', *AJA* 77.4 (1973) 413-424.

Ma, J. ‘Public Speech and Community in the *Euboicus*’, in S. Swain ed. *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*, Oxford, 2000, 108-124.

Ma, J. *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford, 2002.

Ma, J. ‘Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age’, *P&P* 180.1 (2003) 9-39.

Ma, J. ‘Empires, Statuses and Realities’, in R. Parker, N. Papazarkadas and J. Ma eds. *Interpreting the Athenian Empire*, London, 2009, 125-148.

Ma, J. *Statues and Cities: Honorific Portraits and Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World*, Oxford, 2013.

Ma, J. ‘Les cités grecques, une tentative de synthèse’, *CCG* 25 (2014) 149-164.

Ma, J. ‘Whatever Happened to Athens? Thoughts on the Great Convergence and Beyond’, in M. Canevaro and B. Gray eds. *The Hellenistic Reception of Classical Athenian Democracy and Political Thought*, Oxford, 2018, 277-298.

Mack, W. *Proxeny and Polis. Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, Oxford, 2015.

Madsen, J. M. ‘Who Introduced the Imperial Cult in Asia and Bithynia? The Koinon’s Role in the Early Worship of Augustus’, in A. Kolb and M. Vitale eds. *Kaiserkult in den Provinzen des Römischen Reiches: Organisation, Kommunikation und Repräsentation*, Berlin, 2016, 21-35.

Maffre, F. ‘La cité de Cyzique et Auguste en leur temps’, in L. Cavalier, M.-C. Ferriès and F. Delrieux eds. *Auguste et l’Asie Mineure*, Bordeaux, 2017, 241-275.

Magie, D. *Roman rule in Asia Minor to the end of the third century after Christ*, 2 vols, Princeton, 1950.

Mango, E. ‘Bankette im hellenistischen Gymnasion’, in D. Kah and P. Scholz eds. *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*, Berlin, 2004, 273-311.

Mann, C. and Scholz, P. eds. *“Demokratie” im Hellenismus von der Herrschaft des Volkes zur Herrschaft der Honoratioren*, Mannheim, 2012.

Marasco, G. *Fra Repubblica e Impero*, Viterbo, 1992.

Marcellesi, M.-C. ‘Les hydrophores d’Artémis Pythiè à Milet’, in M.-F. Baslez and Fr. Prévot eds. *Prosopographie et histoire religieuse. Actes du colloque tenu en l’Université Paris XII-Val de Marne les 27 et 28 octobre 2000*, Paris, 2005, 85-112.

Marek, C. *Die Proxenie*, Frankfurt, 1984.

Marek, C. ‘Karien im ersten Mithradatischen Krieg’, in P. Kneissel and V. Losemann eds. *Alte Geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Festschrift für Karl Christ zum 65. Geburtstag*, Darmstadt, 1988, 285-308.

Marek, C. and Frei, P. *In the land of a thousand gods: a history of Asia Minor in the ancient world*, Princeton, 2016.

Mason, H. J. *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions. A Lexicon and Analysis*, Toronto, 1974.

Mathys, M. *Architekturstiftungen und Ehrenstatuen: Untersuchungen zur visuellen Repräsentation der Oberschicht im späthellenistischen und kaiserzeitlichen Pergamon*, Darmstadt, 2014.

Matthaei, A. *Münzbild und Polisbild. Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung kleinasiatischer Poleis im Hellenismus*, München, 2013.

McGing, B. C. *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator King of Pontus*, Leiden, 1986.

McKechnie, P. *Christianising Asia Minor. Conversion, Communities, and Social Change in the Pre-Constantinian Era*, Cambridge, 2019.

Meadows, A. ‘The Hellenistic coinage of Clazomenae’, in O. Tekin ed. *Ancient History, Numismatics and Epigraphy in the Mediterranean World, Studies in Honour of Clemens E. Bosch, Sabahat Atlan and Nezahat Baydur*, Istanbul, 2009, 247-262.

Meadows, A. ‘The Great Transformation. Civic Coin Design in the Second Century BC’, in P.P. Iossif, Fr. De Callataÿ and R. Veymiers eds. *ΤΥΠΟΙ. Greek and Roman Coins Seen Through Their Images Noble Issuers, Humble Users? Proceedings of the International Conference Organized by the Belgian and French Schools at Athens, 26-28 September 2012*, Liège, 2018, 297-318.

Meadows, A. ‘Invasion and Transformation. The development of the civic Alexander coinage in Western Asia Minor, c. 323 to 223 BC.’ in M.-C. Marcellesi and S. Kremydi eds. *Les alexandres après Alexandre: histoire d’une monnaie commune*, Athens, 2019, 63-87.

Meier, L. *Die Finanzierung öffentlicher Bauten in der hellenistischen Polis*, Mainz, 2012.

Mellor, R. *ΘΕΑ ΡΩΜΗ. The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World*, Göttingen, 1975.

Mellor, R. ‘The Dedications on the Capitoline Hill’, *Chiron* 8 (1978) 319-330.

Merola, G. ‘Il sistema tributario asiano tra Repubblica e Principato’, *MediterrAnt* 4 (2001) 459-72. (2001a)

Mert, I. H. ‘Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen und kaiserzeitlichen Bauornamentik von Stratonikeia’, Diss. Universität zu Köln, Cologne, 1999.

Meyer-Zwiffelhoffer, E. 'Bürger sein in den griechischen Städten der römischen Kaiserzeit', in K.-J. Hölkeskamp, J. Rüsen and E. Stein-Hölkeskamp eds. *Sinn (in) der Antike. Orientierungssysteme. Leitbilder und Wertkonzepte im Altertum*, Mainz, 2003, 375-402.

Migeotte, L. *L'emprunt public dans les cités grecques*, Quebec, 1984.

Migeotte, L. 'L'évergétisme des citoyens aux périodes classique et hellénistique', in M. Christol and O. Masson eds. *Actes du Xe congrès International d'épigraphie grecque et latine (Nîmes, 4-9 octobre 1992)*, Paris, 1997, 183-196.

