



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Stephen Mitchell Galatia under Tiberius

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **16 • 1986**

Seite / Page **17–34**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1218/5585> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1986-16-p17-34-v5585.6

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

STEPHEN MITCHELL

Galatia under Tiberius*

By any estimate the inscriptions carved on the walls of the temple of Rome and Augustus at Ancyra form a remarkable collection. Principally, of course, they include the fullest surviving versions of the *Res Gestae* of Augustus, which was inscribed in Latin on the two inward looking faces of the *anta* walls, and in Greek along the exterior of the south wall of the *cella*. More important for local, provincial history are the texts cut on the projecting ends of the *antae*. The longer of these, on the left or north side of the entrance, is a list of priests who served the cult during the Julio-claudian period; the shorter, on the right side, is the beginning of a similar text, which listed benefactions made by high priests, probably from the early second century A.D.¹ The aim of this paper is to offer a study of the earlier of these texts, with proposals for its chronology and interpretation. These involve a more precise dating of the province's governors under Tiberius, a new suggestion for the date at which the provincial era began, and a discussion of the documentary evidence for the construction of imperial temples at this time. If these proposals are acceptable, the inscription becomes a key document for our knowledge of the province of Galatia, and in particular of the imperial cult there, under Tiberius.

The text was first noted and copied by PITTON DE TOURNEFORT at the beginning of the seventeenth century, over half a century after the discovery of the temple itself by AUGIER GHISELIN DE BUSBECQ and his companions in 1555.² The first copy

* I am very grateful to BAY KAYHAN DÖRTLÜK, director of the Antalya Museum, for granting permission for the publication of the new Latin inscription from Attaleia. I am also indebted to WERNER ECK, SIMON PRICE and MARC WAELKENS for several helpful suggestions.

¹ IGR III 158 (after PERROT); M. KRENCKER and M. SCHEDE, *Der Tempel in Ankara* (1936), 57; E. BOSCH, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Ankara im Altertum* (1967), no. 102: οἱ ὑποσχόμενοι ἐν ταῖς / ἀρχιεροσύναις ὑπὲρ τῶν / ἐπιδομάτων ἔργα / [M. Κο]κ-
κεῖος Σέλευκος ἀρχιερεὺς / Σεβαστ[οῦ] / οὐ κρυπτοῦ λευκόλιθον / - - - -. For M. Cocceius Seleucus, known from an unpublished inscription of Pessinus (J. STRUBBE, *The Inscriptions of Pessinus* No. 12, in J. DEVREKER and M. WAELKENS, *Les Fouilles de Pessinonte I* [1984], 220), see S. MITCHELL, *AS* 27 (1977), 74 n. 48.

² For a discussion of this discovery and in particular of the first publication of the *Res Gestae*, see L. TARDY and E. MOSKOVSKY, *Acta Antiqua* 21 (1973), 375–401.

with any claims to completeness was made by W. R. HAMILTON in 1835,³ and this served as the basis for FRANZ's edition, CIG 4039, and for DITTENBERGER's OGIS 533. HAMILTON's copy was superseded by that made by M. KRENCKER and M. SCHEDE, in their detailed publication of the architectural remains of the temple,⁴ which in turn served as the basis for L. ROBERT, *Les Gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec* (1940), 135-7 no. 86, and for E. BOSCH, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Ankara im Altertum* (1967), no. 51. Since the former omits the final fragmentary lines, and the latter indulges in some impossible restorations, the inscription is still best studied in KRENCKER and SCHEDE's publication, with its excellent photographs.⁵ Today the text is inaccessible to close examination unless elaborate scaffolding is erected.

It is carved in a single column which extends over fourteen blocks of the projecting end of the *anta* wall. The heading, in larger letters than the rest, appears to read

Γαλατῶν ο[ι]
[ι]ερασάμενοι
θεῶι Σεβαστῶι
καὶ θεᾷ Ῥώμῃ

but KRENCKER and SCHEDE's photographs show traces of letters in a preceding line, including an omicron, and this might point to the reading

[τοῦ κοιν]ο[ῦ τῶν]
Γαλατῶν κτλ

In any event, this serves to introduce a list of nineteen or perhaps twenty priests of the cult of the deified Augustus and the goddess Rome, giving details of the benefactions which each provided during his term of office.⁶ These entries are interspersed with four further names, all Roman *cognomina* or *nomina*, in the genitive, prefaced by the preposition ἐπί. ROSTOVITZEFF recognised that these interjections should refer to the provincial governors during whose terms of office the various

³ *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, Pontus and Armenia II* (1842), 417-9 no. 103.

⁴ *Der Tempel in Ankara*, 52 ff., with Taf. 43 and 44 a.

⁵ The text is also partially reproduced by CAGNAT, *IGR III* 157 (with inept commentary), and by V. EHRENBURG and A. H. M. JONES, *Documents illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*² (1955), no. 109.

⁶ As ROBERT pointed out in *Gladiateurs*, 136, the reading [ι]ερασάμενοι, which was established by KRENCKER and SCHEDE, and which bears the meaning 'having served as priests', establishes the nature of these lines as defining or introducing the list that follows. They cannot be taken as a separate text, describing the dedication of the temple by the Galatians. DITTENBERGER, OGIS 533 n. 1 was led to make this proposal on the basis of the erroneous copies then available to him, although he clearly grasped the point that it involved understanding the verb ἱεραῖσθαι in an otherwise unattested sense. Misleadingly, EHRENBURG and JONES signal the beginning of a separate text at 1. 5, although they reproduce the correct reading.

priests served,⁷ and as such they provide the best evidence for dating the inscription.

