



Mytilene and Other Greek Cities

Sometime before 67 B.C., the Mytilenean people erected a statue in honor of Theophanes, son of Hieroitas, a citizen who had risen to the pinnacle of a local career, the eponymous magistracy.

The people [honor] Theophanes, son of Hieroitas, the *logios prytanis*, for his virtue and piety toward the divine.¹

Around 62 B.C., after Pompeius Magnus had restored Mytilene's independence as a favor to Theophanes, the people erected a second statue to Theophanes, who now carried a Roman name.

[The people honor] Gnaeus Pompeius, son of Hieroitas, Theophanes, who has restored from the common benefactors, the Romans, the city, the territory, and the ancestral freedom and has reestablished the ancestral cults and honors for the gods, for his virtue and piety toward the divine.²

1. V. I. Anastasiadis and G. A. Souris, "Theophanes of Mytilene: A New Inscription Relating to His Early Career," *Chiron* 22 (1992): 377–82: ὁ δᾶμος / Θεοφάνην Ἱροί|τα τὸν λόγιον / πρώτανιν ἀρέ|τας ἔνεκα καὶ / εὐσεβήας τᾶς / πρὸς τὸ θῆον. In its inscriptions, Mytilene used both Lesbian dialect, as here, and Koine. Editors differ on accentuation of Lesbian, L. Robert notably arguing that all dialects should be accented the same way. In this chapter, the conventions of the editors of each text are followed.

2. L. Robert, "Théophrane de Mytilène à Constantinople," *CRAI* (1969): 42–64: Γνα[ῖ]ον Πο[μπ]ήιον, Ἱροίτα υἱὸν, / Θεοφάνην, ἀνακομισσάμενον / παρὰ τῶν κοινῶν εὐεργετᾶν Ῥωμ[αί]ων / τὰν τε πόλιν καὶ τὰν χώραν καὶ τὰν / πάτριον ἐλευθερίαν, ἀποκαταστάσαντα δὲ / καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ πατ[ρ]ῶα καὶ ταῖς τιμαῖς / τῶν θεῶν, ἀρέτας ἔνεκα καὶ εὐσεβείας / τᾶς εἰς τὸ θεῖον. Note that ταῖς τιμαῖς is a Lesbian accusative equivalent to Attic τὰς τιμάς.

Probably while Theophanes was still alive, Mytilene bestowed divine honors on him.

To Gnaeus Pompeius, son of Hieroitas, Theophanes, savior and benefactor.³

Then, after his death, Mytilene augmented the divine honors and dedicated altars to Theophanes in company with Pompeius Magnus and a fellow Mytilenean, Potamon, son of Lesbonax.

To Gnaeus Pompeius, son of Gnaeus, Magnus, imperator, benefactor, savior, and founder;

To the god Zeus Eleutherios, lover of the ancestral land, Theophanes, savior and benefactor and second founder of the ancestral land;

To Potamon, son of Lesbonax, benefactor, savior, and founder of the city.⁴

As evidence is discovered and published, it becomes increasingly possible to write Roman history from a Greek perspective.⁵ This remarkable series of inscriptions tells a story: the story of the revolution of consciousness that

3. *Syll.*³ 755: Γναίῳ Πομπηίου Ἱεροίτα υἱῷ, Θεοφάνη σωτήρι καὶ εὐεργέτῃ. The dative case indicates divine honors; see the insufficiently known study of P. Veyne, “Les honneurs posthumes de Flavia Domitilla et les dédicaces grecques et latines,” *Latomus* 21 (1962): 49–98. Veyne writes at 68: “Or l’accusatif et le datif ont originellement deux significations bien différentes. L’accusatif veut dire que le dédicant a élevé (une statue de) l’empereur ou a honoré l’empereur en lui élevant une effigie; et la pierre qui porte l’inscription est une base de statue parfaitement comparable aux bases que l’on élevait aux simples particuliers qui avaient mérité cet honneur public. Le datif, au contraire, signifie que le signataire a dédié quelque chose au souverain, à savior l’autel même sur lequel est gravée l’inscription et qui est consacré à l’empereur comme il le serait à un dieu.” For “savior” and “benefactor” as cult titles see C. Habicht, *Gottmenschen und griechische Städte*, 2d ed. (Munich: Beck, 1970), 156–59. S. R. F. Price (*Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984], 32–40) disproves the notion that this cult was heroic, rather than divine: a *heros* was the dead recipient of chthonic, not celestial, honors.

4. *Syll.*³ 752–54: Γναίῳ Πονηίου Γναίῳ υἱῷ Μεγάλῳ, αὐτοκράτορι, τῷ εὐεργέτῃ καὶ σωτήρι καὶ πιστῷ. Θεῷ Διὶ [Ἐ]λε[υθε]ρίῳ φιλοπάτριδι Θεοφάνη, τῷ σωτήρι καὶ εὐεργέτῃ καὶ πιστῷ δευτέρῳ τῆς πατρίδος. Ποτάμωνι Λεσβώνακτο[ς], τῷ εὐεργέτῃ καὶ σωτήρος (*sic*) καὶ πιστῷ τῷ πόλι[ς].

5. The guiding lights are the numerous analytic works of L. Robert and the great synthesis of M. I. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, 2d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1953); see especially vol. 2, for the material covered in this section. For an essentially Roman perspective compare G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965).

came when the Greek city discovered that its fate could be determined by the deeds of a single citizen.⁶ The story would be told very differently if we had only Tacitus's perspective to go by (*Ann* 6.18.2).

Exile was pronounced against Pompeia Macrina . . . added to the charge was the fact that Theophanes the Mytilenean, her great-grandfather, had been held by Cn. Magnus among his closest friends and that Greek flattery had given divine honors to Theophanes after he died [*defuncto Theophani caelestes honores Graeca adulatio tribuerat*].

The story the Mytilenean inscriptions tell is at once history and biography, the tale of a city and of a leading citizen; the extent to which these two merged is a major theme of this chapter. As biography, it reflects the successive stages of a public career and remembrance of an individual. As history, it tells of a Roman tributary, with functioning civic offices, that had its freedom restored and offices and cults reestablished and that then made its benefactors part of its religious life. Thus, the story is discontinuous, the story of a man who stretched the limits of civic honors. This discontinuity is embodied in the jump from the first document to the second. Theophanes was honored first for conduct in office, then for restoring the city and the ancestral religion he had formerly served; he received cult, at first in his own, mortal name, then as the traditional god of Greek freedom, Zeus Eleutherios.⁷ Theophanes accomplished a feat of diplomacy so great that Mytilene had to devise new honors for him. He was part of the first generation of Greek citizens to receive divine honors from their cities.⁸ The earliest honors (as in the first inscription) had been available for generations. The likes of the second, third, and fourth inscriptions had never been seen before. Everything was now determined by Rome, which took freedom away and gave it back, and which left its mark on the name of the diplomat, who became a dual citizen and, after Pharsalus, took up residence in Rome. Mytilene's Roman benefactor, Pompeius Magnus, was also given a place in Mytilene's religious life. The change brought about by the coming of Rome would mark Mytilene's political and religious life thereafter; it proved irreversible. Mytilene's leading citizen was no longer the annual eponymous magistrate but a man whose role was exercised outside

6. For the phrase "revolution of consciousness" see F. Millar, "State and Subject: The Impact of Monarchy," in *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*, ed. F. Millar and E. Segal, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), 37–60, at 38.

7. See Robert, "Théophane," 50.

8. Theophanes was not the first, however: Diodorus Paspáros recovered Pergamum's privileges after the First Mithradatic War and received divine honors. See C. P. Jones, "Diodoros Paspáros and the Nikephoria of Pergamon," *Chiron* 4 (1974): 183–205; Price, *Rituals and Power*, 47–52.

Mytilene. Civic honors would not return to their old shape. Paying cult to citizens and to Roman rulers came to dominate the ceremonial life of the city. Divine honors would, after the period of this study, become banal, but not before the practice had emptied out the democratic institutions of the Greek city, turning councils and assemblies into machines for granting honors to individuals. The change was irreversible because Rome became the sole and permanent power. Unlike the old Hellenistic empires, Rome had no effective counterweight in the Greek world.⁹

The story of the Greek city during the generations just before Theophanes is now best told through two other, recently published documents, the decrees of the Colophonian council and people for Polemaios and Menippos.¹⁰ The decrees illustrate the characteristically Hellenistic practice of euergetism, in which men devoted private resources to public ends in return for public honors. But in this age, all other forms of civic benefaction paled before diplomacy with Rome. Colophon repeatedly sent embassies to the Senate and individual Romans, looking to form permanent ties, occasionally asking for positive assistance, but ultimately aiming to keep Rome at bay and the city free. At this time, the honors the city returned to its diplomats were earthly, not divine; and they were not visibly increasing. The city was not yet dominated by any one citizen. It was expected that as Menippos had followed Polemaios, others would follow Menippos; the city would see their like again. In the next century, with diplomats like Theophanes, this relationship, where the city was greater than any of its citizens, would be turned on its head.

In Polemaios and Menippos, Colophon had two typical Hellenistic benefactors.¹¹ Their attainments glorified Colophon in the Greek world, they held

9. On this theme see, e.g., A. Giovannini, "Review-Discussion: Roman Eastern Policy in the Late Republic," *AJAH* 9 (1984): 33–42.