Migeotte, L. 'Le contrôle des prix dans les cités grecques', in *Économie et finances publiques des cités grecques I. Choix d'articles publiés de 1976 à 2001*, Lyon, 2011, 419-438.

Migeotte, L. 'Les dons du roi Eumène II à Milet et les emporika daneia de la cité', in *Économie et finances publiques des cités grecques II. Choix d'articles publiés de 2002 à 2014*, Lyon, 2015, 345-354.

Mileta, C. 'Zur Vorgeschichte und Entstehung der Gerichtsbezirke der Provinz Asia', *Klio* 72.2 (1990) 427-444.

Mileta, C. 'Die offenen Arme der Provinz: Überlegungen zur Funktion und Entwicklung der prorömischen Kultfeste der Provinz Asia (erstes Jahrhundert v. Chr.)', in J. Rüpke ed. *Festrituale in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Tübingen, 2008, 89-114.

Millar, F. *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC-AD 337)*, London, 1977.

Mitchell, L. *Greeks bearing gifts. The public use of private relationships in the Greek world, 435-323 BC*, Cambridge, 1997.

Mitchell, S. 'The Plancii in Asia Minor', *JRS* 64 (1974) 27-39.

Mitchell, S. 'R.E.C.A.M. Notes and Studies No. 5: A Roman Family in Phrygia', *AS* 29 (1979) 13-22.

Mitchell, S. 'Imperial Building in the Eastern Roman Provinces', *HSPh* 81 (1987) 333-365.

Mitchell, S. 'Festivals, Games, and Civic Life in Roman Asia Minor', *JRS* 80 (1990) 183-193.

Mitchell, S. *Anatolia. Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor*, 2 vols, Oxford, 1993.

Mitchell, S. 'The Administration of Roman Asia from 133 BC to AD 250', in W. Eck ed. *Lokale Autonomie und römische Ordnungsmacht in den kaiserzeitlichen Provinzen vom 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert*, Munich, 1999, 17-46.

Mitchell, S. ‘Geography, Politics, and Imperialism in the Asian Customs Law’, in M. Cottier, M. H. Crawford, C. V. Crowther, J.-L. Ferrary, B. M. Levick, O. Salomies and M. Wörrle eds. *The Customs Law of Asia*, Oxford, 2009, 165-201.

Mitchell, S. ‘Dispelling Seleucid Phantoms: Macedonians in Western Asia Minor from Alexander to the Attalids’, in K. Erickson ed. *The Seleucid Empire, 281-222 BC. War within the Family*, Swansea, 2018, 11-35.

Muccioli, F. *Gli epiteti ufficiali dei re ellenistici*, Stuttgart, 2013.

Müller, C. ‘Évergétisme et pratiques financières dans les cités de la grèce hellénistique’, *REA* 113.2 (2011) 345-363.

Müller, C. ‘Oligarchy and the Hellenistic City’, in H. Börm and N. Luraghi eds. *The Polis in the Hellenisic World*, Suttgart, 2018, 27-52.

Müller, H. ‘Pergamenische Parerga’, *Chiron* 33 (2003) 419-445.

Müller, H. and Staab, G. ‘Dion. Ein pergamenischer Politiker im Himmel’, *Chiron* 47 (2017) 339-365.

Münsterberg, R. ‘Verkannte Titel auf griechischen Münzen’, *JÖAI* 18 (1915) 309-323.

Musti, D. ‘I *Nikephoria* e il ruolo panellenico di Pergamo’, in D. Musti ed. *Nike. Ideologia, iconografia e feste della vittoria in età antica*, Rome, 2005, 45-91. (2005a)

Musti, D. ‘Un bilancio sulla questione dei *Nikephoria* di Pergamo’, in D. Musti ed. *Nike. Ideologia, iconografia e feste della vittoria in età antica*, Rome, 2005, 93-147. (2005b)

Musti, D. ‘Aspetti e funzioni della ginnasiarchia nell’Asia Minore occidentale’, in O. Curty ed. *L’huile et l’argent. Actes du colloque tenu à Fribourg du 13 au 15 octobre 2005*, Paris, 2009, 259-273.

Ng, D. ‘Commemoration and Élite Benefaction of Buildings and Spectacles in the Roman World’, *JRS* 105 (2015) 101-123.

Nicols, J. *Civic Patronage in the Roman Empire*, Leiden, 2014.

Nielsen, I. *Thermae et Balnea. The Architecture and Cultural History of Roman Public Baths*, 2 vols, Aarhus, 1993.

Nissen, C. ‘Ιατρεῖον et ἐργαστήριον, les noms des lieux d’exercice des médecins privés dans le monde grec’, *AC* 79 (2010) 117-135.

Noè, E. ‘Un esempio di mobilità sociale nella tarda repubblica: il caso di Ibrea di Milasa’, in E. Gabba, P. Desideri and S. Roda eds. *Italia sul Baetis. Studi di storia romana in memoria di Fernando Gascó*, Turin, 1996, 51-64.

Nutton, V. ‘Healers in the medical market-place : towards a social history of Graeco-Roman medicine’, in A. Wear ed. *Medicine in Society. Historical Essays*, Cambridge, 1992, 15-58.

Özdizbay, A. ‘Euergetists of Italic Origin in the City of Perge and Their Contributions to Urban Development’, in O. Tekin, C. H. Roosevelt and E. Akyürek eds. *Philanthropy in Anatolia through the Ages. Proceedings of the First International Suna & İnan Kıraç Symposium on Mediterranean Civilizations (Antalya March 26-29.03 2019)*, Istanbul 2020, 83-96.

Özgünel, C. A. ‘Das Heiligtum des Apollon Smintheus und die Ilias’ *Studia Troica* 13 (2003) 261-291.

Oppeneer, T. ‘Assembly Politics and the Rhetoric of Honour in Chariton, Dio of Prusa and John Chrysostom’, *Historia* 67 (2018) 223-243.

Parker, R. ‘New ‘Panhellenic’ Festivals in Hellenistic Greece’, in R. Schlesier and U. Zellmann eds. *Mobility and Travel in the Mediterranean from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, Münster, 2004, 9-22.