Opinions have diverged widely on this question, and it is not necessary to review them all. The fourth named priest, Albiorix son of Ateporix, set up a statue for Julia Sebaste (l. 33-4); since Livia did not become Augusta before A.D. 14, it is obvious that most of the list is of Tiberian date, if not later. R. K. SHERK, in his first study of the Galatian *fasti*,⁸ and BOSCH argued for an early starting date in the last years of Augustus, with the list extending through the middle years of Tiberius to A.D. 26 or later.⁹ In his revised version of the Galatian *fasti*, SHERK has argued for a later Tiberian dating, running from A.D. 23 to 37,¹⁰ while in a recently published note H. HÄNLEIN steers a middle course, opting for a start between A.D. 15/16 and 19/20, for preference towards the beginning of this range.¹¹ None of the arguments produced for these schemes is watertight, and the evidence needs to be reconsidered. The point is not simply a matter of academic hair splitting, since a number of important consequences hang upon a precise chronology.

It is clear, in the first place, that the priesthoods were held annually, since several of the incumbents claim to have provided benefactions δι' ὅλου τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ through their whole year of office.¹² Moreover, as SHERK pointed out,¹³ the list should be complete and uninterrupted since it includes the name of one priest, [--]εἰὰς Διογνήτου (l. 38), who provided no benefactions at all. It is, then, in the first instance, a list of annually appointed office holders, not a catalogue of benefactions.

The latest governor on the list, Basila, is known from other sources which can be used to give an approximate idea of his date, and this appears to be confirmed by a newly discovered inscription from the Pamphylian city of Attaleia. He was identified by ROSTOVITZEFF with T. Helvius T. f. Basila,¹⁴ whose career is known from an inscription set up at Atina in Latium, his home town, on which he had

⁷ Inscription des Antes du Σεβαστεῖον d'Ancyre, Mélanges Boissier (1903), 418-24. R. SYME, *Klio* 27 (1934), 139 and 147 objected that they were more likely to be the names of high priests, but he recanted in *Anatolian Studies* presented to W. H. BUCKLER (1939), 332 (= *Roman Papers* I, 147) n. 7, and ROSTOVITZEFF's view has not otherwise been called into question.

⁸ *The Legates of Galatia* (1954), 27-30.

⁹ BOSCH, *Quellen ... Ankara*, 48 favoured a scheme beginning in A.D. 10/11 and extending to A.D. 33/34. However, he assumes that the list originally included up to twenty four priests, which is certainly too many. By his reckoning the eighteenth priest should have held office in 27/28.

¹⁰ *ANRW* II. 7. 2. (1980), 971.

¹¹ *AA* 96 (1981), 511-3.

¹² Cf. BOSCH, *Quellen ... Ankara*, 45 n. 36 see lines 55, 62, 66, 69, 72, 77, 80, 91, 95.

¹³ *ANRW* II. 7. 2. (1980), 973.

¹⁴ ROSTOVITZEFF, *op.cit.* For his career, see now *PIR*² IV, 62: H 67 (cf. I, 355: B 59), and SHERK, *ANRW* II. 7. 2. (1980), 975-6.

bestowed a foundation to provide for the maintenance of children, the earliest known private alimentary scheme for Roman Italy.¹⁵ This shows him to have been aedile, praetor, proconsul, and *legatus Caesaris Augusti*, without identifying the provinces where he held the last two posts. His daughter, Procula, was in due course to marry the senator C. Dillius Vocula, whose own career ended prematurely, when he was killed serving as a legionary legate in Upper Germany, having temporarily obtained full command of the army stationed there, in A.D. 69.¹⁶ Helvius Basila should have been active about a generation earlier, between about A.D. 20 and 45. More precisely, a series of Tiberian coins minted in Galatia carries his name in the form that appears on the Ancyra inscription, ἐπὶ Βασιίλα, thereby proving that at least part of his term as governor fell in Tiberius' reign.¹⁷

Another Galatian issue which was minted under Tiberius, almost certainly at Pessinus, carries the name of another governor, Priscus, in the same form, ἐπὶ Πρεῖσκου, accompanied by a date ΓΜ, the forty third year of a local era.¹⁸ Another Pessinuntine coin issued under Tiberius carries the date Ν, fifty,¹⁹ an era is used to date inscriptions from Ancyra²⁰ and from the Galatian countryside,²¹ and an era date, ἔτους σητ' (year 218), occurs on a series of coins from the third North Galatian city of Tavium. One of these types was issued while Caracalla was Caesar, not yet Augustus, between 4 April 196 and January 198, and simple calculation produces an era for Tavium which began between 4 April 22 and January 20 B.C.²² It is in theory possible that the three cities of North Galatia celebrated different

¹⁵ CIL X 5056 (ILS 977).

¹⁶ CIL VI 1402 (ILS 983), erected at Rome by his wife Helvia T.f. Procula. See PIR² III, 20: D 90 for Helvius' career.

¹⁷ These coins were first discussed at length by M. GRANT, NC 6th ser. 10 (1950), 44–5 nos. 4–8 (cf. also *From Imperium to Auctoritas* [1946], 328). They have now been collected by DEVREKER, in *Fouilles de Pessinonte I* (1984), 190–1 nos. 3–9.

¹⁸ GRANT, NC 6th ser. 10 (1950), 43 nos. 1–2; DEVREKER, *Fouilles de Pessinonte I*, 190–1 nos. 1–2. A specimen of the first of these types was found at Pessinus itself, *Fouilles de Pessinonte I*, 200 no. 78. The reverse depicts a draped and diademed bust of Cybele which bears a striking resemblance, as GRANT noted, to the bust of Pietas on official Tiberian dupondii of A.D. 23, BMC Emp. I, 113 no. 98. However, if the date for the Priscus coin proposed in this article is acceptable, the Galatian type has priority.

¹⁹ GRANT, NC 1950, 44 no. 3; DEVREKER, *Fouilles de Pessinonte I*, 191 no. 3. Obv. laureate head of Tiberius, legend ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ; rev. bust of Cybele, ΜΗΤΗΡ ΘΕΩΝ ΕΤΕΙ Ν.

²⁰ BOSCH, *Quellen ...*: Ankara nos. 133, 188, 211.

²¹ S. MITCHELL et al., *RECAM II: The Ankara District. The Inscriptions of North Galatia* (1982), p. 400 index of dates.

