



<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

Christopher Jones A Decree of Thyatira in Lydia

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **29 • 1999**

Seite / Page **1–21**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/966/5333> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1999-29-p1-21-v5333.8

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).

CHRISTOPHER JONES

A Decree of Thyatira in Lydia*

A fragmentary inscription from Athens began to be known in the late 1830's, when the first pieces came to light on the Acropolis. WILHELM DITTENBERGER in 1878 collected a total of six, and provided a commentary which is still of value; he saw that the lost text had something to do with the Panhellenion founded in the reign of Hadrian, and that the city mainly concerned was Thyatira in north-western Lydia (modern Akhisar). The edition of JOHANNES KIRCHNER in 1916 represented a regression from DITTENBERGER, and the next major advance came from JAMES H. OLIVER in 1941. He assembled eight pieces, and was able to show that the original text was not a decree of the Panhellenes, as DITTENBERGER and KIRCHNER had supposed, but one of Thyatira itself.¹ Then, at the Epigraphical Congress held in Nîmes in 1992, SIMONE FOLLET and DINA PEPPAS-DELMOUSOU presented a revised text, incorporating further fragments and making some significant new joins. They have now made known their results in an article dated to 1997, though published in summer 1998. Their study represents an enormous effort of patience and ingenuity, though in so fragmentary and difficult a text it is no surprise that more remains to be done, especially on the side of supplementation and interpretation.²

It will be best to begin with the text proposed by the two editors; their apparatus criticus is extremely full and detailed, and I will mention proposed restorations only insofar as they bear on the subjects under discussion. After suggesting some different readings, I shall go on to consider the inscription mainly for what it shows about the Panhellenion, an institution which has

* I have used the following special abbreviations: Bull. ép. = Bulletin épigraphique, appearing annually in REG; Décret = S. FOLLET – D. PEPPAS-DELMOUSOU, BCH 121, 1997, 291–309; OLIVER, Greek Constitutions = J. H. OLIVER, Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors from Inscriptions and Papyri, Philadelphia 1989; Panhellenion = C. P. JONES, The Panhellenion, Chiron 26, 1996, 29–56; ROBERT, Documents = L. ROBERT, Documents d'Asie Mineure, Paris 1987; ROBERT, OMS = Opera Minora Selecta I–VII, Amsterdam 1969–90. Volumes in the series Inschriften Griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien will be cited in the form «IAssos (IGSK 4)», etc.

¹ W. DITTENBERGER, IG III 12–13; J. KIRCHNER, IG II² 1088; J. H. OLIVER, Hesperia 10, 1941, 363–8, with excellent photograph on p. 364.

² S. FOLLET – D. PEPPAS-DELMOUSOU, Décret. The editors do not include a translation, so that I have sometimes had to guess at the meaning of their supplements.

drawn much discussion in recent years.³ Since the last lines are extremely fragmentary, and not material to the issues under discussion here, they are omitted.

vacat 3,3 cm

Ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ

- [τοῦ θειοτάτου]υ Αὐτοκράτορος Κ[αίσαρος Τραϊανοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ.]
 Ἐπ[εὶ δὴ ἡ Θυα]τειρηνῶν πόλις, χ[αριζομένη ἐπὶ ταῖς εὐεργεσίαις τοῦ]
 4 με[γίστου Αὐτο]κράτορος Καίσαρος Τραϊανοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ, σωτήρος]
 καὶ [εὐεργέτου]υ, πατὴρ τῆς πα[τρίδος, ἀρχιερέως μεγίστου, ὑπάτου, ἐξ]
 ὧν π[όλεις καὶ ἔθ]νη τῆς ἀπάσης Ἑ[λλάδος εἰς τὸ σεμνότατον τοῦτο Πανελ-]
 λήν[ον κατεστήσα]το, πάντα ἃ Μετ[τ]ίου Μοδέ[στου συ]μβούλου ἐψηφίσατο ἀνα-]
 8 γράψα[ι Ἀθῆνῃσιν] ἐν Ἀκροπόλει β[ούλεται καὶ τ]ὰς δωρεὰς ὡς [ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ τοῦ]
 μεγίστου τῶν ἀείπ[οτε βασιλέων Αὐ]τοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τραϊα[νοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ]
 Ὀλυμπί[ου Πανελλ]ληνίου Διὸς ἐφ[υμνεῖν· νυ τ]οῦτο ἔδο[ξεν, ἀγαθ]ῇ τύχῃ, τῇ Θυα-]
 12 τειρην[ῶν] βουλῇ[ι καὶ] τῷ δήμῳ· τόδ[ε τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν]χαράξει λιθ[ίνῃ]ι σ[τήλῃ] καὶ [σ]τή-]
 σαι ἐν [Ἀκρ]οπόλει, [ἵνα] ἔκδηλον [γένοιτο τοῖς Ἑλ]λησι ἅπασιν ὅσων [δὴ τ]ετύχηκεν
 ἀπὸ τοῦ [μ]εγίστου β[ασι]λέως, ὅτι ἰδίᾳ καὶ κοινῇ πᾶν τὸ τῶν Ἑλλή[νων] εὐεργέτησεν
 ὁ βασιλεὺς, συναγα[γὼν] ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐκεῖνο τὸ συνέδριον, ὡς φι[λο]τειμίαν κοινήν,
 εἰς τῇ[ν λαμ]προτάτῃ[ν Ἀ]θην[αίων] πόλιν, τ[ῇ]ν Εὐεργέτιν, καρπ[ὸν τῶν] Μυστηρίων
 16 ὁμ[οῦ πᾶσι διδου]σαν, τὸ [δὲ σεμνότα]τον Πανελλήνιον, δι' ὧν ἐψηφίσατο, ὁμολογούγ-
 [των τῶν Ῥωμαίων τῆς ἱεράς] συνκλήτου, καὶ ἰ[δίᾳ] τὰ τε ἔθνη κ[αὶ] τὰς πόλεις τ[οῦ]του τοῦ τει-
 [μωτάτου δεχομένην συνεδρ]ίου. Δῆλος δὲ ἐσ[τ]ιν καὶ τὴν ἡμε[τέραν πόλιν ἀρι]στήλως καὶ πολλὰ-
 20 [κις ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐξάνων κ]αὶ εὐεργετῶν, τ[-----]ολ[-----]πων ἔτι τὴν
 [-----] εὐεργέτησε[-----] λαμβάνων ὑπὲρ [-----]
 [-----]εν παρὰ τοῦ[-----] τὴν τῶν ὑδάτων ἀ[α-]
 [γωγὴν [-----]ει παρὰ[-----] κατ]ὰ τὰς ἀπάντων
 [-----]Ε ^ ^ Υ [---]
 24 [-----]
 [-----]
 [-----]ειν προσόδους ?]
 [----- οὐ μόνον ἐπιδείξας τὴν αὐτὴν ?]ἣν μεγ[αλοφροσύνη]ν * μυριάδας εἴκοσιν χάριν
 28 [παρακομιδῆς σίτου καὶ παντοδαπῶ]ν τροφῶ[ν καὶ ταύ]την τὴν περὶ τὸν πυρρὸν ἀφθο-
 [νίαν παρασχών [-----] τῆς τοῦ μ]εγίστου βα[σι]λέως φιλοδωρίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν
 [-----]εν, εὐ[μεν]ῶς αὐτὸς σχὼν πολλάκις, ἥνικα
 [-----]βεβαιω[κώς] [δὲ ἡ]μῖν εἰς αἰ[ὲν] τὴν τῶν ὥρων ἀμε-
 32 [τακίνητον ἀσφάλειαν καὶ τὴν φυλακὴν αὐ]τῶν [διὰ τ]ῆς τοῦ βασιλέως προνοίας, ἔτι δὲ
 [-----] τοῖς ἄρχου[σι] ἐπιτρέψας, αἰτήσασιν παρ' αὐτοῦ,
 [-----] ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ περισσὰ χρήμα[τα] εἰς ἕτερον ἔργον καταλεί-
 [πειν. [-----] Ἡβουλήθη δὲ καὶ τοῖς] τῆς γῆς φόρους ἴσους γενέσ-
 36 [θαι [-----]
 [-----]