Parker, R. ‘A Funerary Foundation from Hellenistic Lycia’, *Chiron* 40 (2010) 103-121.

Parker, R. W. ‘Potamon of Mytilene and His Family’, *ZPE* 85 (1991) 115-129.

Pera, R. *Homonoia sulle monete da Augusto agli Antonini*, Genoa, 1984.

Peristiany J. G. ed. *Honour and shame: the values of Mediterranean society*, Chicago, 1966.

Pernin, I. *Les baux ruraux en Grèce ancienne: corpus épigraphique et étude*, Paris, 2014.

Perrin-Saminadayar, É. *Éducation, culture et société à Athènes. Les acteurs de la vie culturelle Athénienne (229-88) : un tout petit monde*, Paris, 2008.

Petzl, G. and Pleket, H. W. ‘Ein hellenistisches Ehrendekret aus Kyme’, *Chiron* 9 (1979) 73-81.

Pitt-Rivers, J. ‘Honour and social status’, in J. G. Peristiany ed. *Honour and shame: the values of Mediterranean society*, Chicago, 1966, 19-77.

Platt, V. *Facing the Gods. Epiphany and Representation in Graeco-Roman Art, Literature and Religion*, Cambridge, 2011.

Pleket, H. W. ‘Troostdecreten: een maatschappelijk verschijnsel’, in H. F. J. Horstmanshoff ed. *Pijn en balsem, troost en smart. Pijnbeleving en pijnbestrijding in de Oudheid*, Rotterdam, 1994, 149-156.

Pont, A.-V. ‘L’empereur « fondateur » : enquête sur les motifs de la reconnaisance civique’, *REG* 120.2 (2007) 526-552.

Pont, A.-V. ‘Évergetès bâtisseurs à Aphrodisias au Haut-Empire’, in A. D. Rizakis and F. Camia eds. *Pathways to Power. Civic Elites in the Eastern Part of the Roman Empire. Proceedings of the International Workshop held at Athens, Scuola Archaeologica Italiana di Atene, 19 December 2005*, Athens, 2008, 181-208. (2008a)

Pont, A.-V. ‘L’inscription en l’honneur de M. Vlpius Carminius Claudianus à Aphrodisias (CIG, 2782)’, *CCG* 19 (2008) 219-245. (2008b)

Pont, A.-V. *Orner la cité. Enjeux culturels et politiques du paysage urbain dans l’Asie Mineure gréco-romaine*, Bordeaux, 2010.

Pont, A.-V. ‘Grands notables et petites patries en Asie’, in A. Heller and A.-V. Pont eds. *Patrie d’origine et patries électives*, Paris, 2012, 285-308. (2012a)

Pont, A.-V. ‘Aphrodisias, presque une île: la cité et ses réseaux d’Auguste à 249/250’, *Chiron* 42 (2012) 319-346. (2012b)

Pont, A.-V. ‘Élites civiques et propriété foncière : les effets de l’intégration à l’empire sur une cité grecque moyenne, à partir de l’exemple d’Iasos’, in F. Lerouxel and A.-V. Pont, eds. *Propriétaires et citoyens dans l’Orient romain*, Bordeaux, 2016, 233-260.

Portale, E. C. ‘Ancora sulla kelsiane bibliotheke di Efeso’, *MediterrAnt* 14 (2011) 107-148.

Price, S.R.F. *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge, 1984.

Psoma, S. ‘War or Trade? Attic-Weight Tetradrachms from Second-Century BC Attalid Asia Minor in Seleukid Syria after the Peace of Apameia and their Historical Context’, in P. Thonemann ed. *Attalid Asia Minor: Money, International Relations, and the State*, Oxford, 2013, 265-300.

Pugliese Carratelli, G. ‘Ἀπόγονοι Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ Ἡρακλέους’, in *Storia poesia e pensiero nel mondo antico. Studi in onore di M. Gigante*, Naples, 1994, 544-547.

Purcell, N. ‘Livia and the Womanhood of Rome’, *PCPhS* 32 (1986) 78-105.

Purcell, N. ‘Romans in the Roman World’, in in K. Galinsky, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, Cambridge, 2005, 85-105.

Quaß, F. *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens*, Stuttgart, 1993.

Raeck, W. ‘Der mehrfache Apollodoros. Zur Präsenz des Bürgers im hellenistischen Stadtbild am Beispiel von Priene’, in M. Wörrle and P. Zanker eds. *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus*, Munich, 1995, 231-240.

Raeck W. ‘Priene’, in Radt, W. ed. *Stadtgrabungen und Stadtforschung im westlichen Kleinasien: Geplantes und Erreichtes. Internationales Symposion 6./7. August 2004 in Bergama (Türkei)*, Istanbul, 2006, 315-324.

Raggi, A. ‘Senatus consultum de Asclepiade Clazomenio sociisque’, *ZPE* 135 (2001) 73-116.

Raggi, A. *Seleuco di Rhosos. Cittandinanza e privilege nell’oriente greco in età tardo-repubblicana*, Pisa, 2006.

Raggi, A. ‘La scomparsa degli οἱ κατ’ ἄνδρα dall’assemblea provinciale d’Asia’, *ZPE* 172 (2010) 148-150.

Raubitschek, A. E. ‘Epigraphical Notes on Julius Caesar’, *JRS* 44 (1954) 65-75.

Reger, G. ‘*Sympoliteiai* in Hellenistic Asia Minor’, in S. Colvin ed. *The Greco-Roman East. Politics, Culture, Society*, Cambridge, 2004, 145-180.

Reger, G. ‘Mylasa and its Territory’, in R. van Bremen and J.-M. Carbon eds. *Hellenistic Karia*, Bordeaux, 2010, 43-57.

Reynolds, J. M. *Aphrodisias and Rome*, London, 1982.

Reynolds, J. M. ‘Epigraphic evidence for the construction of the theatre: 1st c. B.C. to mid 3rd c. A.D.’, in R. R. R. Smith and K. T. Erim eds. *Aphrodisias Papers 2. The theatre, a sculptor’s workshop, philosophers, and coin-types*, Ann Arbor, 1991, 15-28.