²² SNG Sammlung H. VON AULOCK 6247–50; BMC Cat. Galatia etc., Tavium nos. 19 and 23. There were contemporary issues, also dated, bearing the heads of Septimius Severus and Julia Domna. These issues and the question of the era which they represent are discussed by W. M. RAMSAY, *Anatolian Studies* presented to W. H. BUCKLER (1939), 203; D. MAGIE, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor II* (1950), 1306; B. M. LEVICK, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor* (1967), 193–4; S. MITCHELL, *RECAM II*, p. 29–30.

foundation dates, but this is extremely unlikely. Not only do they share names and titles that were derived from the same model,²³ but their creation from the three Galatian tribes of the Tolistobogii, Tectosages and Trocmi involved a reorganisation of territorial boundaries that was surely synchronic.²⁴ The era recognised at Ancyra and Pessinus, as well as at Tavium, should go back to 22–20 B.C.²⁵ This can probably be narrowed down still further. The edict of Paullus Fabius Maximus, which was issued in Asia in 10/9 B.C., had fixed Augustus' birthday, 23 September, as the first day of the calendar year in that province;²⁶ 23 September also served as New Year's Day in the Pamphylian city of Attaleia. W. KUBITSCHKE, who established this point, and L. R. TAYLOR explained the fact by supposing that Pamphyly was attached to Asia in the Augustan period, and thus naturally adhered to the terms of the edict.²⁷ However, it is now clear that Pamphyly was attached to Galatia from 25 B.C. onwards,²⁸ and never formed part of the province of Asia. Attaleia presumably adopted the Asian calendar simply by imitating, or being instructed to imitate the Asian example, and it is reasonable to suppose that this was true of the other cities of the composite province of Pamphyly and Galatia. Although the calendar change in Galatia had occurred several years after the provincial era had begun, at a later date it will surely have been assumed that the new year had always begun on 23 September. When engravers carved the date 218 on the Tavian coin of Caracalla, they will have done so either during the calendar year which ran from 23 September 196 to 22 September 197, or between those dates in 197–8, but not in 198–9 by which time Caracalla had been promoted to Augustus. Whatever the actual day and month in which the era of the new province had been inaugurated, they will have worked on the assumption that its origin could be traced back to 23 September of 22 or 21 B.C. Since the choice of Augustus' birthday for the beginning of the year was designed precisely as a cult honour for him, and one of its main purposes was to diffuse the forms of devotion and homage to the emperor as widely and as effectively as possible in the provincial communi-

²³ As inscriptions, and above all coins show, the full designation of each comprised the adjective *Sebastenos*, the name of the new civic nucleus of the community (Ancyra, Pessinus, Tavium), and the name of the Galatian tribe from which they were derived (Tectosages, Tolistobogii, Trocmi).

²⁴ See my discussion in RECAM II, p. 14, 19–22. I intend to explore the point in more detail elsewhere.

²⁵ So BOSCH, *AnAr* 1 (1955), 68–74 and *Quellen* ... Ankara, 172–3, in preference, e.g., to LEVICK, *op.cit.*, 193–4, and my own conclusion in RECAM II, 29–30, that this era probably applied only to Tavium. The two Pessinuntine coins are consistent with this conclusion. Given that the forty third and fiftieth year of the era fell in Tiberius' reign, this must have begun between 27 B.C. (forty three years before A.D. 14), and 13 B.C. (fifty years before A.D. 37).

²⁶ The text may conveniently be consulted in EHRENBURG and JONES, *Documents*², no. 98.

²⁷ KUBITSCHKE, *JÖAI* 8 (1905), 108–11; TAYLOR, *AJPh* 54 (1933), 127.

²⁸ See SHERK, *ANRW* II. 7. 2. (1981), 959, following SYME, *Klio* 30 (1937), 127–31.

ties,²⁹ it can also be treated as certain that the priests of the Imperial Cult at Ancyra entered on their terms of office on the same day.

The consequence of this involved argument is to establish that the forty third year of the city of Pessinus began on 23 September A.D. 21 or A.D. 22, and that Priscus must have governed Galatia at that moment. Nothing else is known about him for certain, but a recently published inscription from the Letoon in Lycia shows that the people of Xanthos honoured a certain Q. Cornelius Priscus, *πρεσβευτὴν Τιβερίου Καίσαρος θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ ἀντιστράτηγον*, as a benefactor of the city and of the Lycian *koinon*. Lycia had not come under direct Roman administration at this date, and the conjecture that Q. Cornelius Priscus should be identified with the Priscus who governed the adjacent province of Galatia is at least an attractive and economical one.³⁰ Since Priscus' name does not occur on the surviving part of the Ancyra temple inscription, the continuous sequence of governors which does appear there, running from Metilius to Basila, must fall, in its entirety, either before Priscus' term of office, or after it. On the first hypothesis the priesthood of ...ides son of Philon, in Basila's second year, cannot have been later than A.D. 22, and the first priest in the sequence would belong to A.D. 5. This is out of the question since it would require Albiorix, the fourth named priest, probably the fifth in the sequence, to have dedicated the statue of Iulia Sebaste in A.D. 9, five years before Livia became Iulia Augusta. So, the governors must have occupied the second half of Tiberius' reign.

Given this, it is possible to fix the final term, of Basila, with more precision. The Tiberian coins from Galatia which carry his name include four different reverse and three obverse dies.³¹ It seems inconceivable that they could all have been issued in the first two months of A.D. 37, before Tiberius' death on 16 March of that year. Basila's term should have begun, at the latest, in 36.³² On the other hand, A.D. 34 is also excluded for this would push the beginning of Metilius' governorship to A.D. 21, which cannot be reconciled with the evidence for Priscus, who must certainly have been in office in the year beginning 23 September A.D. 21, if not also in A.D. 22. Thus Basila became governor of Galatia in A.D. 35 or 36.

²⁹ This is the conclusion of U. LAFFI, in his major edition and commentary on the edict of Paullus Fabius Maximus, SCO 16 (1967), 8–98 at p. 81. Cf. J. DEININGER, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit* (1961) 53–4, and S. R. F. PRICE, *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (1984), 54–6, 106.