10. L. Robert and J. Robert, *Claros I: Décrets hellénistiques* (Paris: Editions de Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1989); *SEG* 39.1243–44. For convenience, I hereafter refer to the decree for Polemaios as 1243 and to the decree for Menippos as 1244. Decree 1243 cannot be dated with certainty. It may allude to the war between Aristonicus/Eumenes II and Rome and Rome's allies, when Aristonicus occupied Colophon (133/2 B.C.) before being defeated by the Ephesians at Kyme; see the Roberts' commentary at *op. cit.*, 29–35. In any case, it belongs to the second century B.C. and probably predates decree 1244, which mentions a visit by the Roman governor Q. Mucius Scaevola (120/19 B.C.).

11. Polemaios won crowns in sacred games and sacrificed to the gods; dedicated a censer; served as priest of Apollo Clarios; aided refugees with interest-free loans; relieved debtors; extended credit and hired performers; to celebrate his marriage, banqueted the citizens and also gave meat to metics, untaxed foreign residents, and visiting students; and served as agonothele. Menippos was twice general; served as agonothele, spent more than he promised on doors for the pronaos of the Temple of Apollo; as *prytanis*, gave a public banquet over many days, inviting untaxed foreigners and metics on the second day; and during another man's prytany, paid for banquets at the gymnasium.

public offices, and they spent their personal wealth to benefit the public, through dedications, public banquets, and extensions of credit. Polemaios was a priest and Menippos a general; otherwise their careers were parallel.

The greatest benefaction that each provided was diplomacy. The greater part of their decrees is devoted to praising their missions, public initiatives paid for with private resources. The Colophonian people dispatched Polemaios and Menippos whether or not they held public office at the time. The city had come increasingly to require qualities they possessed, private wealth and persuasive ability. Many missions were strictly protocol. They visited other Greek cities, they greeted Roman magistrates—governors, quaestors—and Romans touring Asia, and they extended hospitality to Romans visiting Colophon. But diplomacy with Romans—in Asia and, even more, to Rome and the Senate—was now paramount, as both decrees make plain. These were missions of necessity, and they foreshadowed the world of Theophanes (1243, ii, lines 11–24).

But the finest embassies, on the most pressing subjects, are those that Polemaios properly made to the Roman magistrates themselves and the Senate, allowing his fellow citizens to live peacefully in the midst of the Romans, assuming, on behalf of all, the danger of travel on land and on sea, confronting the danger, on behalf of the people, with body and soul and his resources.

For the time, most missions aimed at securing permanent ties, especially patronage (1243, ii, lines 24–31; 1244, iii, lines 5–15). The advantage Colophon derived was from the diplomats' negotiating terms of independence, such matters as territorial rights. Under that heading went the first three of Menippos's six missions to Rome (1244, i, lines 20–22; ii, lines 22–23, 34–37), which "concerned the city itself and preserved unharmed the privileges of the people," and which concerned territory on the shore and ancestral boundaries elsewhere. On other occasions, Colophon was unable to defend itself and called on Rome. Under siege, Colophon dispatched Polemaios (1243, ii, lines 31–51).

There was pillage and attack from armed men and injury to our territory . . . having set out with another ambassador, not only did he arrive at an arrangement appropriate to the difficult circumstances, but by a decree of the Roman Senate, he put an end to the pillage of seeds and to injuries, the Senate having told those who had done these things not to cause any harm to the people and having told the governors who came to the province to have care for these things and to be protective.

On still other occasions, Rome itself was the threat. The risk was not that Rome would sack Colophon, at least not immediately: the risk was to individual Colophonians and to Colophon's sovereignty and laws, when they clashed with Roman provincial laws.¹² The individual cases endangered Colophon's autonomy: "When a citizen of Colophon was condemned by a Roman judgment in the province, Polemaios went on embassy to the governor and had the decision reversed" (1243, ii, lines 51–58). Menippos's fourth and fifth Roman missions were similar (1244, i, lines 23–27, 37–48; ii, lines 27–31, 40–48).

The fourth time, those who came to Asia passed judgments according to the laws in keeping with their own power, and each time, the citizens accused were compelled to give sureties . . . Menippos freed the inhabitants of the city from the sureties demanded and the governor's power, the province being kept separate from our autonomy.

The fifth time, letters having been sent from Rome concerning the judgment given against the city before the consuls on the subject of the citizen who was sent to Rome on a capital charge . . . he maintained the authority of our laws for every accusation brought even against the Romans, for the Senate decreed that a Roman, whether accused or plaintiff of one of our citizens, be judged among us. Thus he saved the citizens who had been accused of the murder of a Roman and had been sent to Rome on a capital charge and had received a decision together with the city, along with the laws.

Matters remained at the level of words—trials, jurisdictional challenges, exchanges of decrees. The murder charge alone hints at underlying force.

Everything in the decrees implies that Polemaios and Menippos received the highest civic honors available. Apparently, the scale of civic honors was not inflating precipitously, since the two benefactors, flourishing at different times, received the same gold crown and gilded bronze statues, proclamations of honors at festivals, statues with inscriptions on columns in the sanctuary of Clarian Apollo, privileged seats (*prohedriai*) with other benefactors, and maintenance at the town hall, or *prytaneion* (1243, v, lines 27–57; 1244, iii, lines 15–43). The only difference was that Menippos promised to pay for his statue himself (1244, iii, lines 34–41).

The citizen was no greater than his city, though he was well on the way to becoming so. Communal values remained and were emphasized throughout the decrees. These values were exemplified in the two men, whose achievements future generations could emulate. Polemaios responded to individual

12. See J.-L. Ferrary, "Le statut des cités libres dans l'empire romain," *CRAI* (1991): 551–77.

and collective appeals for aid (1243, iii, lines 31–35) and paid for performers in response to collective appeals (iv, lines 12–16). The value of his diplomatic interventions was not only material and the protection of individuals but constitutional and ideological. Polemaios preserved Colophon’s independence—both the institutions and the abstract values that independence implied. The decrees do not miss a chance to emphasize the ideology of community before individual. Polemaios “preserved intact the decisions, the citizen, and the laws” (1243, ii, lines 56–58). He extended credit, “always showing himself generous and conforming to the civic ethos [τοῦ τῆς πόλεως ἠθους οἰκῆον]” (1243, iv, lines 35–38). Menippos similarly “preserved the authority of the laws” and “saved the laws” (1244, i, lines 40–48). He guarded *autonomia* (i, lines 39–40) and *homonoia* (ii, line 20). Menippos’s sixth Roman mission produced the same result (ii, lines 2–7).

Since Colophon was outside the province, it was inappropriate for the governor to make decisions or meddle in civic affairs—a response utterly appropriate to *demokratia* and most fine.

Unlike Theophanes, Polemaios and Menippos remained squarely within a civic framework. They acted in a manner worthy of the city. The decrees use ἄξιος (worthy) and related words throughout.¹³ Polemaios acted “in a manner befitting a true native son [γνησίως]” (1243, iii, line 22, and Roberts ad loc.).

As Roman hegemony grew, Greek civic independence became reliant on individuals’ abilities and achievements, a major development in the history of the Greek city. But Colophon clung to the idea that such native qualities would reappear in the city. The achievements of the two diplomats were imitable, goads to honorable emulation. Colophon honored Polemaios to “foster communal benefaction through the example of such men” (1243, v, lines 23–25). But the decrees also recognized that “worthy of the city,” while necessary, was no longer sufficient. A new standard had appeared. Polemaios “conducted himself in a manner worthy of both the city and the Roman magistrates themselves” (iii, lines 3–5). In the next century, this whole way of thinking, in which the citizen was subordinated to the city, would be inverted.

Mytilene’s history during the first half of the first century was typical of many Greek cities.¹⁴ Constantly at the mercy of *tyche*, Mytilene sided with a succes-

13. For ἄξιος in acclamatory formulas and other honors see P. Herrmann, “Epigraphische Forschungen in Lydien,” in *Die Epigraphische und altertumskunde Erforschung Kleinasiens* (Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1993), 211–19.

14. See C. Cichorius, *Rom und Mytilene* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1888); R. K. Sherck, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1969) (hereafter cited as *RDGE*).

sion of losing causes. During the twilight of the Hellenistic era, in 88 B.C., Mytileneans slaughtered resident Roman citizens before welcoming and feting Mithradates. After Mithradates was first defeated, Mytilene survived a siege by Lucullus (84 B.C.), only to be sacked by Minucius Thermus four years later. Mytilene was to remain a Roman stipendiary for eighteen years, its darkest epoch. Its subjugation became proverbial, as in Cicero's words in 63 B.C.: "Mytilene, which has clearly been made yours, fellow citizens, by the law of war and the right of conquest" (*Leg. agr.* 2.16.40).

But Mytilene was redeemed through the agency of two diplomats, Theophanes and Potamon. The favored status they won is reflected in a series of Roman documents inscribed in the city. After Pompeius Magnus freed Mytilene in 62 B.C., he put through a senatorial decree confirming the city's territorial rights (*RDGE* 25; 55 B.C.). After Pompeius was defeated at Pharsalus, Julius Caesar vouchsafed his favor toward the city to three successive missions headed by Potamon, the last of which brought back a senatorial decree renewing esteem, friendship, and military alliance (χάρις, φιλία, συμμαχία, *RDGE* 26, cols. a–c). Then, early in Augustus's reign (25 B.C.), Potamon won a treaty of military alliance between the people of the Mytileneans and the *populus Romanus* (*RDGE* 26, cols. d–e). During his two missions to the East (23–21 B.C. and 16–13 B.C.), M. Agrippa and his wife, Julia, wintered in Mytilene. In A.D. 18, Germanicus visited with his wife, Agrippina, and their sons, Nero, Drusus, and Gaius (Caligula), and Agrippina gave birth to Julia Livilla there.