Riaño Rufilanchas, D. ‘Zwei Agone in “I. Priene” 112.91-95’, *ZPE* 129 (2000) 89-96.

Ricl, M. and Akat, S. ‘A New Honorary Inscription for Cn. Vergilius Capito from Miletos’, *EA* 30 (2007) 29-32.

Rigsby, K. J. ‘The Era of the Province of Asia’, *Phoenix* 33.1 (1979) 39-47.

Rigsby, K. J. *Asylia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1996.

Ritti, T. *An Epigraphic Guide to Hierapolis (Pamukkale)*, Istanbul, 2006.

Rizakis, A. ‘Commerce de parfums et evérgétisme civique en Laconie (Gytheion) sous l’empire’, *MediterrAnt* 16.2 (2013) 549-562.

Rizakis, A. D. and Camia, F. eds. *Pathways to Power. Civic Elites in the Eastern Part of the Roman Empire. Proceedings of the International Workshop held at Athens, Scuola Archaeologica Italiana di Atene, 19 December 2005*, Athens, 2008.

Robert, J. and Robert, L. *Fouilles d’Amyzon en Carie*, 2 vols, Paris, 1983.

Robert, J. and Robert, L. *Claros I. Décrets hellénistiques*, Paris, 1989.

Robert, L. *Études anatoliennes, Recherches sur les inscriptions grecques de l’Asie Mineure*, Paris, 1937.

Robert, L. *Études épigraphiques et philologiques*, Paris, 1938.

Robert, L. *Hellenica. Recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*, 13 vols, Paris, 1940-1965.

Robert, L. *Noms indigènes dans l'Asie Mineure gréco-romaine*, Paris, 1963.

Robert, L. 'Inscriptions d'Aphrodisias', *AC* 35.2 (1966) 377-432.

Robert, L. 'Un prêtre à Philadephie de Lydie', in *Monnaies grecques. Types, légendes, magistrats monétaires et géographie*, Paris, 1967, 73-78.

Robert, L. 'Théophane de Mytilène à Constantinople', *CRAI* 113.1 (1969) 42-64. (1969)

Robert, L. *Opera Minora Selecta*, 7 vols, Amsterdam, 1969-1990.

Robert, L. 'Les monétaires et un décret hellénistique de Sestos', *RN* 15 (1973) 43-53.

Robert, L. 'Stele funéraire de Nicomédie et Séismes dans les Inscriptions', *BCH* 102 (1978) 395-408.

Robert, L. 'Documents d'Asie Mineure XXXII. Documents pergaméniens', *BCH* 108.1 (1984) 472-499.

Rogers, G. M. *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos. Foundation Myths of a Roman City*, London, 1991. (1991a)

Rogers, G. M. 'Demosthenes of Oenoanda and Models of Euergetism', *JRS* 81 (1991) 91-100. (1991b)

Rogers, G. M. 'The Assembly of Imperial Ephesos', *ZPE* 94 (1992) 224-228.

Rogers, G. M. 'The Gift and Society in Roman Asia: Orthodoxies and Heresies', *SCI* 12 (1993) 188-199.

Rose, C. B. 'Ilion in the Early Empire', in C. Berns, H. von Hesberg, L. Vandeput and M. Waelkens eds. *Patris und Imperium. Kulturelle und politische Identität in den Städten der römischen Kleinasiens in der frühen Kaiserzeit. Kolloquium Köln, November 1998*, Leuven, 2002, 33-47.

Rose, C. B. 'The Parthians in Augustan Rome', *AJA* 109 (2005) 21-75.

Rowe, G. *Princes and Political Cultures: The New Tiberian Senatorial Decrees*, Ann Arbor, 2002.

Ruggini, L. C. 'La vita associativa nelle città dell'Oriente greco: tradizioni locali e influenze romane', in D. M. Pippidi ed. *Assimilation et résistance à la culture gréco-romaine dans le monde ancien. Travaux du VIe Congrès International d'Études Classiques. Madrid, Septembre 1974*, Bucharest and Paris, 1976, 463-491.

Rumscheid, F. *Untersuchungen zur kleinasiatischen Bauornamentik des Hellenismus*, Mainz, 1994.

Rumscheid, F. 'Vom Wachsen antiker Säulenwälder. Zu Projektierung und Finanzierung antiker Bauten in Westkleinasien und anderswo', *JDAI* 114 (1999) 19-63.

Rumscheid, F. 'Den Anschluss verpasst: Priene in der (frühen) Kaiserzeit', in C. Berns, H. von Hesberg, L. Vandeput and M. Waelkens eds. *Patris und Imperium. Kulturelle und politische Identität in den Städten der römischen Kleinasiens in der frühen Kaiserzeit. Kolloquium Köln, November 1998*, Leuven, 2002, 77-87.

Rumscheid, F. 'Fragen zur bürgerlich-hellenistischen Wohnkultur in Kleinasien', in S. Ladstätter and V. Scheibelreiter eds. *Städtisches Wohnen im östlichen Mittelmeerraum, 4. Jh. v. Chr. – 1. Jh. n. Chr., Akten des internationalen Kolloquiums vom 24.–27. Oktober 2007 an der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Vienna, 2010, 119-143.

Russell, T. J. *Byzantium and the Bosporus: a historical study, from the seventh century BC until the foundation of Constantinople*, Oxford, 2017.

Şahin, S. 'Studien zu den Inschriften von Perge II: Der Gesandte Apollonios und seine Familie', *EA* 25 (1995) 1-23.

Salmeri, G. 'Dio, Rome, and the Civic Life of Asia Minor', in S. Swain ed. *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*, Oxford, 2000, 53-92.

Salomies, O. 'Römische Amtsträger und römisches Bürgerrecht in der Kaiserzeit. Die Aussagekraft der Onomastik (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der kleinasiatischen Provinzen)', in W. Eck ed. *Prosopographie und Sozialgeschichte. Studien zur Methodik und Erkenntnismöglichkeit der kaiserzeitlichen Prosopographie*, Cologne, 1993, 119-145.

Salomies, O. 'Roman Nomina in the Greek East. Observations on some Recently Published Inscriptions', *Arctos* 35 (2001) 139-174.