³⁰ A. BALLAND, *Fouilles de Xanthos VII. Inscriptions d'époque impériale du Letôon* (1981), 121–3 no. 47, making this proposal tentatively at the suggestion of SYME.

³¹ Obverses: DEVREKER, *Fouilles de Pessinonte I*, 191 nos. 4 and 5 identical, 6, and 7; reverses: nos. 4, 5, 6, and 7 are all different. The obverses of nos. 8 and 9 carry the laureate head of Augustus (?) and the legend ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ (cf. n. 36 below). They were perhaps issued under Gaius.

³² SHERK, ANRW II. 7. 2 (1980), 971, ignores the point and suggests dates of A.D. 37–39 for Basila.

There are slight, but not decisive reasons for preferring the earlier year. After the entry in the list for ...ides son of Philon, in the second year of Basila's term, the photographs appear to indicate that half a block of the *anta* wall was uninscribed. There then follow several lines of text which are too damaged to be restored, but which contain references to benefactions including the dedication of an altar. It could be that the break in the inscription marked the change of emperor on Tiberius' death, followed by modifications to the cult in the first year of Gaius' principate. This hypothesis entails the notion that ...ides son of Philon held office from September 36 to September 37. His predecessor, Q. Gallius Pulcher would have been priest from 35 to 36, and Basila had probably arrived in the province in the preceding summer of 35. This would produce a scheme for the Tiberian governors as follows:

Priscus ?–22

Metilius 22–27

Fronto 27–31

Silvanus 31–35

Basila 35–? (at least until the accession of Gaius in 37)

In 1980 archaeologists from the Antalya Museum carried out a rescue excavation in the modern city, about 300 metres east of the well-known Hadrian's Gate. Subsequently a building known as 'Aras Bedesteni' was put up on the site. They found remains of a Byzantine cemetery, probably of the sixth century A.D., and one of the graves had been covered by a large stone block which carried, face down, a Latin inscription of much earlier date.



This frieze block, 0.80 m. high, 1.57 m. wide and 0.17 m. thick, of white marble, was taken to the Antalya Museum, where it is now on display (see Fig. 1). It is complete in itself, but a small portion of the inscribed text clearly ran on to adjacent blocks. The inscription was carved in four lines (letter heights lines 1–3, 0.12 m.; line 4, 0.10 m.), and can be restored as follows:

[Ca]esares Augusti po[nt.]
 [m]aximi tribunic. pot. [vi-]
 am per T. Helvium Basil[am]
 [l]eg. suum pro pr. munieru[nt]

The stone evidently originally belonged to a larger structure, surely a building in Attaleia itself rather than in one of the other Pamphylian cities. If it is rightly restored to commemorate the construction of a road, it might have come from a city gate, or from some other public building connected with a road, possibly on the east side of the city in direction of Perge.

There is one small problem with the reading. The restorations at both ends of lines 1 and 4, at the beginning of l. 2, and the end of l. 3 are certain, and dictate the line lengths. At the end of line 2 we should clearly read POT, and restore *pot* (*estate*). This leaves very little space for a complete word to serve as the object for *munierunt*, and only one seems possible, namely *viam*, which was probably distributed between the lines as indicated above. The restoration is supported by the fact that a long sequence of literary texts, and also some road building inscriptions, show that *munire* is a *vox propria* for road construction.³³ One other road building inscription is known from Pamphylia at this period, a bilingual inscription found in the east gate of Antalya, leading towards Perge, dating to A. D. 50 and dedicated to the emperor Claudius by his procurator M. Arruntius Aquila, who is said to have rebuilt roads (*vias refecit*). It would be hazardous to attempt to reconstruct the history of Julio-claudian road building in Pamphylia on this evidence alone. The formula of the Claudian inscription seems to imply that Arruntius was refurbishing existing roads. The new text obviously supplies evidence that road building had already taken place, but it does not seem likely that Arruntius was concerned with a road built scarcely a dozen years before. It seems better, for the moment, to see both inscriptions as evidence of a move by the Roman authorities to link the cities of the Pamphylian coast with the Augustan road network in Pisidia, known as the *via Sebaste*, which linked the recently founded Pisidian colonies with one another.³⁴ In the new inscription, the plural *Augusti* of the first line can hardly, at this period, refer to two or more emperors reigning at the same time, but to successive

³³ See Thesaurus Linguae Latinae s.v. *munio* II; ILS 5829 and 5029a (Tiberian); 5874 (Ant. Pius); 5513; CIL III 346 (Neronian).

³⁴ CIL III 6737; ILS 215.

rulers, under whom Basila served, and who shared responsibility for constructing the road which will have been begun under one emperor and completed under his successor, evidently Tiberius and Gaius.³⁵ The use of the laconic *Caesar Augustus*, in place of the full titulature of either princeps, can be paralleled at this date from coins and inscriptions, including some which relate to Galatia itself.³⁶

The sequence established here has consequences for other Julio-Claudian governors of Galatia. The earliest known Tiberian governor was Sex. Sotidius Strabo Libuscidianus, *leg. Ti. Caesaris Augusti pro pr.*, who issued an edict designed to curb illegal transport requisitions, which was published in the territory of Sagalassus.³⁷ The preamble of this edict refers to provisions made to prevent abusive requisitioning by the *Augusti, alter deorum alter principum maximus*, clearly Augustus and Tiberius. Later passages refer to the *principis optimi maiestate* (l. 7), translated in the Greek equivalent as τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος Σεβαστοῦ . . . θεϊότητα (l. 30), to a *procuratori principis optimi filioque eius* (l. 14), to an *equiti Romano cuius officio princeps optimus utitur* (l. 19), and to *principis optimi libertis, et servis et iumentis* (l. 24). In all these cases the Greek translation of *princeps optimus* is simply Σεβαστός. In the *editio princeps* of this inscription I argued that the term should refer to Augustus, and that Sotidius had been appointed by him, completing his term of of-

³⁵ A modest provincial illustration of the remark made by Suetonius in the life of Gaius about buildings at Rome: *opera sub Tiberio semiperfecta, templum Augusti theatrumque Pompei, absolvit* (Gaius 21).