³ On this the Addendum, p. 309, notes the articles of C. ANTONETTI, M. NAFISSI and V. MAROTTA in *Ostraka* 4, 1995; since then, Panhellenion; S. SWAIN, *Hellenism and Em-*

With this new edition, the general structure of the document is no longer in serious doubt. After the invocation of the emperor's good fortune in lines 1 to 2, lines 3 to 10 contain the preamble, sometimes called the «considerations», in which the city sets out its motives for passing the resolution that forms the main part of the whole text. The number of lines covered by the resolution is indefinite, since there are two major breaks in the sense, but it must be at least thirty, and could be considerably more. If the last ones, numbered 41 though 48 by the editors, are correctly restored, they concern the embassy which Thyatira sent to Athens to convey the decree and watch over its publication.

It is best to begin with questions concerning specific passages.

Line 3. The preamble begins with the subject, [ἡ Θυα]τειρηνῶν πόλις, and the editors seem right in taking what follows to be a participial phrase. Their suggestion, χ[αριζομένη], would mean «favoring», and χ[άριν εἰδύια] would be better; this phrase is attested with a simple dative in Plutarch, with ἐπί and the dative in Lucian.⁴

Line 5, the editors seem justified in assuming a relative clause dependent on a noun like εὐεργεσίαις, but the sense seems to require, not «as a result of which», [ἐξ] ὧν, but rather [δι'] ὧν, as in line 16.

Lines 6–7, though these lines must refer in some way to Hadrian's role in the establishment of the Panhellenion, the editors' restoration, [εἰς τὸ σεμνότατον τοῦτο Πανελ]λήνι[ον κατεστήσα]το, is questionable. First, τοῦτο is a mere filler, since the Panhellenion has not been mentioned; second, while the word ending the clause is clearly an aorist middle, [κατεστήσα]το is far from being the only possibility. The text could be supplied in a way that makes Hadrian either organize the Panhellenion personally, or merely lend his assistance; Cassius Dio, it will be remembered, says that he «permitted the Greeks to build the sanctuary to himself which is called the Panhellenion» (τόν τε σηκὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τὸ Πανελλήνιον ὠνομασμένον οἰκοδομήσασθαι τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν ἐπέτρεψε).⁵ A supplement which leaves the question open is: [τοῦ σεμνοτάτου μετέχειν Πανελ]ληνί[ου παρεκελεύσα]το, «he urged that they should participate in . . .» For μετέχειν, compare an inscription from Thessalonica, ἀπάσας τὰς μετεχοῦσας πόλεις καὶ ἔθνη τοῦ Πανελληνίου; FOLLET has very plausibly restored a base set up by Cibyra to read, ἡ Κιβυρατῶν πόλις . . . μετέχουσα καὶ αὐτὴ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῆς Ἑλλάδος [συνεδρίου].⁶ See also below, line 18.

pire, Oxford 1996, 75–6; A. R. BIRLEY, ZPE 116, 1997, 220–2; BIRLEY, Hadrian: The restless Emperor, London 1997, 265–6.

⁴ Plut. Alex. 62,5, χάριν οὐδεμίαν εἰδὼς τοῖς πεπραγμένοις. Lucian, Bis. acc. 17, χάριν οἶδεν ἐπὶ τούτοις.

⁵ Cass. Dio 69,16,2. Cf. Panhellenion 30.

⁶ Thessalonica: J. H. OLIVER, Hesperia 47, 1978, 189–90 no. 1. Cibyra: FOLLET, Bull. ép. 1996, 195, discussing O. CURTY, Les parentés légendaires entre cités grecques, Geneva 1995, 204 no. 81.