Relations with Rome shaped Mytilene's history. Opposition to Rome outside the city disappeared with Mithradates, as did the independent military might that allowed Mytilene to hold out during the eighties B.C. Rome had activated what had only been an unspoken fear in the decrees from Colophon, sacking Mytilene and stripping it of freedom. Roman civil wars reverberated in Mytilene. When Roman power changed hands from Pompeius to Julius Caesar, initiative in Mytilene passed from Theophanes to Potamon. Mytilene owed its freedom to two feats of diplomacy, both of which produced memorable literary scenes. In 62 B.C., "when Pompeius reached Mytilene, he freed the city on Theophanes' account and beheld a traditional contest of poets, which had as its sole theme the achievements of Pompeius" (Plutarch *Pomp.* 42.4). Lucan devoted the first sixth of book 8 of his *Pharsalia* (lines 1–158) to Pompeius's visit to Mytilene in 48 B.C., when he advised the Mytileneans to abandon him for Caesar and the Mytileneans reluctantly agreed. Mytilene's about-face was immediate and unpunished; Potamon probably caught up with Caesar in the Troad. Yet it remains uncertain what Mytilene did when civil war broke out again after Caesar's death. In 36 B.C., Mytilene received the fleeing Sex. Pompeius, a gesture that may have been acceptable by the terms

of guest-friendship. It is difficult to know what significance for Mytilene can be attached to Roman *negotiatores* honoring Antonius's admiral Titius in 32 B.C., the year before he deserted Antonius for Imp. Caesar (*ILS* 891).¹⁵ It is possible that Mytilene, along with Sparta, Mantinea, and Aphrodisias in the Greek world, sided with Imp. Caesar against M. Antonius.

That would explain the regard Rome showed toward the city after 31 B.C. This regard manifested itself through treaty status (though free Greek cities—self-governing, ungarrisoned, immune from taxation, or all three—were numerous, federate ones were few),¹⁶ through the visits of Agrippa and Germanicus, and through the advancement of the descendants of Theophanes, whose grandson or great-grandson became the first Roman senator from the Greek East.¹⁷

In Mytilene, epigraphical and literary evidence converge.¹⁸ Agrippa's stay in Mytilene is reflected in an *ex-voto* from his wife, Julia, to Asclepius Euekos (*Sympleroma* 32). This is, however, only a token of the larger way the epigraphical remains of Mytilene reflect Rome's regard. Besides the Roman documents, the most visible signs of loyalism were dedications. The Mytilenean people, for example, erected a statue to the emperor Tiberius.

The people [honor] Imp. Tiberius Caesar Augustus, child of Zeus Caesar Olympius Augustus, common benefactor of the *oikoumene*, yet most visible in our city and its founder.¹⁹

Tiberius was literally most visible in Mytilene, which, it is said, has more honorific inscriptions to the Julio-Claudian house than has any other Greek city.²⁰ The two basic forms of honorific inscriptions, cult inscriptions in the dative case and noncult in the accusative, were parallel. Cult honors were offered to Pompeius, Julius Caesar, Augustus, M. Agrippa, Gaius, Lucius, and Agrippa Postumus (*IG* 12².140–71; *Sympleroma* 41–42). Noncult honors

15. A rhetorical contest between Potamon and an Antipater, judged by Tiberius's teacher Theodorus of Gadara, is undated but may have taken place in Triumviral Rome (*FGrH* 147 T 3).

16. See A. W. Lintott, *Imperium Romanum: Politics and Administration* (London: Routledge, 1993), 36–40.

17. The stemma is controversial. Cf., e.g., R. Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 73; J.-M. Bertrand, "A propos de deux disparus: Cn. Pompeius Theophanes, M. Pompeius Macer," *ZPE* 59 (1985): 175–76.

18. For the inscriptions of Mytilene see *IG* 12² and *Suppl.*; S. Charitonidis, *Αἱ ἐπιγραφαὶ τῆς Λέσβου: Συμπλήρωμα* (Athens, n.p.: 1968) (hereafter cited as *Sympleroma*).

19. *IG* 12².206: ὁ δᾶμος / Αὐτοκράτορα Τιβέριον Καίσαρα Σέβαστον, παῖδα Δίος Καίσαρος / Ὀλυμπίῳ Σέβαστῳ, κοῖνον μὲν τὰς οἰκημένας εὐεργέταν, τὰς / δὲ ἄμματος πόλιος ἐπιφανέστατον καὶ κτίσαν.

20. So argues W. R. Paton in *IG* 12².

were offered to Pompeius; M. Agrippa; Julia, daughter of Augustus and wife of Agrippa; Tiberius; Antonia minor, “wife of Drusus Germanicus the god”; Agrippina; Nero, son of Germanicus; and Nero and Drusus, sons of Germanicus (*IG* 12².202–13). These dedications embody a vision of Roman monarchy that has three notable features. First, monarchy began not with Augustus or even Julius Caesar but with Pompeius. Second, monarchy was the rule of a dynastic house of women as well as men. Third, almost certainly because of Agrippa’s visits, monarchy embraced different dynastic permutations: Gaius and Lucius, Agrippa and Agrippa Postumus, Tiberius. This reflects a fundamental point: loyalism was local; it was not coordinated from above.

A Mytilenean decree inscribed on two sides of a stone stele provides one of the earliest and richest expressions of what the Augustan regime meant for the Greek world (*OGIS* 456; the Greek text is provided at the end of this chapter). It reflects the image Greeks had and deployed of monarchy and the Roman Empire. It suggests the scope for civic and personal advancement that had suddenly opened to those who supported the imperial house.

fr. i

4 . . . having written in / . . . of the hymn by / . . . among the existing spectacles / . . . theatrical contests / 8 . . . as many prizes as the law pertaining to Zeus / . . . and of the high priest and of the stephane- / [phoros . . .] heralds of the first [contests] that will be / [held . . .] to the most famous cities, to put up plaques / 12 [. . . in the temple?] being put up to him by Asia in Pergamum and / . . . and Actium and Brundisium and Tarraco and Ma[s/salia . . .] and Antioch near Daphne. The annual / [sacrifices . . .] and in the temple of Sebastos. That there is to be an oath of the / 16 [judges . . .] with the ancestral gods, and Sebastos / . . . the image of the god. That those of the / . . . of the shrine or precinct and the other rights and privileges / . . . according to his own ability. That on the table of the offerings / 20 . . . each month on his birthday and / . . . of the same sacrifices, as is offered also to Zeus. That are / [to be reared bulls? . . .] mottled[?] as beautiful and large as possible / [. . . by the annual] generals, two by the *epi* / 24 [*statai* by the . . .] *agoranomoi*, three by the high priest / . . . four [hundred] drachmai to each from the public treasury / . . . That the reared are to be displayed / [. . . in] the contests to be reared the same / 28 [time . . .] his birthday / . . . giving to no one / . . . the stephanephoros and / . . . each year / 32 . . . to be placed on

fr. ii

- 34 for benefactions . . . return. That it is a characteristic of his customary greatness of mind to take into account that things that are by fortune and by nature humbler can never be made equal to those that attain a heavenly reputation and possess the authority and power of gods. But if anything more glorious than these is discovered in later times, the zeal and the piety of the city shall fail in none of the things that can deify him all the more.
- 48 That the envoys call on him to allow a plaque to be put up in his home and, in the Capitolium, a plaque or a stele bearing a copy of this decree. That the envoys offer thanks concerning him to the Senate and the vestal virgins and his wife, Julia [*sic*], and his sister, Octavia, and his children and relatives and friends.
- 60 That a crown be sent of two thousand gold pieces, which should be presented by the envoys. That the envoys properly in his presence offer thanks to the Senate for having conducted itself most sympathetically toward the city and for its traditional kindness.

Commonly thought to be a decree of the council, the document may equally well be a decree of the Mytilenean people. The first part concerns festivals and sacrifices in Mytilene, the second an embassy to Rome informing Augustus of the measures, thanking him, and offering him a crown. The decree must date from between 27 and 11 B.C., after the bestowal of the cognomen *Augustus* but before the death of the emperor's sister, Octavia, and perhaps to the later part of the span, if a reference to the emperor's children is to Gaius and Lucius, adopted in 17 B.C. (line 59).²¹ The decree is notable for its image of Rome and the imperial dynasty. As regards divine honors, the decree is representative of other Greek cities, if more explicit. Divine honors marked the religious recognition of authority and power and were meant to be the highest possible, setting a pattern of permanent inflation that effectively wrecked the economy of civic honors. Yet, though the honors expressed a power relation, as between the humble Mytileneans and the heavenly emperor, they were founded on the recognition that by granting divine honors, Mytilene made a god of Augustus (lines 35–48).

The decree also provides a map of Roman politics from a Greek perspec-

21. On the date see Dittenberger *OGIS* 456; the other (contradictory) clues are an apparent reference to the Temple of Augustus at Pergamum, begun in 29 B.C., as being under construction (line 12) and the anticipated presence in the Senate of the vestal virgins (lines 56–57). As keepers of important Roman documents, the vestals may have been expected to join in the celebration of the 25 B.C. treaty.

tive, juxtaposing old and new centers of power (“that the envoys call on him to allow a plaque to be put up in his home and, in the Capitolium, a plaque or a stele bearing a copy of this decree,” lines 48–53) and public and private (“that the envoys offer thanks concerning him to the Senate and the vestal virgins and his wife, Julia (*sic*), and his sister, Octavia, and his children and relatives and friends,” lines 54–60). While treating the Senate as an extension of the emperor, receiving thanks on his behalf, the decree also acknowledges the Senate’s historic role: “That the envoys properly in his presence offer thanks to the Senate for having conducted itself most sympathetically toward the city and for its traditional kindness” (lines 63–68). This new association of emperor and Senate may help to explain why the Senate received Greek cult honors for the first time under Tiberius.