³⁶ The most obvious instance to cite is ILS 977 for Helvius Basila himself, who was *legatus Caesaris Augusti*. DESSAU, in his note on this text, cited as parallels CIL VI 5539 (ILS 1786) and 8934 (ILS 1838), which refer to Claudius and Nero respectively as *Caesar Augustus*. ILS 2648, a career inscription, describes the honorand as *proc. Imp. Caes. Aug. prov. Lusitaniae*, where the emperor is again Nero. Gaius is called *Caesar Augustus* in CIL VI 811 (ILS 192), a votive inscription set up on his behalf by the ordinary consuls of A.D. 38, and an Imperial letter which he addressed to several Greek communities (IG VII 2111; ILS 8792) simply begins Αὐτοκράτωρ Σεβαστός Καῖσαρ. Two of the coins minted at Pessinus under Basila carry the legend ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ and display a laureate head which GRANT took to be that of Augustus, but the identification is not at all certain, and it is perhaps more likely that both bust and legend represent Gaius (see n. 31). In *From Imperium to Auctoritas* (1946), 328–34, GRANT also considers a large number of other provincial bronze issues with the legends ΚΑΙΣΑΡ or ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ, which were minted between the reigns of Tiberius and Nero. In most cases he suggests that the legends and the busts which go with them are posthumous references to Augustus. But in many instances, such as the Galatian issues of Basila, it is surely possible that these coins allude to or portray the reigning emperor. The inscriptions cited above show that *Caesar Augustus* could be used, on occasion, to denote Gaius, Claudius and Nero. One would expect the usage to be favoured by die engravers with little space to accommodate the full titles of the emperors. Moreover, the portraiture of these coins is in many cases crude and ambiguous. If GRANT is right to claim that these issues are posthumous commemorations of Augustus, it seems extraordinary that they make no allusion to his deification.

³⁷ S. MITCHELL, JRS 66 (1976), 106–31.

fice under Tiberius. This interpretation encounters serious objections, which have been raised by E. A. JUDGE,³⁸ who points out that the *maiestas*, and the officials and servants, can hardly be those of a dead man, but of the living emperor who had inherited his powers. Moreover, the term *princeps optimus* is unparalleled as a description for Augustus, but occurs for the first time precisely in the reign of Tiberius, both in epigraphic and literary sources.³⁹ The weight of these points is undeniable, and there is no positive reason to place Sotidius' appointment before the death of Augustus in A. D. 14, although the allusion to measures taken by both *Augusti* makes best sense at an early date in Tiberius' reign. JUDGE uses a further argument to fix the edict precisely to A. D. 18/19. The Latin version, echoed by the Greek, states that rights to requisition transport were given, among others, *procuratori principis optimi filioque eius*. In the first edition I suggested that an official document designed to curb abuses could hardly be so blatant in allowing not only a Roman official, but also his son, to claim transport, and argued that the text should be emended to *filiique eius*, understanding the reference to be to Augustus and his son Tiberius. JUDGE, accepting the amended text, suggests that it refers to Tiberius and Germanicus, who held his extended eastern command in A. D. 18/19.⁴⁰ However, the case for emendation is far from sound. The Greek text faithfully translates *filio* not *filii*, so the error is not one of the lapicide, but of the person who drafted the text and transmitted it to be inscribed. This seems far-fetched. In fact, G. ALFÖLDY has argued that the text should be taken at face value, and that there is no reason to shrink from the implication that a procurator's son shared his father's privileges, at least in this respect.⁴¹ This too is not without its problems. It is one thing for the sons of equestrian officials to share the *dignitas* of their fathers, another for a son to obtain the entitlements which his father enjoyed in a specific official capacity. It is also noteworthy that the text, by using the singular *filio* not the plural *filiis* seems to have a specific case in mind, and was not designed to accommodate all Galatian procurators and any of their sons in any circumstances. It is probably simplest to suppose that at the moment of Sotidius' edict, the Galatian procurator was accompanied by his son who was actively assisting him in his duties, and hence was entitled, by the governor's decision, to the same privileges as his father. An inscription from the Thracian Chersonese offers a

³⁸ In G. H. R. HORSLEY, *New Documents illustrating Early Christianity* 1 (1981), 36–45 no. 9.

³⁹ Cf. R. FREI-STOLBA, *MH* 26 (1969), 18–39 at 21–2; JUDGE, *op. cit.* 41, citing *CIL* VI 93, 903, 904; XI 3872; Valerius Maximus, *praef.* 2; Velleius Paterculus II. 126. 5. A. J. WOODMAN's recent commentary on Velleius endorses JUDGE's view, with a similar citation of parallels, although excluding the inscription at issue here. The point that *princeps optimus* should refer to Tiberius is also made by G. ALFÖLDY, *Chiron* 11 (1981), 201 n. 163.

⁴⁰ *Op. cit.*, 42.

⁴¹ *Chiron* 11 (1981), 201 n. 163.

parallel for a procurator being aided by his son, in this case in army recruitment.⁴² This interpretation removes the argument for dating the edict to A.D. 18/19. It could belong anywhere between A.D. 14 and A.D. 21, although if Priscus served a normal term of office prior to 22, then Sotidius is unlikely to have been in post after A.D. 19.