Salzmann, D. 'Cn. Pompeius Theophanes. Ein Benennungsvorschlag zu einem Porträt in Mytilene', *MDAI(R)* 92 (1985) 245-260.

Samama, É. *Les médecins dans le monde grec. Sources épigraphiques sur la naissance d'un corps médical*, Geneva, 2003.

Sánchez, P. '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 (2010) 41-60.

Santangelo, F. *Sulla, the Elites and the Empire*, Leiden, 2007.

Santangelo, F. 'Theophanes of Mytilene, Cicero and Pompey's Inner Circle', in H. Van der Blom, C. Gray and C. Steel eds. *Institutions and Ideology in Republican Rome. Speech, Audience and Decision*, Cambridge, 2018, 128-146.

Sartre, M. *L'Orient romain : provinces et sociétés provinciales en Méditerranée orientale d'Auguste aux Sévères (31 avant J.-C-235 après J.- C.)*, Paris, 1991.

Sartre, M. *L'Asie Mineure et l'Anatolie d'Alexandre à Dioclétien (IVe s. av. J.-C. / IIIe s. ap. J.-C.)*, Paris, 1995.

Satlow, M. L. ed. *The Gift in Antiquity*, Chichester, 2013.

Savalli-Lestrade, I. 'Courtisans et citoyens: le cas des philoi attalides', *Chiron* 26 (1996) 149-181.

Savalli-Lestrade, I. *Les philoi royaux dans l'Asie hellénistique*, Geneva, 1998.

Savalli-Lestrade, I. 'Les Attalides et les cités grecques d'Asie Mineure au IIe siècle a.C.', in A. Bresson and R. Descat eds. *Les cités d'Asie Mineure occidentale au II^e^ siècle av. J.-C.*, Bordeaux, 2001, 77-91.

Savalli-Lestrade, I. 'Les rois hellénistiques, maîtres du temps', in I. Savalli-Lestrade and I. Cogitore eds. *Des Rois au Prince. Pratiques du pouvoir monarchique dans l'Orient hellénistique et romain (IVe s. av. J.-C.- IIe s. après J.-C.)*, Grenoble, 2010, 55-83.

Savalli-Lestrade, I. 'Collections de citoyennetés et internationalisation des élites civiques dans l'Asie Mineure hellénistique', in A. Heller and A.-V. Pont eds. *Patrie d'origine et patries électives*, Paris, 2012, 39-59.

Scharf, R. 'Conobaria 5 v. Chr. - Der erste römische "Kaisereid"', in P. Defosse ed. *Hommages à Carl Deroux III - Histoire et épigraphie, droit*, Brussels, 2003, 415-424.

Scherrer, P. 'Der *conventus civium Romanorum* und kaiserliche Freigelassene als Bauherren in Ephesos in augusteischer Zeit', in M. Meyer ed. *Neue Zeiten – Neue Sitten. Zu Rezeption und Integration römischen und italischen Kulturguts in Kleinasien*, Vienna, 2007, 63-75.

Schörner, G. 'Wie integriert man Rom in die Polis? Der Kult des Senats in Kleinasien', in G. de Kleijn and S. Benoist eds. *Integration in Rome and in the Roman World*, Leiden, 2014, 217-242.

Scholz, P. 'Elementarunterricht und intellektuelle Bildung im hellenistischen Gymnasion', in D. Kah and P. Scholz eds. *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*, Berlin, 2004, 103-128.

Scholz, P. 'Die 'Macht der Wenigen' in den hellenistischen Städten', in H. Beck, P. Scholz and U. Walter eds. *Die Macht der Wenigen. Aristokratische Herrschaftspraxis, Kommunikation und 'edler' Lebensstil in Antike und Früher Neuzeit*, Historische Zeitschrift Beiheft 47. Munich, 2008, 71-99.

Scholz, P. 'Städtische Honoratiorenherrschaft und Gymnasiarchie in der Kaiserzeit', in P. Scholz and D. Wiegand eds. *Das kaiserzeitliche Gymasion*, Berlin, 2015, 79-96.

Schuler, C. ‘Die Gymnasiarchie in hellenistischer Zeit’, in D. Kah and P. Scholz eds. *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*, Berlin, 2004, 163-192.

Schuler, C. ‘Die διοίπησις της πόλεως im öffentlichen Finanzwesen der hellenistischen Poleis’, *Chiron* 35 (2005) 385-404.

Schuler, C. ‘Local Elites in the Greek East’, in C. Brun and J. Edmondson eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy*, Oxford, 2014, 250-269.

Schwarzer, H. ‘Untersuchungen zum hellenistischen Herrscherkult in Pergamon’, *MDAI(I)* 49 (1999) 249-300.

Schwertheim, E. ‘Ein postumer Ehrenbeschluss für Apollonis in Kyzikos’, *ZPE* 29 (1978) 213-228.

Scott, J. C. *Seeing like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, New Haven, 1998.

Segre, M. ‘Duo novi testi storici’, *RFIC* 60 (1932) 446-461.

Segre, M. ‘Iscrizioni di Licia. I. Tolomeo di Telmesso’, *Clara Rhodos* 9 (1938) 179-208. (1938a)

Segre, M. ‘Giulio Cesare e la χώρα pergamena’, *Athenaeum* 16 (1938) 119-127. (1938b)

Sève, M. ‘Un décret de consolation à Cyzique’, *BCH* 103.1 (1979) 327-359.

Sève, M. ‘Notables de Macédoine entre l’époque hellénistique et le Haut-Empire’, in P. Fröhlich and C. Müller, eds. *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique*, Geneva, 2005, 257-273.

Sezgin, Y. ‘Antik Dönemde Pergamon-Aigai İlişkileri’, *Arkeoloji Dergisi* 17 (2012) 81-96.

Sherk, R. K. *Roman Documents from the Greek East*, Baltimore, 1969.

Sherk, R. K. ‘The eponymous officials of Greek Cities IV’, *ZPE* 93 (1992) 223-272.

Sherwin-White, A. N. *The Roman Citizenship*, Oxford, 1973.