Rome appears as the capital of a wider world. Imperial honors unite a pacified Mediterranean, and the decree reflects the consciousness of belonging to a world empire. The Mytileneans sent heralds announcing local contests in honor of the emperor to “the most famous cities” around the empire (lines 11–14). In Pergamum and the great Mediterranean ports (Actium, Brundisium, Tarraco, Massalia, and Antioch), the heralds were to put up plaques announcing the contests—communication and publicity on a scale impossible in the fragmented Hellenistic world and unthinkable in the first half of the first century B.C. The festivals united East and West and forged a Greco-Roman world. They furnished the Greek city with a new way to advertise itself, attain status, and draw competitors and spectators; these were the civic dividends of loyalty.

The decree also provides an image of Mytilene and the diverse range of activities that constituted imperial cult and of how cult touched all aspects of public life. A hymn was added to existing spectacles; there were theater festivals, oaths, a cult image, and annual and monthly sacrifices;²² the oath was sworn by judges and presumably other public officials; public funds were spent; and city magistrates had to provide sacrificial bulls. And there was a new civic office, the high priesthood of the emperor. In Mytilene, as in Pisae and throughout the empire, the priest of the emperor was commonly also the city’s chief diplomat; the new position was the personal dividend of loyalty.

The best way to appreciate the impact of dynastic monarchy on the cities of the empire is to look closely at oaths. Oath taking and the inscribing of oaths in permanent form were characteristic of the early Principate. Mommsen and many others have thought that the Roman military *sacramentum* provided the

22. On the sacrifices see Price, *Rituals and Power*, 217–19. Price probably strains the evidence, however, when he says, “If the victims at Mytilene were mottled, it would mean that fundamental doubts were being expressed about the fully Olympian nature of Augustus.”

model for extant oaths; A. von Premerstein influentially argued that the model was a putative *clientela* oath, and he pronounced that oaths were the sociological key to the Principate.²³ In fact, Premerstein's approach took the sociological dimension out of history, by making it unnecessary to ask why people behaved as they did. It remained for P. Herrmann, who remarked that oaths differed, to conclude that they were local, rather than central, in inspiration.²⁴ He diagnosed a Western Latin tradition, built around a vow to guard the health or safety (*salus*) of the emperor, and an Eastern Greek tradition, built around a vow of loyalty (εὐνοία). But he also stressed the essential similarity of the traditions, the oath taker's fundamental promise to regard the emperor's friends as his own and not to rest in the pursuit of the emperor's enemies. In essence, the lesson Herrmann taught was to view oaths not from Rome out but from provincial communities in.

A new oath from Conobaria in southern Spain now joins the small corpus (*AE* 1988, 723; the Latin text is provided at the end of this chapter). Plausibly dated to 6–5 B.C., it is certainly the first Augustan oath from the West, and it may be the earliest surviving imperial oath. In it, the magistrates, Senate, and people of the Conobaria make a vow on behalf of the [*salus*], *honos*, and *victoria* of Augustus, his adopted sons, Gaius and Lucius, and his grandson, M. Agrippa (Postumus). The oath reflects a perspective on an uncertain situation, in which Agrippa Postumus, though not adopted as a son, was reckoned to be part of the dynastic nexus. The Conobaria oath can be used to extend Herrmann's findings with two conclusions regarding timing and content: that oaths were local responses to events in the center, namely, dynastic changes; and that though offered by local elites, they were imposed on local masses and in that sense involved the remaking of local politics on the basis of empire.

The probable or certain dates of surviving oaths are as follows: Conobaria, 6–5 B.C.; Samos (Herrmann, *Kaisereid*, app. 1, no. 6), 5 B.C.; Paphlagonia (no. 4), 6 March 3 B.C.; Palaipaphos (no. 5), A.D. 14; Aritium (no. 1), 11 May A.D. 37; Assos (no. 3), A.D. 37. Clearly, the last three coincided with the accessions of the emperors Tiberius and Caligula. They were local reactions to the changed situation in Rome. The Assos oath was quoted in a decree of the assembly passed on the arrival of the news and begins, "Since the rule [ἡγεμονία] of C. Caesar Germanicus Augustus, hoped for in the prayers of all men, has been announced" (no. 3, lines 5–6). The Palaipaphos oath, still uncertain about

23. A. von Premerstein, *Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats* (Munich: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1937).

24. P. Herrmann, *Der römische Kaisereid* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1968); see Herrmann's app. 1, pp. 122–26, for the best texts of the five oaths then known, together with the Samian decree regarding a sixth. See also the review by E. W. Gray in *Gnomon* 42 (1970): 390–96.

whether Tiberius was to be given the title *Autokrator* (*Imperator*) and whether the title would be a praenomen or a cognomen, and only undertaking to vote divine honors, was also an immediate reaction to fresh news. What about the timing of the first three oaths? The Samos oath was probably offered in reaction to Augustus's assuming the consulate and Gaius's assuming the *toga virilis*. But the cluster of oaths is best explained by the disappearance of Tiberius from the political scene. The oaths are as important for whom they exclude as for whom they include, as concerned with the future of power as with its present: they honor not just a monarch but a dynasty. In this respect, imperial oaths differed from Hellenistic ones. Herrmann demonstrated that there was no precedent for the extension of the oath to cover the ruler's family.²⁵ The Samos oath honored Augustus and his children ([τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτοῦ, no. 6, b, line 11); the leader of the Samian delegation was priest of the cult of Augustus, his son Gaius, and the senior M. Agrippa (then dead; lines 20–22). The Paphlagonia oath was offered to Augustus, his children, and his descendants—three generations and apparently cognate relations as well as agnates (no. 4, lines 9–11). The Palaipaphos oath promised loyalty and worship to Tiberius, son of Augustus, “with all his house [οἶκος]” and promised to divinize Tiberius, “the sons of his blood, and no one else” (a slight on Germanicus or a misunderstanding?), pointedly excluding Agrippa Postumus (no. 5). The Assos oath (no. 3) promised loyalty to Caligula and his whole house and emphasized that Caligula and his father visited the city in A.D. 18. The Aritium oath (no. 1) is the exception that proves the rule. Dated 11 May A.D. 37, it mentioned Caligula alone, reflecting that Ti. Gemellus was not perceived as coemperor and that Caligula had made no dynastic plans.

Three features of the dynastic conception in the oaths should be stressed: the concern with male members of the imperial family and the office of emperor; the growing irrelevance of republican offices; and the emphasis on permanence and omnipotence. The oaths were concerned with the occupants and potential occupants of the *paterna statio*. They reflected a pseudogens concept and a conception of power that did not acknowledge, for example, Livia. The Conobarria oath was offered to Augustus as *pontifex maximus* alone but to Gaius with a full complement of titles: *princeps iuventutis*, consul designate, and pontifex (*AE* 1988, 723). This was exceptional. The Samos decree revealingly called the emperor “Sebastos and so on” ([Σε]βαστὸν καὶ τὰ λοιπά, no. 6, col. b, lines 18–19).²⁶ The Paphlagonia oath strained for consular dating of a distinctly imperial sort: “the third year from Augustus's

25. Herrmann, *Kaisereid*, 43–45.

26. For the text as a hasty summary see P. Herrmann, “Die Inschriften römischer Zeit aus dem Heraion von Samos,” *AM* 75 (1960): 68–193, at 73.

twelfth consulate” (no. 4, lines 2–3). The Palaipaphos, Assos, and Aritium oaths gave no titulature at all: they reflected an ideological, unofficial conception of the emperor’s position. The Palaipaphos oath styled Augustus a descendant of Aphrodite and offers the earliest Greek version of the eternal or perpetual Rome motif (τὴν ἀένναον Ῥώμην, no. 5, line 9). The preamble to the Assos decree was couched in cosmic, ideological terms, utterly divorced from Roman republican conceptions, saying that “the sweetest age for man has now begun” (no. 3, lines 8–9). All this was in marked contrast to the ideology of the Tiberian dossier of senatorial decrees, which emphasized passivity and wisdom. The image of the dynasty constructed and presented in the oaths was as great as possible.

The oaths also project notable images of the communities offering them. They reflect not only that the city was part of the empire but that the empire was part of the city. This emerges from the dating formulas employed.²⁷ Like the Italian municipal *fasti*, the oaths synchronized local and Roman calendars. The oaths also reflect how the sending of delegations to Rome was now a part of public life. The Samian and Assian delegations were led by Greeks who were Roman citizens (C. Iulius Sosigenes, no. 6, b, line 22; C. Varius Kastos, no. 3, line 26). The Assian delegates were instructed to sacrifice to Capitoline Jove in the name of the city for the preservation of Caligula (no. 3, lines 31–33).

The presence of Rome at home was manifested above all through local cult.²⁸ Samos had its own cult of Capitoline Jove, as well as its own cult of Augustus, Gaius, and M. Agrippa (no. 6). The Paphlagonia oath was sworn by Zeus, Ge, Helios, all the gods and goddesses, and Augustus himself (no. 4, lines 8–9): in Gangra, it was sworn throughout the territory at imperial temples, at Sebasteia, and on altars of Augustus; in Neapolis, at the single Sebasteion, at its altar (lines 36–42). The Palaipaphos oath is the most revealing, integrating Rome into a local pantheon: it was sworn “by our Akraia Aphrodite, our Kore, our Apollo Hylates, our Apollo Kerynetes, our savior Dioscuri, the common Council Hearth [*Boulaia Hestia*] of the island, Augustus the god Caesar, descendant of Aphrodite, Eternal Rome, and the rest of the gods and goddesses” (no. 5, lines 1–10). The Assos oath was sworn by Zeus Soter, the god Caesar Augustus, and the ancestral holy Parthenos (no. 3, lines 19–20). This was the complex creation of a Greco-Roman world, the reaction

27. The Conobaria oath (*AE* 1988, 723) is dated by governor, member of governor’s staff, and two local magistrates; the Paphlagonia oath (Herrmann, *Kaisereid*, app. 1, no. 4) employed the imperial “consular” dating for the year, the Roman calendar for the month and day; the Assos oath (no. 3) employed consular dating; the Aritium oath (no. 1) is dated by governor at the beginning, consuls and local magistrates at the end.