Another governor for whom a Tiberian date has been suggested is the .. *Axius leg. pro pr. fetialis*, who appears on a monumental inscription of Ancyra.⁴³ SHERK originally identified him with L. Axius Naso, proconsul of Cyprus in A.D. 29, and suggested that he might have governed Galatia in Tiberius' later years.⁴⁴ He revises this to a possible Claudian date in his fresh study of the *fasti*⁴⁵. The absence of the *cognomen* Naso from the Ancyran inscription is a puzzle, and W. ECK has since made a convincing case for identifying the Galatian governor with T. Axius, who held a suffect consulship sometime after A.D. 38, and married Caecilia, daughter of the consul of A.D. 16, T. Statilius Taurus. If the conjecture is right, T. Axius could have governed Galatia in the early years of Tiberius, between 14 and 21, or, much more plausibly, after T. Helvius Basila, under Gaius or Claudius,⁴⁶ but certainly before M. Annius Afrinus, who was legate from A.D. 49 to 54.⁴⁷

II

The inscription on the *anta* of the temple of Ancyra provides detailed information about the priests of the imperial cult at Ancyra, and the benefactions which they made during their terms of office. Several of these have an important bearing on the development of the cult in North Galatia, and the chronology which has been established for the inscription makes it possible to trace its development very precisely.

In recent years it has become clear from the Belgian excavations at Pessinus and from a survey at the Augustan colony of Pisidian Antioch, that during the Julio-claudian period, and especially between the principates of Tiberius and Claudius, a number of important buildings connected with the imperial cult were erected in these provincial cities, which played a vital role not simply in the development of emperor worship, but in creating urban centres in a region where civic life had hardly existed before. The archaeological and architectural evidence for this development is the subject of a number of studies by M. WÆLKENS, which are shortly to be pub-

⁴² Republished and interpreted by B. ISAAC, ZPE 44 (1981), 67–74.

⁴³ CIL III 248; BOSCH, Quellen ... Ankara no. 54.

⁴⁴ The Legates of Galatia (1954), 91–2.

⁴⁵ ANRW II. 7. 2. (1980), 976.

⁴⁶ ZPE 42 (1981), 253–4.

⁴⁷ Sherk, ANRW II. 7. 2. (1980), 976–7.

lished.⁴⁸ The aim of the following remarks is to discuss some of the epigraphic and numismatic evidence which illustrates and helps to date the phenomenon.

The most important existing monument of the imperial cult in Galatia is the temple of Rome and Augustus of Ancyra itself. Since this point has recently been called into dispute by K. TUCHELT, it is necessary to rebut his sceptical arguments before examining the question of its date. TUCHELT's principal reasons for doubting the traditional view of the dedication are, firstly, that the formula which begins the priest list (see above p. 18) does not state that the office holders were priests of Augustus and Rome, but merely that they made dedications to them, and, secondly, that the reference in the inscription to the fourth priest, Pylaemenes, having provided 'the place where the *Sebasteion* is', is only intelligible if it refers to a place other than the actual locality of the temple on which the text is inscribed.⁴⁹ Neither of these arguments carries conviction, either *prima facie* or on reflection. If, as TUCHELT argues, it is merely incidental to their office that holders of the priesthood made dedications to Rome and Augustus, it is remarkable that they should have all done so, singly, year by year, and without exception. The claim can, in fact, be formally refuted. KRENCKER and SCHEDE, followed by SHERK, have already observed that their names were not all inscribed at the same time, and the majority were added to the list after the preface to the text had been carved. It is therefore clear that it was known from the start that all the priests would make a dedication to Rome and Augustus; it must have been by virtue of their office that they did so. The second argument also carries no weight. The text in itself creates no prejudice as to the whereabouts of the *Sebasteion*. The inscriptions on the temple, both the *Res Gestae* itself⁵⁰ and the priest list, unambiguously indicate that this was an imperial temple. It is not incidental that every reference to a specifically religious innovation to the cult made by the holders of the priesthood (see below) is to a modification of the Imperial cult.

TUCHELT further argues that early imperial *Sebasteia* were generally connected with other civic buildings, such as an agora, gymnasium or theatre, as indeed was the Ancyra building, which was linked to a 'Festplatz' and a 'Wagenrennen' (πανήγυρις, ιππόδρομος). There is, he claims, no evidence that large sacred buildings like the Ankara temple were dedicated to the imperial cult under Augustus. In reply to this it must be said, first that we do not know what buildings, if any, were

⁴⁸ The Early Imperial Sanctuary at Pessinus, to appear in *Epigraphica Anatolica*; the publication of the Julio-claudian architecture of Pisidian Antioch, to appear in S. MITCHELL and M. WAELKENS, *Pisidian Antioch. The Site and its Monuments*. Both studies include discussion of the evidence from Ancyra, published originally by KRENCKER and SCHEDE. For preliminary reports on the work at Antioch, see S. MITCHELL, *AS* 33 (1983), 9–11, and 34 (1984), 8–10. For a short survey of the developments in this field, see S. MITCHELL, *Archaeology in Asia Minor 1979–84*, *JHS Arch. Reports* 1985, 98–100.

⁴⁹ K. TUCHELT, *AA* 1985, 317–9.

⁵⁰ Pace F. PREISSHOFEN, *AA* 1985, 320–2.

associated with the Ankara temple, since they have not been excavated; second, the references in the inscription to a *panegyris* and to a horse race are apparently to *events* (note the verb γέινεται in contrast to ἔστιν which denotes the position of *Sebasteion*), not to buildings where these events took place; and third, the contention concerning the absence of large imperial temples in the Augustan period is a *petitio principii*. Although the imperial cult buildings of the early Julio-claudian period at Ephesus, Pergamum, and other cities of western Asia Minor are relatively small, and often merely part of larger civic structures, this is not the case in Galatia, where there is clear evidence for large imperial sanctuaries of Julio-claudian date, not only at Ancyra but at Pisidian Antioch and Pessinus.⁵¹