Sherwin-White, A. N. *Roman Foreign Policy in the East 168 B.C. to A.D. 1*, London, 1984.

Sherwin-White, S. *Ancient Cos*, Göttingen, 1978.

Skaltsa, S. ‘Hellenistic gymnasia: the built space and social dynamics of a polis institution’, Diss. Oxford University, Oxford, 2008.

Slater, W. J. ‘Handouts at Dinner’, *Phoenix* 54 (2000) 107-122.

Smith, R. R. R. *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, Oxford, 1988. (1988a)

Smith, R. R. R. 'Philorhomaioi: Portraits of Roman client rulers in the Greek East in the 1st century BC', in N. Bonacasa and G. Rizza eds. *Ritratto Ufficiale e Ritratto Privato. Atti della Conferenza Internazionale sul Ritratto Romano, 1984*, Rome, 1988, 493-497. (1988b)

Smith, R. R. R. *The Monument of C. Julius Zoilos*, Mainz, 1993.

Smith, R. R. R. 'Cultural Choice and Political Identity in Honorific Portrait Statues in the Greek East in the Second Century A.D.', *JRS* 88 (1998) 56-93.

Snowdon, M. 'Commemorating Freedom: *I.Metropolis* and the Restoration of Freedom', *Mouseion (Canada)* 8 (2008) 377-393.

Spawforth, A. J. S. *Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge, 2012.

Steel, C. 'Being Economical with the Truth: What Really Happened at Lampsacus?', in J. Powell and J. Paterson eds. *Cicero the Advocate*, Oxford, 2004, 233-251.

Steskal, M. *Das Prytaneion in Ephesos*, Vienna, 2010.

Stewart, F. H. *Honor*, Chicago and London, 1994.

Stoop, J. 'Between City and Empire: Awarding Statues to Romans in Greek Cities', *P&P* 235 (2017) 3-36.

Strubbe, J. H. M. 'Gründer kleinasiatischer Städte: Fiktion und Realität', *AncSoc* 15-17 (1984-1986) 253-304.

Strubbe, J. H. M. 'Epigrams and Consolation Decrees for Deceased Youths', *AC* 67 (1998) 45-75.

Strubbe, J. H. M. 'Posthumous Honours for Members of the Municipal Elite in Asia Minor, 2nd-3rd Cent. A.D.', in *XI Congresso internazionale di epigrafia greca e latina, Roma, 18-24 settembre 1997*, Rome, 1999, 489-499.

Strubbe, J. H. M. 'Bürger, Nicht-Bürger und Polis-Ideologie', in K. Demoen ed. *The Greek City from Antiquity to the Present: Historical Reality, Ideological Construction, Literary Representation*, Leuven, 2001, 27-39.

Strubbe, J. H. M. 'Cultic Honours for Benefactors in the Cities of Asia Minor', in L. De Ligt, E. A. Hemelrijk and H. W. Singor eds. *Roman Rule and Civic Life: Local and Regional Perspectives*, Amsterdam, 2004, 314-330.

Strubbe, J. H. M. 'Young Magistrates in the Greek East', *Mnemosyne* 58.1 (2005) 88-111.

Sugliano, A. 'Cittadini, pareci, stranieri: le categorie giuridici e sociali nelle città greche d'Asia Minore fra III e I secolo a.C.', *MediterrAnt* 4.1 (2001) 293-324.

Sullivan, R.D. 'Dynasts in Pontus', *ANRW* 2.7.2 (1980) 913-930.

Suspène, A. ‘Les rois amis et alliés face au principat : rapports personnels, représentations du pouvoir et nouvelles stratégies diplomatiques dans l’orient méditerranéen’, in M. Christol and D. Darde eds. *L’expression du pouvoir au début de l’Empire. Autour de la Maison Carrée à Nîmes. Actes du Colloque organisé à l’initiative de la ville de Nîmes et du Musée archéologique (Nîmes, Carré d’Art, 20-22 octobre 2005)*, 2009, 45-51.

Syme, R. *Anatolica. Studies in Strabo*, Oxford, 1995.

Talbert, R. J. A. *The Senate of Imperial Rome*, Princeton, 1984.

Tekin, O., Roosevelt, C. H. and Akyürek, E. eds. *Philanthropy in Anatolia through the Ages. Proceedings of the First International Suna & İnan Kıraç Symposium on Mediterranean Civilizations (Antalya March 26-29.03 2019)*, Istanbul, 2020.

Thériault, G. ‘Remarques sur le culte des magistrats romains en Orient’, *CEA* 38 (2001) 85-89.

Thériault, G. ‘Évergétisme grec et administration romaine: la famille cnidienne de Gaios Ioulios Théopompos’, *Phoenix* 57.3-4 (2003) 232-256.

Thériault, G, ‘Honneurs cultuels et évergétisme : le cas de Potamôn de Mytilène’, in A. Daviault ed. *Mélanges offerts à Pierre Senay* (= *CEA* Suppl. I), Trois-Rivières, 2011, 55-64.

Thériault, G. ‘Cultes des évergètes (magistrats) romains et *agones* en Asie Mineure’, in K.Konuk, ed. *Stephanéphoros. De l’économie antique à L’Asie Mineure. Hommages à Raymond Descat*, Bordeaux, 2012, 378-387.

Thonemann, P. ‘Hellenistic Inscriptions from Lydia’, *EA* 36 (2003) 95-108.

Thonemann, P. ‘Polemon, son of Polemon (Dio, 59.12.2)’, *EA* 37 (2004) 144-150.

Thonemann, P. ‘The Women of Akmoneia’, *JRS* 100 (2010) 163-178.

Thonemann, P. *The Maeander Valley. A Historical Geography from Antiquity to Byzantium*, Cambridge, 2011. (2011a)

Thonemann, P. ‘Eumenes II and Apolloniocharax’, *Gephyra* 8 (2011) 19-30. (2011b)

Thonemann, P. ‘Alexander, Priene and Naulochon’, in P. Martzavou and N. Papazarkadas eds. *The Epigraphy of the Post-Classical Polis*, Oxford, 2012, 23-36.