28. See S. Weinstock, “Treueid und Kaiserkult,” *AM* 77 (1962): 306–27.

to and rendering of external political events in local religious terms, as S. R. F. Price has rightly emphasized.

But there was another, local social and political dimension. Though these were mass oaths, involving local political institutions—in Conobaria, the magistrates, Senate, and people—they were expressed in personal terms: “e]x mei animi sententia ut eg[o]” (*AE* 1988, 723, line 6). The local dimension is fully revealed in the Paphlagonia oath, which was offered, accomplished, or administered (τελεσθ[είς]) by local elites to local masses (no. 4, line 5). Oath taking, like other communal acts, could help to create or reinforce an elite, such as the named diplomats from Samos and Assos. This elite administering oaths had a new power base. The Samian delegation was led by a priest of the imperial family cult (no. 6, b, lines 20ff.). The oaths also had an important temporal dimension. With their eye on the succession, they were equally oriented toward the present and the future, and the same was true locally. In Paphlagonia, the terms were, “I bind myself, body, soul, and life [i.e., resources], and my children and descendants” (no. 4, lines 15–16); in Palaipaphos, “ourselves and our descendants [οἱ ἔκγονοι ἡμῶν]” (no. 5, lines 10–11).

Oaths were local reactions to dynastic reshuffles, concerned with the succession in ideological, rather than formal, terms. They offer a glimpse of the emergence of a new local order that would extend itself into the future. Oaths were instruments of local power and, for this reason, emphasized permanence and omnipotence.

In Mytilene, everything connected with loyalty to the Augustan regime rebounded to the glory of an individual.

Potamon the Mytilenean: son of Lesbonax, rhetor. Declaimed in Rome under Tiberius Caesar; when Potamon was returning to his ancestral land, the *basileus* supplied him with a letter saying, “Whoever would dare to harm Potamon, son of Lesbonax, let him consider carefully whether he will be able to contend with me.”²⁹

After serving as diplomat to Caesar and Augustus, Potamon’s imperial associations took a new form, the priesthood of the imperial cult. The process is embodied in his inscribed monument, the Potamoneion. The Potamoneion mirrors the rest of Mytilene’s epigraphy, especially the decree on imperial honors. It reflects how, under Augustus, civic history became the

29. *FGrH* 147 T I (*Suda*). For the consensus view that Potamon lived ca. 75 B.C.–A.D. 15 see R. W. Parker, “Potamon of Mytilene and His Family,” *ZPE* 85 (1991): 115–29, at 118; but in the passage from the *Suda*, “Tiberius Caesar” may as well have been an error for “Julius Caesar” or “Imp. Caesar.”

biography of an individual. Monarchy bolstered local power, and the Roman dynasty begot a Mytilenean dynasty, as Potamon passed his position on to his descendants.

Three documents establish that Potamon was priest of the imperial cult in Mytilene: a dedication to Augustus,³⁰ a marble throne commemorating his *prohedria* (*IG* 12².626), and an honorific decree mentioning his purchase of animals from Mysia for a beast hunt during imperial spectacles (*IG* 12 *Suppl.* 9). Potamon himself received public honors. In addition to the inscription honoring him with Theophanes and Pompeius Magnus, there are four others to him as benefactor, savior, and founder of the city (*IG* 12².159–62, *Suppl.* 43–44). Above all, there is the Potamoneion ([Ποτα]μῶνειον, *IG* 12².51). Nothing reveals when it was erected, whether in Potamon’s lifetime or after his death, or by whom. Its precise function is also uncertain; its name suggests strongly that it was a shrine to his cult; its outer walls were covered with inscriptions, documents falling into two categories, Roman and Greek.³¹ The Roman documents—the letters from Julius Caesar and Augustus, senatorial decrees, and the treaty mentioned earlier in this chapter (*RDGE* 26, cols. d–e)—parallel the rest of the inscriptional evidence from Mytilene in three principal ways. First, they depict a continuity from Julius Caesar to Augustus. There is no gap between the last Caesarian document and the first Augustan one. It seemed a good idea to preserve Caesar’s memory under the Principate, while consigning the Triumvirate, whether a good or a bad memory for Mytilene, to oblivion. Second, the documents register the dominance of individual Romans over the state machinery. Decrees of the Senate appear as quotations of letters from Caesar and Augustus, who cited them as evidence of personal esteem (*RDGE* 26, col. a).

Letter of the god [Julius] Caesar . . . to the council and people . . . greetings and good health . . . Wishing to benefit your city . . . I have sent you a copy of the decree of friendship . . . Thus assured, be confident and enjoy . . . unmolested, since I do this gladly.

This phenomenon is equally important for the way institutions and individuals actually interacted in Rome, for the way Caesar and Augustus depicted them as interacting, and for the way Greeks perceived them. Augustus similarly treated the Senate as an instrument of his will and a senatorial decree as a token of his solicitude in the *Fifth Cyrene Edict* (4 B.C.), the earliest known

30. *IG* 12².154: Ποτ[άμιον Λεο[βων]άκτος ὁ διὰ [βίου ἰερεὺς---] Θεῶ Σεβαστῶ [Κ]αίσα[ρ]ι.

31. For the contents of the Potamoneion see Parker, “Potamon,” 115 n. 2, listing *IG* 12².23–57; *Suppl.* 6–12; *Sympleroma* 6–15; and *SEG* 27.491.

Roman document designed for universal provincial publication (*RDGE* 31, trans. Sherk).³²

Imp. Caesar Augustus . . . says: A decree of the Senate was passed in the consulship of C. Calvisius and L. Passienus. I was present and participated in its writing, and since it pertains to the security of the allies of the *populus Romanus*, in order that it might be known to all those in our care, I have decided to send it to the provinces and to append it to this, my edict, from which it will be clear to all inhabitants of the provinces how much concern I and the Senate have that no one of our subjects suffer any harm or extortion.

The Senate became an instrument of individual favor. Third, the Roman documents, besides expressly praising Potamon's diplomacy, subtly advertised his unique intimacy with Rome, by, for example, transliterating Latin *curia* into Greek *κοῦρία* for the first and only time, an exoticism, paralleled both in the famous Abdera decree with a conspicuous mention of Roman *atria* (*Syll.*³ 656) and in the Mytilenean provision to hang a plaque in Augustus's home, something that reinforced both Mytilene's and Potamon's claims to special status.

Similarly, the honorific decrees of the Potamoneion, from Mytilene, other Greek cities, and the Asian League, show how Potamon's connections with the emperor elevated Mytilene in the Greek world and elevated Potamon in Mytilene.³³ Imperial honors could bring supracivic recognition. The decree of the Lesbian League may betray the grandiosity of Mytilene's claims. It comes from "the [League] of Lesbians to Potamon, descendant of Penthilus, the king [of the Aeolians]" (*IG* 12 *Suppl.* 7). According to Strabo (582): "the Aeolian colonization of the Troad preceded the Ionian by four generations. Sixty years after the Trojan war, Penthilus advanced as far as Thrace." The Greek archive walls are best seen as constituting a genre of local history, a genre appearing when a city had to define and declare its place in a new political world.³⁴ Of the many Augustan examples, most are civic monuments. The Potamoneion shows how local history could be embodied in the career of an individual, the imperial priest.

Potamon's priesthood proved to be transmissible. Potamon's son was the next lifelong priest of the emperor in Mytilene. His privileged theater seat was inscribed with the words "C. Claudius Diaphenes, lifelong high priest of Thea

32. See Millar, "State and Subject," 52–53.

33. Cf. *IG* 12².42, from Adramytenoi, 43 and *Suppl.* 12, from the Thessalians.

34. D. S. Potter, (*Prophets and Emperors: Human and Divine Authority from Augustus to Theodosius* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994]) reasonably calls them "history walls."

Roma and Augustus Zeus Caesar Olympios, pater patriae” (IG 12².656). Even into the third century, Potamon’s descendants were holding high civic office: “the council and people honor Aurelia Artemisia, *logios prytanis*, benefactor, . . . descendant of Potamon the *nomothete* and Lesbonax the philosopher” (IG 12².255). Potamon was part of a Mytilenean dynasty that would long outlast the Roman one.

How was the position transmitted? Theophanes and Potamon earned their status by winning independence for Mytilene. What could the generation that came of age after Actium, having no such opportunities for feats of diplomacy, do to maintain local standing? The evidence from Mytilene fails to answer these questions. It is necessary to look at changes in the Augustan Greek world as a whole.

Potamon’s civic status reflected supracivic standing, Roman connections and honors from the rest of the Greek world. During Augustus’s reign, especially its first decades, the structures and opportunities for honoring the emperor expanded steadily. There were more ceremonial occasions for approaching the imperial family, at Rome or wherever they happened to be. The burgeoning provincial *koina* (assemblies or leagues) and festivals provided settings for honoring the emperor and for passing the dividends of imperial honors on to their producers. Roman officials actively encouraged imperial cult and other honors. Once the Augustan regime was established, the successful Greek would be the one that could harness these developments to enhance his local position.