The date at which the Ankara temple was built has been a matter of considerable dispute. KRENCKER and SCHEDE argued that it was a Hermogenian building of the mid second century B.C., originally dedicated to a local deity, perhaps Mên, but reconsecrated as an imperial temple under Augustus. This suggestion was firmly rejected by E. WIEGAND, in an important review of *Der Tempel in Ankara*, and he argued that it was Augustan.⁵² Few would now accept that it has a hellenistic origin, although opinions as to the exact date have varied within the Julio-claudian period.⁵³ Recent studies suggest that most of the ornamentation of the temple appears to belong to the early or middle Augustan period, and a powerful supporting argument for this has been derived from the manner in which the *Res Gestae* is carved on the walls of the *cella* and the *antae* of the temple.⁵⁴ However, it is important to note that very little of the entablature, and none of the column capitals of the *peristasis*, which would have been the last parts of the building to have been completed, have survived. Construction might therefore have continued into the later years of Augustus and the early part of Tiberius' reign, and this would allow the archaeological evidence to be reconciled with an epigraphic argument for the date of the temple's inauguration. If the chronological arguments of the first part of this study are accepted, they indicate that the first priest in the list, whose name is unfortunately obscured by damage to the stone, took office in A.D. 19. It is reasonable to assume that this also marked the formal inauguration of the temple. As we have seen, the fourth priest, Pylaemenes, son of the last Galatian ruler Amyntas, provided the place where the *Sebasteion* stood.⁵⁵ This need not imply that con-

⁵¹ See the studies referred to in n. 48, against TUCHELT's own view of these sanctuaries, which is to be found in *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Kleinasiens*, *Festschrift K. BITTEL* (1983), 501–24.

⁵² *Gnomon* 13 (1937), 418 ff.

⁵³ For a conspectus of opinions, see H. HÄNLEIN, *AA* 1981, 511.

⁵⁴ See M. WÄLKENS (n. 48) and the brief but persuasive summary, with references to relevant recent literature, by K. FITTSCHEN, *AA* 1985, 314–5. For the carving of the *Res Gestae*, see below.

⁵⁵ FITTSCHEN, *AA* 1985, 311–2 interprets the phrase τόπους ἀνῆκε, ὅπου τὸ Σεβαστήον ἔστιν, to mean placed adjoining the temple site: «Pylaïmenes konnte zu dem der Kultge-

struction only began at that date, for then his predecessors would have had no shrine at which to officiate, and in any case that conclusion would be seriously at odds with the architectural evidence. Instead, we should suppose that Pylaemenes had made this gift before his term of office, and simply took the opportunity provided by the inscription of his name and benefactions in A.D. 22 to advertise the fact.⁵⁶

Modifications to the cult at Ancyra itself are recorded in the following year, when statues were set up for Tiberius Caesar and Iulia Augusta, and perhaps also in A.D. 38 when a new altar may have been built in connection with the death of Tiberius and the accession of Gaius (see above p. 23).

The publication of the *Res Gestae* of Augustus should probably be associated with the inauguration of the temple. The blocks of the *antae* and *cella* walls where it is carved, were specially smoothed down for the purpose, and the drafted margins which characterise the masonry were obliterated.⁵⁷ This certainly implies that the decision to display the text of the *Res Gestae* had not been taken as the temple was under construction. In fact, since the building of the *cella* clearly preceded Augustus' death, this was not an option open to the designers and architects of the building. However, the Greek and Latin texts of the *Res Gestae* are prominently placed and carefully integrated into the plan of the building, and it is reasonable to assume that it was carved in time to adorn the temple at its inauguration in A.D. 19.

If so, there is a striking synchronism with the publication of the copy of the *Res Gestae* found at Apollonia, also in Galatia, close to the border with the province of Asia. Here the city set up a large pedestal between the death of Augustus in A.D. 14 and that of Germanicus in 19, designed to carry statues of the divine Augustus, Iulia Augusta, Tiberius Caesar, Germanicus and Drusus. The *Res Gestae* were carved on the base of this pedestal, arranged in seven columns.⁵⁸ At precisely the same period an inscribed statue base was erected in honour of Apollonius son of Olympichus, a member of the city's leading family, which states that he had himself put up three equestrian statues in the *temenos* of the Augusti, which are believed to have represented Tiberius, Germanicus and Drusus, undertaken an embassy to Germanicus, presumably while he was in the East between A.D. 18 and 19, and been priest of the goddess Rome, when he had made notable public bene-

meinschaft bereits gehörigen Grundbesitz weitere Grundstücke hinzugeschenkt haben.» But this is not what the Greek says.

⁵⁶ Contra FITTSCHEN, *op. cit.*, 311 n. 19, who regards this as «bedenklich». HÄNLEIN, AA 1981, 511 ff. first underlined the relevance of this passage to the inauguration of the temple, although she was wrong to insist that construction cannot have begun before Pylaemenes' priesthood. See now her *Veneratio Augusti*. Eine Studie zu den Tempeln des ersten römischen Kaisers (1985), 186–90 and 289–90.

⁵⁷ KRENCKER and SCHEDE, *Der Tempel in Ankara*, 51; FITTSCHEN, AA 1985, 313–4; the point is also made by WAELKENS in his study for *Epigraphica Anatolica*.

⁵⁸ MAMA IV 143, with fig. 17 to show the form of the monument.

factions and provided public feasts.⁵⁹ Taken together, these inscriptions provide clear evidence for a major refurbishment or embellishment of the imperial cult at Apollonia in the early years of Tiberius' reign, culminating in the publication of the *Res Gestae* by A.D. 19. We might conjecture that the embassy to Germanicus was itself associated with this issue, for it is clear that the Roman authorities did not adopt an entirely passive role in the creation of the imperial cult, however much they may have welcomed apparently spontaneous gestures of homage and loyalty from the provincial communities.⁶⁰

The synchronism of the publication of the *Res Gestae* at Ancyra and Apollonia may well be more than a coincidence. It has long been a puzzle that the three known exemplars of the text, found at Ancyra, Apollonia and Pisidian Antioch, all originate from the same province, Galatia. In default of any other plausible explanation for this, J. DEININGER was surely right to conjecture that the decision to publish it should be attributed to the Galatian *koinon*.⁶¹ It reflects a local initiative, which, as it happens, was not followed by other provinces or provincial organisations, but its effects were felt not in a single city, but throughout the province. Since the *koinon*'s main task was to manage the imperial cult on a provincial level, it is also not surprising that the text should have been inscribed within the precincts of imperial sanctuaries: at Ancyra on the temple walls, at Apollonia on a monumental base in the *temenos*, and at Antioch in close association with the stairway and triumphal arch which led directly to the precinct in which the temple of Augustus lay.⁶²

No fragment of the *Res Gestae* has been found at Pessinus, but there is other evidence, epigraphic and numismatic, for the development of the imperial cult. In A.D. 31/32 the priesthood at Ancyra was held by a man with clear Pessinuntine connections.⁶³ His benefactions include the provision of a public banquet at Pessi-

⁵⁹ MAMA IV 142, based on the restoration of W.M. RAMSAY, JHS 28 (1918), 178 no. XVII.