Lines 7–8. This passage is one of the most important in the whole decree. The editors' decipherment of ΣΤΟΥΣ, where OLIVER had read Μέρ[τιος ὁ] τοῦ σ[υνεδρίου], is a major advance, and incidentally will be seen to confirm a brilliant intuition of DITTENBERGER. The wording of the relative clause, however, πάντα ἃ Μεττ[ίου Μοδέ]στου συμβούλου ἐψηφίσατο, is once again questionable. At least in prose, a genitive absolute clause must contain a verbal participle, in this case ὄντος. In terms of substance, though Roman officials certainly gave advice to Greek cities, it would be highly singular for a city to inscribe «everything that it had voted» as the result of such advice.

The question of the text cannot be separated from a prosopographical puzzle, the various persons named Mettius Modestus. Mettius Modestus, son of a homonymous procurator of Syria, and himself consul suffect early in the reign of Domitian, can be presumed the father of C. Trebonius Proculus Mettius Modestus, suffect in 103, and proconsul of Asia in 119/20. If a hypothesis of G. W. BOWERSOCK is correct, there was another man of this name active in the reign of Hadrian, a nephew of the proconsul who was legate of Lycia about 130/1. In the paternal line the family appears to be from Arelate in Narbonensis, though either from the beginning or in the course of time it may have acquired connections or property in Asia.⁷

Since the Panhellenion is known to have begun life in 131/2, that seems to offer a welcome coincidence with the activity of the second Modestus in Lycia, and the editors incline to suppose that this Modestus «had met Hadrian during his voyage of 129–131 in the Orient, (and that) he might have urged the foundation of the Panhellenion, helped in drawing up its statutes, or simply advised the city of Thyatira to honor Hadrian with a decree and to have it erected on the Acropolis. In any case, he seems to have played a role in the foundation of the Panhellenion.»⁸ This explanation seems to assume that Thyatira is the referent of the proposed ἐψηφίσατο, and yet it would be odd for a proconsul of Lycia-Pamphylia to give advice to a city in Asia. This, combined with the syntactical difficulty already discussed, suggests that an answer must be sought in another direction.

Though the actual resolution is very mutilated, enough survives to show that it concerns not only Hadrian. Beginning in line 29, it also refers to someone who, while «himself being benevolently disposed» (1.30), had acted at the emperor's behest. This person had taken measures concerning the city's bound-

⁷ For the various members of the family, PIR² M 565 (consul of ?82), 566 (procurator in Syria), 568 (suffectus of 103). For the hypothesis followed here, G. W. BOWERSOCK, *Bonner Historia-Augusta Colloquium* 1982–83, Bonn 1985, 82–6 = *Studies on the Eastern Roman Empire*, Goldbach (bei Aschaffenburg) 1994, 378–82, cf. W. ECK, *Chiron* 13, 1983, 169, 171 n. 415. On the family see also A. BALLAND, *Fouilles de Xanthos VII 1*, Paris 1981, 136–40, suggesting an origin in the *pars Graeca*.

⁸ Décret 302.

aries and revenues; in the latter connection he may have permitted certain funds to be used on a building for which they had not been intended, and he also did something about «the revenues of the land» (1.34–5). Now the proconsul of Asia in 119/20 appears in two extant letters of Hadrian. One, addressed to Ephesus, shows that he had acted in favor of the *gerousia*, ensuring that its debtors whether living or dead pay their debts. The other, addressed to a subsequent proconsul, shows that he had made certain decisions concerning the *vectigalia* of Aezani.⁹ Modestus seems therefore to have been a proconsul with a special interest in the financial health of the Asian cities, rather as Pliny had been a few years before in Bithynia. It follows that the Modestus of the present passage is the proconsul of 119/20, not the legate of Lycia-Pamphylia, and that the resolution praised him for his beneficence, and not only Hadrian.¹⁰

DITTENBERGER had already guessed that the proconsul Mettius Modestus was mentioned at this point in the decree, though when he wrote he could not have known that the Panhellenion had been founded more than a decade after Modestus' year of office. The interval might be thought an argument against the identification, or at least against supposing that the decree concerned Modestus' activities as proconsul. The answer perhaps lies in the fact that in the year 62 the senate had banned provincials from thanking ex-governors by delegations appearing before it; thus the admission of Thyatira into the Panhellenion enabled it to thank Modestus in a decree to be set up in Athens, where its contents might be known to the Greek world at large.¹¹

To return to the restoration of the relative clause, the preceding argument suggests that the required sense is not «what the city voted» but «what it received». The verb might be as short as ἔσχεν or ἔχει, leaving about fourteen letters for a participle or participial phrase, or as long as ἐπέτυχεν. For the participial verb several restorations are possible, of which the best seems to be συ[στήσαντος], «having recommended (it)», «on the recommendation of . . .». This sense of συνιστάναι is well known from Hellenistic and imperial inscriptions.¹² For the general sense we might compare a phrase from an inscription

⁹ Ephesos: Syll.³ 833; F.F. ABBOTT – A.C. JOHNSON, *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*, Princeton NJ, 1926, no. 78; IEphesos V (IGSK 15) 1486; OLIVER, *Greek Constitutions* 71. Aezani: OGIS 502; ABBOTT – JOHNSON 82 part II; MAMA IX P1.

¹⁰ V. MAROTTA, *Ostraka* 4, 1995, 158, had also concluded that the proconsul was meant, though he assumed that he had become the city's patron after his year of office, and «would have supported the entrance of the Thyatirans into the new foundation».

¹¹ For further discussion, see Appendix.