Thonemann, P. ‘The Attalid State, 188-133 BC’, in P. Thonemann ed. *Attalid Asia Minor: Money, International Relations, and the State, Oxford*, 2013, 1-47. (2013a)

Thonemann, P. ‘Phyrgia: an anarchist history, 950 BC- AD 100’, in P. Thonemann ed. *Roman Phrygia. Culture and Society*, Cambridge, 2013, 1-40. (2013b)

Thonemann, P. *The Hellenistic World. Using Coins as Sources*, Cambridge, 2015.

Thornton, J. 'Una città e due regine. *Eleutheria* e lotta politica a Cizico fra gli Attalidi e i Giulio Claudi', *MediterrAnt* 2.2 (1999) 497-538.

Trümper, M. 'Urban Context of Greek Public Baths', in S. K. Lucore and M. Trümper eds. *Greek Baths and Bathing Culture*, Leuven, 2013, 33-72.

Trümper, M. '"Privat" versus "öffentlich" in hellenistischen Bädern', in A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann eds. *Stadtkultur im Hellenismus*, Heidelberg, 2014, 206-249.

Trümper, M. 'Modernization and change of function of Hellenistic gymnasia in the Imperial period: Case-studies Pergamon, Miletus and Priene', in P. Scholz and D. Wiegand eds. *Das kaiserzeitliche Gymasion*, Berlin, 2015, 167-221.

Tuchelt, K. 'Bemerkungen zu den Capito-Thermen in Milet', in *Mansel'e armağan. Mélanges Mansel*, 3 vols, Ankara, 1974, 1.147-169.

Tuchelt, K. *Frühe Denkmäler Roms in Kleinasien. Beiträge zur archäologischen Überlieferung aus der Zeit der Republik und des Augustus*, Tübingen, 1979.

Van Berchem, D. *Les distributions de blé et d'argent a la plebe romaine sous l'empire*, Geneva, 1939.

Van, Bremen, R. *The Limits of Participation: Women and Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, Amsterdam, 1996.

Van Bremen, R. 'Leon Son of Chrysaor and the Religious Identity of Stratonikeia in Caria', in S. Colvin ed. *The Greco-Roman East. Politics, Culture, Society*, Cambridge, 2004, 207-244.

Van Bremen, R. 'The Inscribed documents on the temple of Hekate at Lagina and the date and meaning of the temple frieze', in R. van Bremen and J.-M. Carbon eds. *Hellenistic Karia*, Bordeaux, 2010, 483-503.

Van Bremen, R. 'On the dating of the land transaction documents from Olymos', *EA* 51 (2018) 19-35.

Van der Vliet, E. C. L. 'Pride and participation. Politial practice, euergetism, and oligarchisation in the Hellenistic polis', in O. M. van Nijf, R. Alston and C. G. Williamson eds. *Political culture in the Greek city after the classical age*. Leuven, 2011, 155-184.

Van Nijf, O. M. 'Inscriptions and civic memory in the Roman East', in A. Cooley ed. *The Afterlife of Inscriptions*, London, 2000, 21-36.

Van Nijf, O. M. 'Local heroes: athletics, festivals and elite self-fashioning in the Roman East', in S. Goldhill, ed. *Being Greek under Rome. Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, Cambridge, 2001, 306-334.

Van Nijf, O. M. 'The Social World of Tax-Farmers', in M. Cottier, M. H. Crawford, C. V. Crowther, J.-L. Ferrary, B. M. Levick, O. Salomies and M. Wörrle, eds. *The Customs Law of Asia*, Oxford, 2009, 279-311.

Van Nijf, O. M. 'Athletes, Artists and Citizens in the Imperial Greek City', in A. Heller and A.-V. Pont eds. *Patrie d'origine et patries électives*, Paris, 2012, 175-194.

Van Nijf, O. M. 'Affective Politics: The Emotional Regime in the Imperial Greek City', in A. Chaniotis and P. Ducrey eds. *Unveiling Emotions II. Emotions in Greece and Rome: Texts, Images. Material Culture*, Stuttgart, 2013, 351-368.

Van Nijf, O. M. 'Civic Mirrors: Honorific Inscriptions and the Politics of Prestige', in A. B. Kuhn ed. *Social Status and Prestige in the Graeco-Roman World*, Stuttgart, 2015, 233-245.

Veligianni, C. '*Philos* und *philos*-Komposita in den griechischen Inschriften der Kaiserzeit', in M. Peachin ed. *Aspects of friendship in the Graeco-Roman world*, Portsmouth, 2001, 63-80.

Ventroux, O. 'Le premier des citoyens à Pergame sous le Haut-Empire : C. Antius Aulus Iulius Quadratus', in A. Heller and O. M. van Nijf eds. *The Politics of Honour in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire*, Leiden, 2017, 339-369. (2017a)

Ventroux, O. *Pergame. Les élites d'une ancienne capitale royale à l'époque romaine*, Rennes, 2017. (2017b)

Veyne, P. 'Panem et Circenses: l'évergétisme devant les sciences humaines', *Annales (HSS)* 24.3 (1969) 785-825.

Veyne, P. *Le pain et le cirque. Sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique*, Paris, 1976.

Virgilio, B. *Gli Attalidi di Pergamo. Fama, Eredità, Memoria*, Pisa, 1993.

Virgilio, B. 'La città ellenistica e i suoi "benefattori": Pergamo e Diodoro Pasparos', *Athenaeum* 82 (1994) 299-314.

Virgilio, B. 'Forme e linguaggi della comunicazione fra re ellenistici e città. Forme e linguaggi della comunicazione fra re ellenistici e città', *Studi Ellenistici* 27 (2013) 197-215.

Vitale, M. *Eparchie und Koinon in Kleinasien von der ausgehenden Republik bis ins 3. Jh. n. Chr.*, Bonn, 2012.

Von den Hoff, R. 'Hellenistische Gymnasia: Raumgestaltung und Raumfunktionen', in M. Zimmermann ed. *Stadtbilder im Hellenismus*, Berlin, 2009, 245-275.

Von den Hoff, R. 'Ruler Portraits and Ruler Cult in the Pergamon Gymnasion', in U. Mania and M. Trümper eds. *Development of Gymnasia and Graeco-Roman Cityscapes*, Berlin, 2018, 253-271.