For Greeks, ceremonial occasions for approaching the imperial family grew out of emergency embassies to civil war potentates. Embassies at crucial junctures were followed by embassies of annual renewal and then by embassies with an imperial purpose, rather than a local one—the distinctive Augustan development. For Greeks, this was the significance of the expansion of ceremonial in Augustan Rome. Envoys continued to follow the emperor wherever he traveled.³⁵ They now approached princes as well.³⁶ Together, these missions constituted a lifelong diplomatic career, a cycle of ritually approaching Romans, pledging loyalty to the regime, and receiving renewed guarantees of civic rights and privileges. The contents of imperial diplomatic careers are vividly reflected in a recently published Ephesian archive wall that begins at the time of Actium

35. Consider the vivid expression of *Bull. Ep.* 1976, 620 (A.D. 39/40): “traveling as envoy to Rome and Germany and Caesar” [προσβειῶ[ν] ἄρχι Ῥώμης καὶ Γερμανίας καὶ Καίσαρος]. For Caligula’s journey to Germany to suppress the “conspiracy of Lepidus and Gaetulicus” see chap. 6.

36. See *ILS* 9463, the letter from Tiberius in Bononia in Gaul (A.D. 4/5) to the council and people of the Aezinatai acknowledging πρὸς ἐμὲ συναθί[αν] and the [εὔ]νοιαν of the city and promising to do what he is able in granting what they may ask.

and closes in A.D. 31/2.³⁷ The archive contains letters from Imp. Caesar, from Tiberius before Augustus's death, from Germanicus during his tour of the East (A.D. 18), and from the proconsul of Asia whom Tiberius notoriously left in the field for three consecutive years (A.D. 29–32). Several points are worth stressing. First, the Ephesians approached Romans at every level; the archive offers the first proof that Greek cities sent ambassadors to governors annually, probably in expectation of new appointments. Second, there remained variation within the ritual. The decrees variously promised *διάνοια*, *εὐνοια*, or *εὐσεβεία*, all of which meant “loyalty”; this could be taken both as a reflection of the narrow range of loyalism allowed the Greeks and as proof of a certain vitality in loyalism, which had not yet ossified into formulas. Third, as is so often the case, imperial cult played a part in “political” transactions, as priests served as envoys. Fourth, the conception of monarchy was dynastic. Ephesian envoys approached Tiberius while Augustus was emperor, and Tiberius spoke of his *οἶκος* and promised to protect the privileges established by his father, Augustus, and grandfather, Julius Caesar.

While taking every opportunity to approach the emperor and his house, Greeks also developed new structures for honoring them. The history of provincial leagues paralleled the history of the Greek city.³⁸ The Asian League existed before the Principate, promoting Greek interests. During the Republic, the league sent ambassadors to Rome, to the Senate and magistrates.³⁹ Under the empire, the league became chiefly a machine for providing and coordinating imperial honors.⁴⁰ Honors took two forms, temples and festivals. The league allowed cities to collaborate and lent uniformity to imperial honors. The league also created a new office, the annual high priesthood of the provincial cult, as well as the separate priesthoods of provincial imperial temples, through which local grandees rotated.⁴¹ It provided a new world in which local notables could move, a new source of honors to translate into

37. D. Knibbe et al., “Neue Inschriften aus Ephesos XII,” *JÖAI* 63 (1993): 113–50.

38. See J. Deininger, *Der Provinziallandtag der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Munich: Beck, 1965), discussing the Asian League at 36–60.

39. The key republican document, published after Deininger's monograph appeared, is J. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, 1982), no. 5, a decree of the league of the Greeks in Asia meeting at Ephesus: the league sent ambassadors to the magistrates (and Senate), and the ambassadors, after enduring many dangers, delivered the league's decrees and were awarded gold crowns and bronze statues.

40. In addition, the patchy sources suggest that the Asian League leveled *repetundae* charges against governors under the Julio-Claudians. For all the evidence see P. A. Brunt, “Charges of Provincial Maladministration under the Early Principate” (1961), reprinted in *Roman Imperial Themes* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990), 53–95.

41. The basic discussion is L. Robert, “Le culte de Caligula à Milet et la province d'Asie,” *Hellenica* 7 (1949): 206–38.

local prestige. The same was true of the Greek festivals established and reestablished during the Augustan peace. The effect of the festivals can best be seen in the case of Herod the Great, who might be regarded as the most prominent Greek notable of his era. Josephus describes how, while making benefactions throughout the Greek world, Herod provided Nicopolis in Epirus, the site of new quadrennial Actian games, with most of its public buildings and reestablished the Olympic games; in return, Elea named him *agonothete* for life (*AJ* 16.146–49; *BJ* 1.426–27). Thanks to the Augustan peace, euergetism could be practiced on a supracivic scale.

Greek honors to the imperial house were encouraged by Roman officials. In the West, the elder Drusus consecrated the altar of Roma and Augustus below Lugdunum in 11 B.C., and Domitius Ahenobarbus (cos. 16 B.C.), while governor on the Danube (A.D. 1), set up an altar to Augustus on the far shore of the Elbe (*Dio* 55.10a.2; cf. Tacitus *Ann.* 4.44). Through the Asian League, Paullus Fabius Maximus inspired or encouraged Greek cities to begin their civic calendars on Augustus's birthday and won a prize, the "crown . . . voted to the person finding the greatest honors for Caesar," which again reflects the inflationary nature of imperial honors.⁴² But the most important document of Roman encouragement of Greek cult honors is a Messenian decree for a *quaestor pro praetore* of Achaia (*SEG* 23.206; the Greek text is provided at the end of this chapter).⁴³ The decree shows the magistrate propagating and coordinating cult honors to the *domus Augusta* (lines 3–10).

When Philoxenidas was scribe of the council under the magistracy of Theodorus; it was decided: Whereas Publius Cornelius Scipio, *quaestor pro praetore*, being endowed with unsurpassed goodwill towards Augustus and his whole house, having made one very great and highly honorific vow, to preserve the house safe for all time, as is shown by his deeds on every occasion, has performed the Caesarea without falling short at all in respect to cost or display or gratitude to the gods for the sacrifices to Augustus, and at the same time causing most of the cities of the province to do the same with him . . .

It also reflects the extent to which Roman officials may have relayed imperial news (lines 10–19).

42. For text and full discussion of the dossier see U. Laffi, "Le iscrizioni relative all' introduzione nel 9 a.C. del nuovo calendario della provincia d'Asia," *SCO* 16 (1967): 5–98.

43. The translation is that of J. E. G. Zetzel, "New Light on Gaius Caesar's Eastern Campaign," *GRBS* 11, no. 4 (1970): 259–65, with one correction, concerning the pronoun τοῦτον (5): "the latter" must refer not to ὁ Σεβαστός (4) but to ὁ οἶκος (4). If ὁ Σεβαστός were meant, one would expect ἐξείνον (the former) or αὐτόν (him).

. . . and later learning that Gaius the son of Augustus, who was fighting against the barbarians for the safety of all mankind, was well and had avenged himself upon the barbarians, having escaped dangers, Scipio being overjoyed at such good news directed everyone to wear crowns and to sacrifice, being untroubled and undisturbed, and he himself sacrificed an ox for Gaius' safety, and was lavish in varied spectacles, so that what took place then rivaled what had come before, but the solemnity remained balanced; and he made a great effort, in leaving two days off the days of Caesar's festival, to begin the sacrifices for Gaius on the day on which Gaius was first designated consul.

. . . and he instructed us to observe this day annually with sacrifices and crown-wearing as joyously and . . . as possible; therefore, the council approved on the fifteenth day before the Kalends of . . .

It is striking how at home in new imperial values the honoree, Cornelius Scipio, appears. His report on Gaius's mission parallels the Pisan funeral honors (see chap. 4). If his name were missing, it would be hard to guess that the honoree was a Roman magistrate.

The burgeoning industry of honors to the imperial house provided the key to transmitting status. By following the imperial succession, subjects could ensure their own. The problem for the generations that came of age after Actium was to gain recognition and status without diplomatic feats. The solution that they found is most revealingly illustrated by a stele containing twelve documents in honor of Menogenes of Sardis.⁴⁴ Menogenes exploited the growing industry of imperial honors deftly, combining minimal diplomatic achievement with maximal self-promotion and artfully playing a supracivic body, the Asian League, and the civic ones of Sardis against each other. The reversal of Colophonian values was complete: the city of Sardis was dwarfed by its leading citizen. Then, seamlessly, Menogenes passed his own honors on to his son, Isidorus, commemorated on a scale comparable to that of Polemaios and Menippos for having done less even than his father—in fact, for having done nothing.

Representing the Asian League and Sardis, Menogenes brought salutations to Augustus on the occasion of Gaius's assumption of the *toga virilis* (5 B.C.) and returned home with a letter of acknowledgment from the emperor. The Sardians received the news, rejoiced, and declared the day sacred (doc. i).

44. W. H. Buckler and D. M. Robinson, *Sardis*. Vol. 7, 1. (Leiden: Brill, 1932), no. 8: (i) decree of council and demos (5 B.C.); (ii) letter of Augustus (5 B.C.); (iii) decree of council (5 B.C.); (iv) decree of council and demos (5 B.C.); (v–vi) decrees of the *gerousia* (5 B.C.); (vii–viii) letters of *koinon* officials (4–3 B.C.); (ix–x) decrees of the *koinon* (3/2–2 B.C.); (xi–xii) decrees of council.

Whereas Gaius Julius Caesar, the eldest of the sons of Augustus, has, as was ardently desired, assumed in its full splendor the pure white toga in lieu of that with the purple border . . .