⁶⁰ See the subtle discussion of S.R.F. PRICE, *Rituals and Power* (1984), 53–77.

⁶¹ Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit, 68–9. SIMON PRICE points out that the decision could also have been initiated by the provincial governors. His own discussion cited in the previous note might also point towards a collaboration.

⁶² We should certainly see the building activity at Pisidian Antioch in the same context, for the construction of the temple of Augustus and its surrounding porticos, the monumental *propylon*, and the *Tiberia platea*, which form a huge, coherent architectural ensemble at the centre of the city, certainly spanned the period from the middle years of Augustus to A.D. 50, when the *propylon* was dedicated. The architectural context in which the Antiochene copy of the *Res Gestae* was situated remains obscure. The text was inscribed on a series of marble plaques, which must have been attached to some structure in the neighbourhood of the *propylon* or the stairway leading up to it. Further detailed study may resolve the question, which will be discussed in the book referred to in n. 48.

⁶³ Only the final letters of his name survive, ..λλιος. BOSCH restores [Γά]λλιος, and assumes that he was related to the Q. Gallius Pulcher who was priest in 35/36. But the absence

nus, twenty five pairs of gladiators (presumably at Ancyra), and ten pairs at Pessinus, olive oil for the two tribes (that is the Tectosages and the Tolistobogii) for the whole year, and the erection of a divine statue at Pessinus. These developments, especially the last, advertised on the temple at Ancyra, may perhaps mark the official introduction of a provincial, rather than simply a civic cult of the emperor at Pessinus. A more decisive change occurred four years later in 35/36, when the priesthood at Ancyra was again occupied by a Pessinuntine, Q. Gallius Pulcher, who provided the funds for two public banquets, the sacrifice of a hecatomb at Pessinus, and olive oil for the two tribes throughout the year. It has already been noted (p. 22) that the governor under whom Q. Gallius Pulcher served, Helvius Basila, supervised the issue of a series of coin types which bore his name. These issues, which do not carry a city name or any explicit reference to the Galatian *koinon*, have been termed an official coinage, minted at the instigation of the Roman authorities,⁶⁴ but their types and fabric have very close connections with the city coinage of Pessinus, and there is no doubt that they were struck there.⁶⁵ Three of the five reverse types depict a hexastyle temple facade, the first appearance of this design on any Galatian coinage. It is difficult not to connect the image on the coins with the hexastyle temple whose foundations have been uncovered at Pessinus by the recent excavations. Although they discovered no decisive epigraphic evidence to clinch the argument, the excavators have suggested on very cogent grounds that the temple and the theatre-like structure which adjoins it on the west, were designed to accommodate the imperial cult, gladiatorial games and other rituals which were associated with it. They also argued, on ceramic and architectural evidence, that it should be dated to the reign of Tiberius.⁶⁶ These points have been further substantiated by WÆLKENS in his recent study, who would date it more precisely to the second part of Tiberius' reign.⁶⁷ In the light of these findings, it is surely correct to conclude that the coins were minted to celebrate the completion and inauguration of the temple in A.D. 35/36. The hecatomb which Q. Gallius Pulcher sacrificed at Pessinus, admittedly not a unique benefaction on the Ancyra list, might have been an appropriate celebration for the occasion.

of a *cognomen* is unexpected, and a better suggestion is [Μ. Λό]λλιος. The Lollii, who had acquired their name from M. Lollius, the first governor of Galatia, were an important Pessinuntine family in the Augustan period. For the epigraphic evidence, see J. STRUBBE, *The Inscriptions of Pessinus* no. 78, in *Fouilles de Pessinonte I*, 230; M. WÆLKENS, *Die kleinasiatischen Türsteine* (1985), 285 no. 723, with pl. 90.

⁶⁴ GRANT, *NC* 6th ser. 10 (1950), 43 ff.

⁶⁵ DEVREKER, *Fouilles de Pessinonte I*, 190.

⁶⁶ P. LAMBRECHTS et al., *AC* 41 (1972), 156–73. The existence of a provincial temple of the imperial cult at Pessinus is formally demonstrated by the inscription for Ti. Claudius Heras (IGR III 230), which calls him σεβαστοφάνης τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ ἐν Πεσσινοῦντι. TUCHELT, *AA* 1985, 318 wrongly takes this to be a municipal temple at Pessinus.

⁶⁷ See n. 48.

The reign of Tiberius was, therefore, decisive in the development of the imperial cult in Galatia. The temple at Ancyra, whose construction had begun under Augustus, was probably inaugurated in A.D. 19/20. The *Res Gestae* was inscribed on its walls at the same time, and by a decision of the Galatian *koinon* provisions were probably made for its display elsewhere in the province, notably at Apollonia where a *temenos* of the imperial cult had been built between A.D. 14 and A.D. 19. A temple and associated buildings were already under construction at Pisidian Antioch, where a copy of the *Res Gestae* has also been found, although the date when it was inscribed is uncertain. By A.D. 35/36 a second temple of the provincial cult had been completed at Pessinus, and the fact was advertised on coins minted under the supervision of the provincial governor. The buildings which were erected in these centres to accommodate the cult were on a scale that must have dwarfed the existing architecture of these cities, especially at Ancyra and Pessinus where city life itself was a novelty. They thus mark a crucial step not only in the establishment and diffusion of emperor worship, but also in the creation and fostering of civic life in Galatia.

University College of Swansea
Department of Classics and Ancient History
Singleton Park
Swansea, SA2 8PP
England