¹² See in particular J. and L. ROBERT, *Bull. ép.* 1946–47, 195; 1968, 464, p. 513, citing SEG 1, 329, 14–15 (Istria, letter of Flavius Sabinus, reign of Nero), λαλήσω δὲ καὶ Αἰμιλιανῷ διαδόχῳ μου καὶ εἰς τὸ παντελὲς συστήσω ὑμᾶς.

of Smyrna, καὶ ὅσα ἐπετύχαμεν παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου Καίσαρος Ἀδριανοῦ διὰ Ἀντωνίου Πολέμωνος.¹³

Lines 8–10. After the relative clause discussed above, the editors supply [ἀνα]γράφει [Ἀθήνησιν] ἐν Ἀκροπόλει βούλεται καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς ὥς [ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ τοῦ] μεγίστου τῶν ἀείψου βασιλέων . . . ἐφ[υμνεῖν, κτλ. DITTENBERGER, working with fewer fragments, interpreted the ΩΣ after [τῆς δωρεᾶς] as the relative adverb ὥς, and supplied ὥς [ἔκασται ἐδόθησαν]; but the new fragment to the right eliminates this reading. Retaining ὥς, the new editors read ὥς [ἔλαβεν], but this is hardly Greek. ΩΣ is better taken, not as the relative adverb, but the beginning of the adverb ὡς[αὐτως], followed by [τῆς τοῦ]; the second τῆς can also be omitted, on the assumption of a small *vacat* at the end, such as the mason has left in several of the extant lines.

Line 10. If this reconstruction is right, then the preamble ended with Διός in line 10, and the following ΕΦ cannot represent ἐφ[υμνεῖν]: this restoration is anyhow curious in sense, and in addition it requires a *vacat* in the middle of the line, the only such in all of the extant text. Now whereas decrees of the classical and the earlier Hellenistic periods pass directly from the considerations to the resolution, beginning in about the late second century BCE they sometimes insert a pronominal phrase, thus alerting the reader to the start of a new section. At Asian Cyme soon after the constitution of the province of Asia, several decrees honor the benefactress Archippe: of those that are sufficiently preserved, two have nothing in this position, two have διό.¹⁴ Similarly in the series of decrees honoring Epaminondas of Acraephia, the resolutions begin δι' αὐτῆς ἢ δι' αὐτῆς πάντα.¹⁵ In a decree for Agreophon of Caunos in Caria, probably of the second century, the very long series of considerations is followed by the phrase ἐφ' οἷς πᾶσιν δεδόχθαι, κτλ.¹⁶ It seems almost certain, therefore, that ἐφ' [οἷς πᾶσιν] is to be restored here.

As the editors observe, ΕΔΟΣΕΝ for the expected ἔδοξεν may be a reflection of the spoken language.¹⁷

Line 12. The singular τετύχηκεν after the plural subject shows that the redactor is either thinking of the city alone, or more probably of the *boule* as its more important representative.

¹³ IGRR IV 1431, 33; ISmyrna (IGSK 24,1) II 697.

¹⁴ Viz. IKyme (IGSK 5) 13 lines 50, 76 (omitted), 95, 109 (διό). Cf. δι' αὐτῆς in TAM II 1, 175, 8 (IGRR III 582, time of Commodus), where the expression is misunderstood by KALINKA.

¹⁵ IG VII 2711, 111; 2712, 89–90; 2713, 46.

¹⁶ P.HERRMANN, *OpAth* 10, 1971, 37 line 18 (J. and L. ROBERT, *Bull. ép.* 1972, 430). The same phrase in a slightly different context in TAM II 3, 905 IX G 9 (IGR III 739 IX 102).

¹⁷ Décret 301.

Lines 13–18, the long *ὅτι*-clause, giving the context of Hadrian's benefactions, is best considered as a unit. The editors give the first words as [ἰδίᾳ καὶ κοι]νῇ πᾶν τὸ τῶν Ἑλλή[νων] εὐεργέτησεν. Since καὶ ἰδίᾳ appears in line 17, we might rather expect the preceding lines to refer to some general benefaction to «all the Greek nation», so that the space occupied by ἰδίᾳ καὶ is better filled with ἅμα τε, which can correctly be followed by an answering καί.¹⁸ Thereafter the editors' new restorations look secure down to [διδού]σαν in line 16, but not so what follows: τὸ [δὲ σεμνότα]τον Πανελλήνιον, δι' ὧν ἐψη[φίσατο, ὁ]μολογούν[των τῶν Ῥωμαίων τῆς ἱερᾶς] συνκλήτου. First, the syntax of [τῶν Ῥωμαίων τῆς ἱερᾶς] συνκλήτου seems to lack all parallel. As for the content, assuming with the editors that the subject of ἐψηφίσατο is the city of Athens, while the senate might confirm what a Greek city had voted, it would hardly be consistent with its dignity to approve something «because» of that city's vote. Now it may be recalled that the verb ψηφίζεσθαι does not only have to mean «vote» in Greek of this period: in the official Greek of the province of Asia and Lycia-Pamphylia, which no doubt reflects general usage, it can mean «put to the vote», «propose».¹⁹ Thus in the foundation of Demosthenes of Oenoanda, precisely from the reign of Hadrian, the testator takes precautions so that nobody «moves or proposes or petitions a governor in order to prevent any of the provisions I have laid down from going into effect», ἢ εἰσήγηται ἢ ψηφίσεται ἢ ἡγεμόνι ἐντυχῇ περὶ τοῦ μὴ γέινεσθαι τι τῶν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ διεσταλμένων. In the present text, then, it may be proposed that εὐεργέτησεν in line 13 introduces two participial phrases, of which the first begins at συναγαγὼν and ends at [διδού]σαν, while the second runs: τὸ [δὲ σεμνότα]τον Πανελλήνιον, δι' ὧν ἐψη[φίσατο, ὁ]μολογούν[των τῶν Ῥωμαίων δόγματι] συνκλήτου, «when the Romans approved the most venerable Panhellenion by decree of the senate because of what he proposed».

Lines 17–18. It was suggested above that the second part of the *ὅτι*-clause beginning in line 13 had two parts, both referring to Hadrian, of which the second begins with καὶ ἰδίᾳ in line 17. If that is right, δεχομένην cannot be right in line 18, and indeed we would not expect δέχεσθαι to govern a genitive: instead we need a finite verb referring to Hadrian. Since the official phrase for membership of the Panhellenion is μετέχειν τοῦ Πανελληνίου (above, line 6), it seems plausible to suppose that the required verb here is μετέδωκε, «and individually he gave the tribes and the cities a share in this most honorable council».