On this day, the Sardinian people would wear wreaths and festal garb, the generals would sacrifice to the gods and make supplications for Gaius's welfare, and Gaius's image would be consecrated in his father's temple. The council decreed a second sacred day on the day when the news was received. It sent an embassy to report the honors, congratulate Gaius and Augustus, present the decree, sealed with the seal of the people, and address Augustus regarding the common interests of Asia and the city; in this way, an imperial occasion became an opportunity to promote Greek interests. In response, Augustus slightly refocused the Sardinian picture of monarchy, making plain that Gaius was not the "eldest son" but the "elder" of two (thus excluding Agrippa Postumus), and expanding the picture to include not only the emperor and his son but the emperor and his house (doc. ii).

I commend your earnest endeavor to demonstrate to me and all mine [εἰς τε ἐμὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς πάντας] your gratitude for the benefits conferred on you by me.

These corrections performed the same function as the Tiberian dossier of senatorial decrees, spelling out to subjects precisely who the objects of loyalty were to be. The Sardians apparently only picked up half the message. They continued to call Gaius "eldest" (doc. iii, line 31), but said that "at his audience with Augustus, Menogenes expressed the city's joy on Gaius's account and its loyalty to all his house [περὶ ὅλον τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ εὐνοίαν]" (lines 33–34). As in the Messene decree, the encouraged view of the succession was as an aspect of the rule of a dynastic house, a view that acknowledged the key role of women and, more importantly, kept options for succession open.

Though the Menogenes dossier repeatedly refers to other leading Romans, which should not be taken as implying that Sardians were uncertain of Augustus's hegemony, it does not contain any reference to organs of state, either the Senate or the assemblies. For Menogenes and Sardis, the parts of the republican framework, such as the consulate, were only aspects of imperial ceremonial. Apparently Menogenes went on further embassies to Augustus, though there is only a single reference to "embassies" in the plural to say so (προσβήαις πρὸς τὸν Σεβαστόν, doc. ix, line 92). If he did, nothing in these embassies was deemed worth recording. If he did anything to promote Asian and Sardinian interests other than congratulate Augustus, that is not recorded

either. This was a mission of protocol, not necessity, and it was the extent of Menogenes' benefaction to Asia and to Sardis, other than holding office and graciously erecting monuments to himself and his son.

This embassy was the highlight of a successful public career, in which Menogenes was *eklogistes* of Sardis, three times *ekdikos* of the league, and priest of the imperial cult at Pergamum. Finding the political texture of the dossier is difficult but not impossible. A combination of observations suggests that Menogenes' real genius lay in self-promotion. The first is that several of the documents are not precisely honorific decrees. They are either texts reporting preliminary, informal honors to Menogenes or testimonials from officials of the league—documents that promise future honors, that could be used to gain further honors, or both. Menogenes showed no compunction about engraving preliminary honors and testimonials and eventual honorific decrees. Preliminary honors came from the council and people (doc. iii, doc. v).

. . . that his honors be postponed till the legal time, but that the testimony of the people to him be declared by this decree and that for these things also he be held in the highest esteem.

The council of elders, because of its esteem for him, has now decided to testify by resolution its genuine and fitting commendation and to take steps at the proper time to pay him the honors that are his due.

The testimonials were from officials of the league to Sardis (doc. vii, doc. viii).

We have therefore written to you about his honors for your information.

The second observation is that Menogenes was assiduous in reporting his accomplishments and recognitions to all bodies and skilled in playing results off each other. As his first act on returning (doc. iii),

Menogenes appeared before a duly convened assembly of the people and reported on his embassies, and the people, having esteemed him and, from the replies that he brought back, having learned his diligence and care, were moved to honor him.

Menogenes then went to the council of elders: "whereas the report on his embassy has been made by Menogenes . . ." (doc. iii). On the Sardian council, Menogenes brought pressures to bear from above and from below. From above, pressure came from the Asian League. Informed of Menogenes'

qualities, doubtless by Menogenes himself, the league reported back to Sardis, repeatedly telling the Sardians about Menogenes' exemplary conduct as a Sardian citizen. "A good man, he is in his native city held in the greatest esteem for his gentlemanly qualities, his loftiness of character, his embassies to Augustus, and the faithfulness shown in the offices entrusted to him," reads one decree (doc. ix). "A member of a most illustrious family, which has done many good deeds for his native city in the offices and priesthoods entrusted to it," reads another (doc. x). The league also moved "that a copy of this decree, sealed with the sacred seal, be sent to the Sardians" (doc. x). Thus the league brought supracivic pressure to bear on cities; Menogenes also received testimonials from leading citizens of Pergamum, Mastaura, Smyrna, and Thyateira, as well as from the league as a whole. From the league, Menogenes received not only the offices but four painted portraits with gilt shields and with inscriptions, to be placed in any city of Asia that he wished (docs. vii–x)—at least one of which he dedicated in Sardis—and permission to erect his stele, which the Sardian council could only second. From below, pressure came from the Sardian people. Menogenes' first act on returning was to report to the Sardian assembly and to receive informal honors, probably theater acclamations. In the last document of the dossier, the residents of a Sardian district, the sacred precinct of Zeus Polieus and Artemis, where Menogenes made a benefaction, petitioned the council (doc. xii). But not only the Sardian council was subjected to pressures on Menogenes' behalf. A similar analysis from the perspective of the league or of the Sardian council of elders or people would produce the same results. Because Menogenes was so good at informing each body what he was to be honored for, none had any real choice about whether to honor him.

Menogenes' son, Isidorus, the honoree of the last three documents of the dossier, conferred no benefaction at all. Explicitly, he was honored for being his father's son and for the sake of his father: ". . . son born with the fairest hopes . . . on account of his father's zeal and loyalty toward Asia, in recognition of all his noble qualities" (doc. x). As in the case of Menogenes' honors, pressure on the Sardian council was from above and below. Isidorus's supracivic status is summed up by the unparalleled title the council gave him: "citizen of Asia" (doc. xii). The only difference was that Menogenes elected to aim Isidorus's honors at the next generation, placing his portrait shield in the Sardian gymnasium (doc. xi). Through Menogenes' efforts, the imperial dynasty spawned a Sardian one.

These examples reflect a general phenomenon. In every Greek city, leading diplomats who consolidated their local positions as priests of the imperial cult will be found. Recent publications reveal the phenomenon in Aphrodisias and Miletus, for example, where the diplomat-priests were C. Julius Zoilus

and C. Julius Epicrates.⁴⁵ These men can also be expected to have founded local dynasties. Often, the only evidence of piggybacking is descendants in the imperial priesthood. Sometimes, longer documents are available to make the mechanisms of transmission more apparent. At the start of Tiberius's reign, in guidelines for sacred festivals, Gytheion intertwined recognition for the city's Roman past, present, and future with recognition of a regional dynasty (EJ 102a). The first six days of the festival were dedicated to Augustus, Tiberius, Livia, Germanicus, the younger Drusus, and T. Quinctius Flamininus, who had freed Gytheion from a Hellenistic king in 197 B.C. (lines 17–22).

After the celebration of the days of the gods and the rulers, the *agora-nomos* shall introduce quadrennial games for two more days of performances, one to the memory of C. Julius Eurycles, benefactor of our nation and city in many ways, and a second in honor of [his son] C. Julius Laco, guardian of our nation and our city's security and safety. (trans. Sherk)

A decree of the council and people of Kyme paid tribute to a local benefactor who kept one eye on the imperial succession and one eye on his own succession.

In the Augustan Games conducted by the league of Asia Kleanax conducted, just as he announced, the sacrifices and festivities, sacrificing oxen to Imp. Caesar Augustus and to his two sons . . .

For this reason also the *prytanis* Kleanax is worthy of praise and honor, namely that he became the father of an outstanding son, took thought for the boy's education in letters and furnished the people with a man worthy of his family—Sarapion, a protector and helper, one who in many ways has displayed zeal toward the city by his own manly deeds, a father-loving man to whom this epithet ought to be added officially, a man who is witness for his father also by a public decree for all time. (trans. Sherk)⁴⁶

The phrase “furnished the people with a man worthy of his family” is emblematic of the replacement of democratic values with dynastic ones.

45. For the inscriptions relating to—and now the reliefs depicting—C. Iulius Zoilus see the prescient article of L. Robert, “Inscriptions d'Aphrodisias” (1966), reprinted in *Opera minora selecta*, vol. 6 (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1989), 1–56; Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome*, app. 5; R. R. R. Smith and C. Ratté, “Archaeological Research at Aphrodisias in Caria,” *AJA* 100 (1996): 5–53, esp. figs. 28–30.

46. See the excellent publication of this text by R. Hodot in “Décret de Kymè en l'honneur du prytane Kléanax,” *J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 10 (1982): 165–80.

GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS

OGIS 456: The Mytilenean Decree regarding Divine Honors for Augustus*fr. i*

- 1 [----]ν δὲ κ
[----]ιάδας ἱερὰ
[----]εσθαι ἐν τε
- 4 [----] γραφόντων εἰς α
[----]ηθέντα ὕμνου ὑπὸ
[----] ἐ]ν ταῖς γινομέναις θεαῖς
[----]ίδα ἀγῶνας θυμηλικούς
- 8 [----]ακιν ἄθλα ὅσα ὁ Διακός νόμος πε
[----]ανων καὶ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τοῦ στεφανη-
[φόρου ----]ς καταγγελεῖς τῶν πρώτων ἀ(χ)θησο-
[μένων ἀγῶνων ---- ἐπι]ημοτάταις πόλεσιν, ἀναθεῖναι δὲ
δέλτου[ς]
- 12 [---- ἐν τῷ ναῶ τῷ κατα]κευαζομένῳ α[ὐ]τῷ ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας ἐν
Περγάμῳ κα[ὶ]
[----]φ καὶ Ἀκτίῳ καὶ Βρεντεσίῳ καὶ Ταρραχῶνι καὶ Μα[ς-]
[καλία καὶ ---- καὶ Ἀν]τιοχίῃ τῇ πρώτῃ τῇ Δάφνῃ. τὰς δὲ κατ'
ἐνιαυτὸν
[----]ς καὶ ἐν τῷ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ. ὄρκον δὲ εἶναι τῶν δι-
16 [κακτῶν ----]ομένων σὺν τοῖς πατρίοις θεοῖς καὶ τὸν Σεβασ-
[τὸν ----]της τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ. τὰς δὲ τῶν γανῶν
[----] τεμένους εἶναι καὶ τὰλλα δίκαια καὶ τίμι[α]
[----]κατὰ δύναμιν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ. ἱερῶν δ' ἐπὶ [τ]ράπε-
20 [ζαν ----κατ]ὰ μῆνα ἐν τῇ γενεθλίῳ αὐτοῦ ἡμέρῃ καὶ π[.]
[----τῶν] αὐτῶν θυσιῶν ὡς καὶ τῷ Διὶ παρίσταται. τρέ-
[φεισθαι δὲ ---- βοῦ]ς ἐφελιωμένους ὡς καλλίστους καὶ με[γ-]
[ίστους---- ὑπὸ τῶν κατ' ἐνια]υτὸν στρατηγ(ῶ)ν, δύο δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν
ἐπι[ς-]
- 24 [ταπῶν, ---- δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγ]ορανόμων, τρία δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως
[---- ἐκ τοῦ] δημοσίου δραχμῶν ἑκάστῳ τετρα-
[κοσίας ----δ]εῖκνυσθαι δὲ τοὺς τραφέντας
[---- ἐν τ]οῖς ἀγῶσιν τρέφεσθαι τὸν ἴσο[ν]
28 [χρόνον ----] τὴν γενέθλιον ἡμέραν αὐτο[ῦ]
[----] μηδενὶ διδομένου
[---- τῷ]ς τεφανηφόρῳ καὶ τ[ῷ]

32 [---- καθ' ἑκάστον ἔτος ἐν
 [----]αι τίθεσθαι ἐπ[ι]
 [----]ενα

fr. ii

34 εὐεργειῶν νομικ[---εὐχα-]
 ριστίαν. ἐπιλογίασθαι δὲ τῆ[ς]
 36 οἰκείας μεγαλοφροσύνης ὅτ[ι]
 τοῖς οὐρανίου τετε[υ]χόσι δό-
 ξης καὶ θεῶν ὑπεροχὴν καὶ
 κράτος ἔχουσιν οὐδέποτε δύ-
 40 νатаι συνεξισωθῆναι τὰ καὶ
 τῆ τύχῃ ταπ(ε)ινότερα καὶ τῆ φύ-
 ρει. εἰ δὲ τι τούτων ἐπικυδέ-
 44 τερον τοῖς μετέπειτα χρό-
 νοις εὐρεθήσεται, πρὸς μη[δέν]
 τῶν θεοποιεῖν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ [πλέ-]
 ον δυνησομένων ἐλλείψει[ν]
 τὴν τῆς πόλεως προθυμίαν
 48 καὶ εὐσέβειαν. παρακαλεῖν
 δὲ αὐτὸν συγχωρῆσαι ἐν τῆ [οἰ-]
 κία αὐτοῦ δέλτον ἀναθεῖνα[ι]
 καὶ ἐν τῷ Καπετωλίῳ δέ[λτον]
 52 ἢ κτήλην τοῦδε τοῦ ψη[φίμα-]
 τος ἔχουσιν τὸ ἀντίγραφ[ον.]
 εὐχαριστῆσαι δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ
 τοὺς πρέσβεις τῆ τε συγ[κλή-]
 56 τῶ καὶ ταῖς ἱερῆαις τῆς Ἑς[τί-]
 ας καὶ Ἰουλίᾳ τῆ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ
 καὶ Ὀκαταΐᾳ τῆ ἀδελφῆ καὶ τοῖς
 τέκνοις καὶ συγγενέσι καὶ φί-
 60 λοις. πεμφθῆναι δὲ καὶ στέφα-
 νον ἀπὸ χρουῶν δικηλίων, ὄν
 καὶ ἀναδοθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν πρέ-
 64 βεων. εὐχαριστῆσαι δὲ ἐπ' αὐ-
 τοῦ καὶ τῆ συγκλήτῳ τοὺς πρέ-
 βεις προσενηνεγμένης αὐτῆς
 τῆ πόλει συμπαθέστατα καὶ
 τῆς πατρίου χρηστότητος
 68 οἰκείως.

AE 1988, 723: The Conobarria Oath

From J. González, “The First Oath *pro Salute Augusti* Found in Baetica,” *ZPE* 72 (1988): 113–27.

- | | | |
|----|--|----------------|
| 1 | P(ublio) Petronio P(ublii) f(ilio) T(urpiliano)--- |] |
| | M(arco) Alfio G(aii) f(ilio) Lachete [--- |] |
| | T(itus) Quinctius T(iti) f(ilius) Silo P[--- |] |
| 4 | senatus et populus Co[nobariensium]--- |] |
| | (<i>vacat</i>) in ea ver[ba]--- |] |
| | [ex] mei animi sententia ut eg[ro] pro--- |] |
| | honore, victoria Imp(eratoris) Caesa[ris]--- |] |
| 8 | Augusti pontu[fic]is maxum[i]--- | Gaii Caesaris] |
| | [A]ugusti f(ili) princ[ip]is iu<v>entutis c[onsulis]--- |] |
| | pontuficis et pro L(ucii) Caesaris Aug[usti] f(ili) M(arci)] | |
| | Agrippae Augusti nepotis sente[ntiam]--- |] |
| 12 | faciam arma, capiam eosdem [--- |] |
| | sociosque quos eis esse intel[lexero]--- |] |
| | habebo eosdemque inimicos m[eos]--- |] |
| | statuam quos eorum partibus [--- | animad-] |
| 16 | vertero. (<i>vacat</i>) et si quis adversus [--- |] |
| | facierint senserint eos terr[ra]--- |] |
| | ad internicionem persequa[r.]--- |] |

SEG 23.206: The Messenian Decree for P. Cornelius Scipio,
Propagandist of Gaius

From J. E. G. Zetzel, “New Light on Gaius Caesar’s Eastern Campaign,” *GRBS* 11, no. 4 (1970): 259–65.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Γραμματέως συνέδρων Φιλοξενίδα τοῦ ἐπὶ θεοδώ[ρου].
δόγμα.
Ἐπεὶ Πόπλιος Κορνήλιος Σκειπίων ὁ ταμίας καὶ ἀντιστράταγος
ἀνυ- |
| 4 | περβλήτω χρώμενος εὐνοία τᾶ εἰς τὸν Σεβαστὸν καὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐ-
τοῦ πάντα μίαν τε μεγίσταν καὶ τιμιωτάταν εὐχὰν πεποιημένος,
εἷς ἅπαν ἀβλαβῆ τοῦτον φυλάσσεσθαι, ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν καθ’ ἕκαστον
ἑαυτοῦ
ἐπιδείκνυται ἔργων, ἐτέλεσε μὲν τὰ Καισάρεια μηδὲν μήτε
δαπάνας |
| 8 | μήτε φιλοτιμίας ἐνλείπων μηδὲ τὰς ὑπὲρ τᾶν διὰ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ
θυσιᾶν |

- εὐχαριστίας ποτὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἅμα καὶ τὰς πλείστας τῶν κατὰ τὴν
 ἐπαρχίαν πό-
 λεων σὺν ἑαυτῷ τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιεῖν κατασκευασάμενος.
 ἐπιγνοὺς δὲ καὶ Γάιον
 τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ τὸν ὑπὲρ τὰς ἀνθρώπων πάντων σωτηρίας
 τοῖς βαρβάροις μα-
12 χόμενον ὑγιαίνειν τε καὶ κινδύνους ἐκφυγόντα ἀντιτετιμωρῆσθαι
 τοὺς πολε-
 μίους, ὑπερχαρῆς ὢν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀρίσταις ἀγγελίαις, στεφαναφορεῖν
 τε πάντοις δι-
 ἐτάξε καὶ θύειν, ἀπράγμονας ὄντας καὶ ἀπαράχους, αὐτὸς τε
 βουθυτῶν περὶ
 τὰς Γαίου σωτηρίας καὶ θεαῖς ἐπεδαφιλεύσατο ποικίλαις, ὡς ἔριν
 μὲν γείνε-
16 σθαι τὰ γενόμενα τῶν γεγονότων, τὸ δὲ σεμνὸν αὐτοῦ δι' ἴσου
 φυλαχθῆμεν, ἐφιλο-
 τιμήθη δὲ καὶ διαλιπὼν ἀπὸ τῶν Καίσαρος ἡμερῶν ἡμέρας δύο τὰν
 ἀρχῶν τῶν
 ὑπὲρ Γαίου θυσιᾶν ποιήσασθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν ᾧ τὸ πρῶτον
 ὑπατος ἀπεδεί-
 χθη. διετάξατο δὲ ἁμῖν καὶ καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν τὰν ἡμέραν
 ταύταν μετὰ
20 θυσιᾶν καὶ στεφαναφορίας διάγειν ὅσοις δυνάμεθα ἰλαρώτατα καὶ
 [---]τατα
 ἔδοξε τοῖς συνέδροις πρὸ δέκα πέντε καλανδῶν . . .