Von Hesberg, H. *Formen privater Repräsentation in der Baukunst des 2. und 1. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Vienna, 1994.

Von Hesberg, H. 'Das griechische Gymnasion im 2. Jh. v.Chr.', in M. Wörrle and P. Zanker eds. *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus*, Munich, 1995, 13-27.

Von Hesberg, H. 'Die Basilika von Ephesos – die kulturelle Kompetenz der neuen Stifter', in C. Berns, H. von Hesberg, L. Vandeput and M. Waelkens eds. *Patris und imperium. Kulturelle und politische Identität in den Städten der römischen Provinzen Kleinasiens in der frühen Kaiserzeit*, Leuven, 2002, 149-158.

Von Kienlin, A. 'Zur baulichen Entwicklung der Agora von Priene', *Boreas* 21.2 (1998/1999) 241-259.

Von Kienlin, A. 'Die Agora von Priene', Diss. Technische Universität München, Munich, 2004.

Von Saldern, F. 'Anhang: Katalog der Inschriften', in A. Filges ed. *Blaundos. Berichte zur Erforschung einer Kleinstadt im lydisch-phrygischen Grenzgebiet*, Tübingen, 2006, 321-350.

Von Thüngen, S. *Die freistehende griechische Exedra*, Mainz, 1994.

Waelkens, M. 'The Library of Titus Flavius Severianus Neon at Sagalassos' in H. Metin, B. Ayça Polat Becks, R. Becks and M. Fırat eds. *Pisidia Yazıları Hacı Ali Ekinci Armağani. Pisidian Essays in Honour of Hacı Ali Ekinci*, Istanul, 2015, 215-259.

Walbank F. W. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, 3 vols, Oxford, 1957-1979.

Wallace, C. '*Ager Publicus* in the Greek East: *I. Priene* 111 and Other Examples of Resistance to the *Publicani*', *Historia* 63.1 (2014) 38-73.

Weaver, P. '*P.Oxy* 3112 and Joining the Household of Caesar', *ZPE* 149 (2004) 196-204.

Wehrli, G. 'Sur la formule "Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ κοινοὶ εὐεργέται πάντων" ("Les Romains, commus bienfaiteurs de tous") dans les inscriptions grecques de l'époque républicaine', *Siculorum Gymnasium* 31 (1978) 479-496.

Weis, B. K. *Didyma. Das Orakelheiligtum des Apollon*, Ludwisgburg, 1983.

Weisser, B. 'Die Basis von Puteoli', *Antike Plastik* 30 (2008) 105-160.

Welsh, A. *What is Honor? A Question of Moral Imperatives*, New Haven, 2008.

Wiemer, H.-U. *Krieg, Handel und Piraterie. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des hellenistischen Rhodos*, Berlin, 2002.

Wilhelm, A. ‘Zu Inschriften aus Kleinasien’, in W. H. Buckler and W. M. Calder eds. *Anatolian studies presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay*, Manchester, 1923, 415-439.

Wilhelm, A. *Akademieschriften zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde (1895-1951)*, 3 vols, Leipzig, 1974.

Wilson, A. J. N. *Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome*, New York, 1966.

Winter, E. *Staatliche Baupolitik und Baufürsorge in den römischen Provinzen des kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasian*, Bonn, 1996.

Witulski, T. *Kaiserkult in Kleinasien. Die Entwicklung der kultisch-religiösen Kaiserverehrung in der römischen Provinz Asia von Augustus bis Antoninus Pius*, Fribourg, 2007.

Wörrle, M. *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien. Studien zu einer agonistischen Stiftung aus Oinoanda*, Munich, 1988.

Wörrle, M. ‘Vom tugendsamen Jüngling zum <gestreßten> Euergeten. Überlegungen zum Bürgerbild hellenisticher Ehrendekrete’, in M. Wörrle and P. Zanker eds. *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus*, Munich, 1995, 241-250.

Wörrle, M. ‘Pergamon um 133 v. Chr.’, *Chiron* 30 (2000) 543-576.

Wörrle, M. ‘Zu Rang und Bedeutung von Gymnasion und Gymnasiarchie im hellenistischen Pergamon’, *Chiron* 37 (2007) 501-516.

Wörrle, M. ‘Epigraphische Forschungen zur Geschichte Lykiens XI: Gymnasiarchinnen und Gymnasiarchen in Limyra’, *Chiron* 46 (2016) 403-451.

Yarrow, L. M. *Historiography at the End of the Republic: Provincial Perspectives on Roman Rule*, Oxford, 2006.

Yegül, F. *Baths and Bathing in Classical Antiquity*, New York, 1992.

Zachhuber, J. ‘The Lost Priestesses of Rhodes? Female Religious Offices and Social Standing in Hellenistic Rhodes’, *Kernos* 31 (2018) 83-110.

Zehnacker, H. ‘La terre et l’argent (Cicéron, *Pro Flacco*, 42-50)’, *REL* 57 (1979) 165-186.

Ziethen, G. *Gesandte vor Kaiser und Senat. Studien zum romischen Gesandtschaftswesen zwischen 30 v.Chr. und 117 n.Chr.*, St. Katharinen, 1994.

Zimmermann, C. *Handwerkervereine im griechischen Osten des Imperium Romanum*, Mainz, 2002.

Zolotas, G. I. ‘Χιακῶν καὶ ἐρυθραϊκῶν ἐπιγραφῶν συναγωγή’, *Ἀθήνα* 20 (1908) 110-381.

Zuiderhoek, A. ‘The Ambiguity of Munificence’, *Historia* 56.2 (2007) 196-213.

Zuiderhoek, A. ‘On the Political Sociology of the Imperial Greek City’, *GRBS* 48 (2008) 417-445.

Zuiderhoek, A. *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire. Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor*, Cambridge, 2009.

Zuiderhoek, A. ‘Modelling the Middle? Stratification, Social Mobility and Status Bargaining in the Cities of Western Asia Minor (1st c. BCE-early 3rd c. CE)’, *CCG* 29 (2018) 235-250.