¹⁸ LIDDELL – SCOTT – JONES, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1940, ἅμα A.

¹⁹ For a series of examples from provincia Asia, L. ROBERT, *Monnaies Grecques*, Geneva 1967, 53–55; for the example in the text, M. WÖRRLE, *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien*, Munich 1988, 8, lines 34–35, with his discussion, 165; further, P. WEISS in: *Studien zum antiken Kleinasien*, Bonn 1991, 176 (SEG 42, 1844).

It is not unusual for emperors or their families to speak before the senate in support of requests made by the Italian or subject communities. Tacitus' account of the transaction whereby the senate remitted tribute to the cities of Asia affected by the earthquake of 17 seems to have involved a motion put by Tiberius.²⁰ Some or all of a group of measures reported by the same historian in the year 53 resulted from a plea made by Nero as heir-apparent: the remission of tribute to Ilium, a subvention of ten million sesterces to Bononia after a fire, the restoration of liberty to Rhodes, and a remission of the tribute of Phrygian Apamea after an earthquake.²¹ An example of such imperial intervention is preserved in an inscription of Miletus. Here Marcus Aurelius writes to the city, saying that, after reading its letter he decided to speak to the senate about the citizens' request. Because his *oratio* touched on many subjects, he subjoins to his letter only that section in which he spoke in their support.²² This last example is all the more relevant to the case of the Panhellenion, if in fact Hadrian spoke to the senate about an request from the Greeks, rather than himself initiating the plan.

Line 18: [ἀριζ]ήλως is unusual and poetic, and [ἐκδ]ήλως or [ἐπιδ]ήλως is not excluded, despite the preceding δῆλος.

Line 21: the reference to «waters», even if now bereft of context, recalls in particular the documents from Coronea in Boeotia, showing Hadrian's concern with the flooding of the city's territory.²³

Lines 27–29 are best taken as a group. Μεγ[αλοφροσύνη]ν is an excellent restoration in 27, and the editors seem also to be right in taking χάριν as the quasi-proposition with a following genitive, and in understanding Hadrian to be the logical subject. Other of their suggestions are less self-evident. Οὐ μόνον does not have to be assumed from ἀλλὰ καί in line 29, since this collocation of particles can be progressive, «and yet . . . also».²⁴ Moreover, Hadrian is not likely to be the subject of the sentence or phrase «the generosity of the greatest of kings» in line 29: rather, the syntax should have shifted into a subordinate clause. [Ταύ]την in line in 28 may be right, but it is also disturbing: does it mean «our well-known . . .»? Though line 29 is particularly difficult to supplement, the whole passage perhaps ran somewhat as follows: [ἐκδηλοτάτην ποιούμενος τ]ὴν μεγ[αλοφροσύνη]ν (drachmas) μυριάδας εἴκοσιν χάριν [σειτωνίας ἐχαρίσατο τῇ πόλει, ὥς ἄλλω]ν τροφῶ[ν καὶ πλείσ]την τὴν περὶ τὸν πυρὸν ἀφθο[ρίαν περιγενέσθαι ἡμεῖν διὰ τῆ]ς τοῦ μεγίστου βασιλέως φιλοδοξίας,

²⁰ Tac. Ann. 2, 47.

²¹ Tac. Ann. 12, 58 (assuming that the sentences beginning *redditur* and *tributumque* cohere with the preceding *eodem oratore*; cf. Suet. Nero 7, 2).

²² HERRMANN, MDAI(I) 25, 1975, 149–66, esp. 157–9 (OLIVER, Greek Constitutions 192).

²³ OLIVER, Greek Constitutions 108–12.

²⁴ J. D. DENNISTON, *The Greek Particles*², Oxford 1954, 21–2; see further on ll. 29–32.

«making his munificence very clear, he gave the city 200,000 drachmas for the purpose of grain-purchase, so that we received abundance of other foods and to the greatest degree of wheat through the generosity of the greatest of kings». Cassius Dio in a well-known passage says that Hadrian «helped the cities, both allied and subject, most magnificently; he visited many of them, more than any other emperor, and aided practically all of them, giving water to some, and variously harbors, cereal, building, money and honors to others». These generosities are also attested in inscriptions and coins.²⁵ Gifts of grain, whether in the form of a direct grant, permission to buy from Egypt or elsewhere, or the establishment of an alimentary scheme, seem to lie behind the title of «nourisher» (τροφεύς) which Hadrian receives in several cities of the empire; he is known to have set up such a scheme at Athens and at Antinopolis in Egypt, and probably also at Cyrene.²⁶

Lines 29–32. The ἀλλὰ καὶ appears to mark a change of subject, and (as already noticed) can mean simply «and yet . . . too»; this use, without a preceding negative, is quite common in Appian for instance: thus Syr. 364–5, Γρυπὸς ἐγένετο βασιλεὺς . . . ὃ δὲ (Κυζικηνός, sc.) μαθὼν ἐπολέμει τε αὐτῷ καὶ βασιλεὺς αὐτ' ἐκείνου ἐγένετο. ἀλλὰ καὶ τόνδε Σέλευκος . . . παρείλετο τὴν ἀρχήν. If the proposal made above is correct, the person now introduced is Mettius Modestus, the proconsul of Asia in 119/20. His name can easily be fitted in, for example ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν [αὐτὴν εὐνοίαν ὁ κράτιστος Μόδεστος ἐπέδειξεν, εὐ[μεν]ῶς αὐτὸς σχὼν πολλάκις, κτλ. The following lines describe an occasion on which Modestus showed his benevolence to the city by doing something with reference to its borders. The editors' suggestion of [βεβαιω]κώς in 31 may introduce the right verb, but the perfect participle is suspect in the context of two aorist ones, σχὼν in line 30 and ἐπιτρέψας in 33. As for the first part of line 32, ἀμε[τακίνητον ἀσφάλειαν], suggested by DITTENBERGER, looks right as to sense, but there are other, shorter possibilities such as ἀμε[τάθετον διάθεσιν or τάξιν]. The second object added by the editors, [καὶ τὴν φυλακὴν αὐ]τῶν, looks like another filler, and we surely need something to explain what Modestus did «as a result of the king's foresight» (perhaps ἐκ rather than διὰ).

Now the involvement of the emperors in boundary disputes appears in two contemporary documents. A long inscription at Delphi concerns an arbitration between Delphi and its neighbors over boundaries in which the judge was Avidius Nigrinus, proconsul of Achaia late in the reign of Trajan. In the Greek translation, he begins his decree: περὶ τῆς ἀμφισβητήσεως . . . περὶ τῶν ὄρων, περὶ ἧς ὁ μέγιστος αὐτοκράτωρ ἐκέλευσέν με κρεῖναι, κτλ.²⁷ Hadrian's «fore-

²⁵ Cass. Dio 69,5,1–3, cited Décret 307.

²⁶ Hadrian as τροφεύς: references and discussion in: C. P. JONES, JRS 109, 1989, 189; for Cyrene, JONES, Chiron 18, 1998, 261.

²⁷ Syll.³ 827 D 1–2; FDelphes III 4, 293.

sight» in a similar matter at Abdera in Thrace appears in two identical inscriptions set up where the Via Egnatia crosses the River Nestos. The city honored the emperor «after recovering its own land through his celestial foresight (διὰ τὴν οὐρανίαν πρόνοιαν), its boundaries having been set (διατεθέντων) as far as the River Nestos».²⁸ Similarly, ROBERT suggested that Hadrian extended or confirmed the boundaries of Apollonia in Phrygia, so that the city set up a pillar in his honor, dedicating it to the Θεοὶ ἐνόριοι.²⁹ In line 32 of the Thyatira inscription, therefore, it would be better to put a finite verb governing the preceding noun, ἐκύρωσεν or ἐβεβαίωσεν, and then a participle to go with the following prepositional phrase, [δικαιοδο]τῶν or better [δια]τῶν [ἐκ] τῆς τοῦ βασιλέως προνοίας.

If that is right, it leaves the lacuna to the left of line 31 to give the context of Modestus' arbitration. It now becomes tempting to see the letters ΚΩΣ not as the last syllable of a perfect participle but of an adverb in a phrase such as [αἰτιῶν τινῶν ἐπενεχθεῖσιν ἀδίκ]ως [ἐφ' ἡ]μῖν, «certain charges having been unjustly laid against us».

In lines 33–34, the editors supply [τοῖς ἄρχου]σι ἐπιτρέψας, αἰτήσασιν παρ' αὐτοῦ, [- - - - ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ περισσὰ χρήμα]τα εἰς ἕτερον ἔργον καταλεί[πειν], of which [ἄρχου]σι is due to them, [χρήμα]τα to DITTENBERGER, and καταλεί[πειν] to PITTAKIS. Their understanding of the clause essentially follows DITTENBERGER, who supposed that the honorand «civitati illi aedificium aliquod suis ipsis impensis exstruxerit, ita ut illis liceret ad aliud opus, quod fortasse aequè necessarium videbatur, pecuniam reservare quae initio ad illud destinata erat». That a building is in question is certainly correct.³⁰ In a monetary context, however, καταλείπειν with χρήματα as its object usually means «bequeath», not «reserve». Already found in Isaeus (8, 3), this combination is frequent in inscriptions: thus ROBERT restored an inscription of Carian Stratonicea to read ἐπιτυχῶν πρεσβείᾳ τῇ εἰς Ῥώμην τὰ καταλεί[φθέντα τῇ] πατρίδι χρήματα, «having secured the moneys left to the city by his embassy to Rome».³¹

²⁸ AE 1937, 170–1; L. ROBERT, *Études épigraphiques et philologiques*, Paris 1938, 192 n. 3; *Noms indigènes dans l'Asie Mineure gréco-romaine*, Paris 1963, 358 n. 3; cf. BCH 102, 1978, 442 = *Documents d'Asie Mineure* 138.

²⁹ ROBERT, *Noms indigènes* 358, discussing the inscription now republished by M. CHRISTOL and TH. DREW-BEAR, *Un Castellum romain près d'Apamée de Phrygie*, DAWW 189, Vienna 1987, 16–17.

³⁰ On this frequent sense of ἔργον, L. ROBERT, *Rev. Phil.* 32, 1958, 22 n. 3 (on p. 23) = OMS V 162, discussing TAM V 2, 945 (Thyatira); ROBERT, BCH 101, 1977, 124 n. 187 = *Documents d'Asie mineure* 82.

³¹ LIDDELL – SCOTT – JONES, s.v. καταλείπω I 2. Stratonicea: L. ROBERT, *Études anatoliennes*, Paris 1937, 538, noting «le verbe καταλείπειν, usuel dans ce sens» (IStratonikeia 2,1 [IGSK 22,1] 631). For the treatment of the group ΦΘ in syllabic division, L. THREATTE, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions I*, Berlin – New York 1980, 67.

Despite DITTENBERGER's misinterpretation of *καταλείπειν*, understandable at a time when so many fewer inscriptions were known, his instinct was basically correct. The person honored, who is surely Mettius, had received a request (*αἰτήσασιν*)³² from the magistrates of Thyatira. This request seems to have involved «moneys left for the purpose of another building». JAMES H. OLIVER collected a number of instances in which Roman governors protect gifts or endowments left by citizens to their cities.³³ The very frequency of such praises, however, suggests that corporate beneficiaries were sometimes tempted, as they still are, to break the terms of a will. The foundation of Julius Demosthenes provides against this very possibility by fixing a penalty of 2,500 drachmas «lest anyone . . . approaches a governor to prevent anything stipulated in my will from taking effect».³⁴ A partly similar case arises in the correspondence of Pliny and Trajan. One Julius Largus had left moneys to the cities of Heraclea and Ticio, to be spent according to Pliny's decision either on *opera* in the emperor's honor, or on quinquennial games to be called Traiana. The emperor tells Pliny to investigate the local situation and do what he judges best.³⁵ At Thyatira, it may be suggested, money had been left to the city for the purpose of some building, and the magistrates asked the governor's permission to use it for another purpose, for example [εἰς ὕδατος κατασκευὴν καταχωρίσαι (ἀναλῶσαι) χρήματα εἰς ἕτερον ἔργον καταλει[φθέντα], «to allocate towards the construction of an aqueduct money left for (the purpose of) another building».

To summarize the foregoing discussion, I give my own text of lines 1 through 19 and 27 through 36, though it should be noted that the proposed supplements of lines 27 through 36 are meant to give the general sense, not the precise wording. I then give a translation of the same parts of the text.

Ἀγαθῇ τύχη]

[τοῦ θειοτάτου Αὐτοκράτορος Κ[αίσαρος Τραϊανοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ.]

Ἐπ[εὶδὴ ἡ Θυα]τειρηνῶν πόλις, χ[άριν εἰδύια ἐπὶ ταῖς εὐεργεσίαις τοῦ]

- 4 με[γίστου Αὐτο]κράτορος Καίσαρος Τραϊανοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ, σωτήρος]
καὶ [εὐεργέτου, πατρὸς τῆς πα[τρίδος, ἀρχιερέως μεγίστου, ὑπάτου, δι']
ὦν π[όλεις καὶ ἔθ]νη τῆς ἀπάσης Ἑ[λλάδος τοῦ σεμνοτάτου μετέχουσιν Πανελ-]
ληνίου παρεκελεύσατο, πάντα ἃ Μετ[τίου Μοδέ]στου συ[στήσαντος (?) ἐπέτυχεν (?) ἀνα-]
8 γράψαι [ἡ Ἀθήνησιν] ἐν Ἀκροπόλει β[ούλεται καὶ τὰς δωρεὰς ὡς αὐτὸς (τὰς) τοῦ]
μεγίστου τῶν ἀείπων βασιλέων Αὐ[τοκράτορος] Καίσαρος Τραϊαν[οῦ Ἀδριανοῦ]

³² On this sense of *αἰτεῖν*, more usual in the middle than in the active, L. ROBERT, *Hellenica* 11/12, 1960, 53–62; RPH 41, 1967, 56 n. 3 = OMS V 396; *Monnaies Grecques* (n. 19) 53; P. WEISS (n. 19), 167–80.

³³ OLIVER, *The Ruling Power*, Philadelphia 1953, 963–80.

³⁴ WÖRRLE, *Stadt und Fest* (n. 19) p. 8, lines 34–5 (cited above), with his discussion, p. 165.

³⁵ Pliny, *Epp.* 10, 75–6.

- Ὀλυμπί[ου Πανελλ]ηνίου Διός· ἐφ' [οἷς πᾶσιν τ]οῦτο ἔδο(ξ)εν, ἀγαθ[ῇ] τύχη, τῇ Θυα-
 τειρην[ῶν] βουλή[ι καὶ] τῷ δήμῳ· τόδ[ε] τὸ ψήφι]σμα ἐναρᾶξαι λιθ[ίνῃ]ι σ[τήλῃ]ι καὶ σ[τή-]
 12 σαι ἐν [Ἀρχ]οπόλει, [ἵνα] ἔκδηλον γένοιτο τοῖς Ἑλ[λησι] ἅπασιν ὅσων [δὴ] τετύχηεν
 ἀπὸ τοῦ [μ]εγίστου βασι[λέως, ὅτ]ι ἅμα τε κοι[n]ῇ πᾶν τὸ τῶν Ἑλλ[ήνων] εὐεργέτησεν
 ὁ βασιλεὺς, συναγα[γῶν] ἐξ αὐ[τῶν] ἐκεῖνο τ]ὸ συνέδριον, ὡς φ[ιλο]τεμίαν κοινὴν,
 εἰς τῇ[ν] λαμ[πρ]οτάτη[ν] Ἀ[θη]ν[αίων] πόλιν, τ[ῇ]ν Εὐεργέτιν, καρπ[ὸν] τῶ[ν] Μυστηρίων
 16 ὁμ[οῦ] πᾶσι διδοῦ[σαν], τὸ [δὲ] σεμνότα[τον] Πανελλήνιον, δι' ὃν ἐψη[φίσατο, ὁ]μολογού-
 [των] τῶν Ῥωμαίων δόγματι] συγγλήτου, κα[ὶ] ἰ[δί]α τὰ τε ἔθνη καὶ τὰς πόλεις τ]οῦτου τοῦ τει-
 [μωτάτου μετέδωκε συνέδρ]ιου. Δῆλος δὲ ἐσ[τ]ιν καὶ τὴν ἡμε[τέραν] πόλιν ἀρι[στ]ήλως καὶ πολλὰ-
 19 [κις ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐξάνων καὶ] εὐεργετῶν, . . .
- 27 [- - - - - ἐκδηλοτάτην ποιούμενος τ]ὴν μεγ[αλοφροσύνη]ν Ἡ μυριάδας εἴκοσιν χάριν
 28 [σειτωνίας ἐχαρίσατο τῇ πόλει, ὡς ἄλλω]ν τροφῶ[ν καὶ] πλείστ[η]ν τὴν περὶ τὸν πυρὸν ἀφθο-
 [ρίαν περιγενέσθαι ἡμῖν διὰ τῆς] τοῦ μ[εγίστου] βασι[λέως] φιλοδοξίας· ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν
 [αὐτὴν] εὐνοίαν Μέττιος Μόδεστος ἐπέδειξ[εν], εὐ[μεν]ῶς αὐτὸς σχὼν πολλάκις, ἥνικα
 [αἰτίων τινων ἐπενεχθεισῶν ἀδι]κῶς [ἐφ' ἡ]μῖν εἰς αἰετὴν τῶν ὅρων ἄμε-
 32 [τάθετον διάθεσιν ἐβεβαίωσε δια]ιτῶν [ἐκ τ]ῆς τοῦ βασι[λέως] προνοίας, ἔτι δὲ
 [- - - - - τοῖς ἄρχου]σι ἐπιτρένας, αἰτήσασιν παρ' αὐτοῦ,
 [εἰς ὕδατος κατασκευὴν (e.g.) καταχωρίσαι χρῆμα]τα εἰς ἕτερον ἔργον καταλει-
 [φθέντα. - - - - - τοῦς] τῆς γῆς φόρους ἴσους γενέσ-
 36 [θαι - - - - -]

«With the good fortune of the most divine Emperor Caesar Trajan Hadrian Augustus»:

«Whereas the city of the Thyatirans, [giving thanks for the benefactions of] the (4) greatest emperor Caesar [Trajan Hadrian Augustus, savior and benefactor, father of the fatherland, *pontifex maximus*, consul, through] which (benefits) [he encouraged] cities and nations of all Hellas [to share in the most venerable] Panhellenion, (8) [wishes] to inscribe on the Acropolis at Athens everything which [it has received on the recommendation (?)] of Mettius Modestus, and similarly (to inscribe) the gifts of the greatest of kings of all time, Emperor Caesar Trajan Hadrian Olympios, Zeus Panhellenios»:

«In consideration of [all which], the following was [resolved] with good [fortune] by the council and people of the Thyatirans: to inscribe this decree on a stone stele and to place it (12) on the Acropolis, so that it may [be] clear to all the Greeks how much it (i.e. Thyatira) has received from the greatest of kings, since [simultaneously] he benefited all the Greeks in common when he summoned that council from among them, as a universal gift, to the most brilliant city of Athens, the Benefactress, who gives reward of the Mysteries (16) to all equally, and when, on his proposal, [the Romans] approved the most venerable Panhellenion [by decree] of the senate; and individually he [gave] the tribes and the cities [a share] in this most honorable council. And [the king] evidently [fosters and] benefits our city as well conspicuously and frequently. . . . [making his] munificence [very clear, he gave] the city 200,000 drachmas for the purpose [of grain-purchase, so that we received abundance of other] foods and to the [greatest degree] of wheat through the generosity of the greatest of

kings; and yet [Mettius Modestus] also [showed] the [same goodwill,] when, [certain charges having been unjustly laid against us, he] confirmed in perpetuity the [inalterable placement] of our boundaries, arbitrating in conformity with the emperor's providence; and in addition. . . permitting [the magistrates,] when they asked him, [to allocate towards the construction of an aqueduct] moneys left for (the purpose of) another building. . . the revenues of the land to be equal (or: fair). . .»

Some conclusions may be suggested about the text as a whole, and about some wider issues that it raises. The latest editors call it a «decree of Thyatira concerning the benefactions of Hadrian», but that is only partly correct. The text praises him for the benefits he had conferred on the Greeks in general, and on Thyatira in common with other «peoples and cities», by promoting the cause of the Panhellenion. He had presented a proposal for its formation to the senate, had perhaps «encouraged» eligible entities to join by an edict or other constitution, had «assembled» the members in Athens, and had «given them a share» in it. But praise of the city of Athens is not the major subject, and the generosity of Hadrian is only a part. The decree does two things, the first perhaps designed to reinforce the second: it praises the emperor for his generosity to Thyatira, and attests to the beneficence of someone else, apparently the proconsul of 119/20, Mettius Modestus.

Thyatira, the source of the decree, had advantages which might well have attracted the goodwill of Mettius Modestus, even if he was not already attested as a zealous proconsul reminiscent of the Younger Pliny under Trajan. Advantageously situated near the river Lycus and at the junction of important roads, the city had its own contacts with the Roman power. A *conventus* of Roman businessmen was perhaps established there as early as the first century BCE. It is the only city of Lydia known among the consultants of Apollo of Claros, which tended to be communities newly Hellenized and often with Roman connections, for example the colony of Parium on the Hellespont and the imperial foundation of Germanice Caesarea in Bithynia. In the second quarter of the third century, Thyatira produced the eminent Roman jurist Licinius Rufinus, now known to have formed one of the group of twenty consulars prominent in the year 238.³⁶

The new editors have observed the connection between this decree and one of Synnada in Phrygia, which though very fragmentary can be seen to concern benefactions received by the city either from Hadrian or (more probably)

³⁶ Site and history: J. KEIL, RE 6 A, 1936, 657–9; D. MAGIE, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, Princeton 1950, I 123, II 977–8; HERRMANN, TAM V 2, pp. 306–15. *Conventus*: TAM V 862, 924 (with discussion of the date), 1002, 1003. Claros: J. and L. ROBERT, *Claros I: Décrets hellénistiques*, Paris 1989, 5. Licinius Rufinus: L. ROBERT, *Hellenica* 5, 1948, 29–34; HERRMANN, *Tyche* 12, 1997, 111–23; C. P. JONES, *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 11, 1998, 297.

Pius.³⁷ A number of words and phrases pique the attention. The opening lines mentioned Sparta and Attica, clearly with reference to Synnada's mythic origins. Lower down there appear the phrases «winter-torrents» (χειμαρροί), «rising of the rivers», «impending dangers», «our boundaries», «his procurator», «the council among us» (apparently, though not certainly, the League of Asian Hellenes), then in a more connected passage «... the boundaries of the city and the crops... as also the estates of private persons... from his own estates he provides to the city...», «the ancient... of the city», «being shaken in Asia» (ἐν Ἀσίᾳ κεινομένων), very probably a reference to earthquakes,³⁸ and probably the «acropolis in Athens».³⁹ If the Synnadan decree too was set up on the acropolis, then that, combined with the reference to the city's mythical origins, might suggest another parallel: that Synnada, as a member of the Panhellenion, honored the reigning emperor in a decree set up in the group's central sanctuary.⁴⁰ Like Thyatira, Synnada was a city with strong connections to Rome, being the distribution center for the highly prized «Phrygian marble» quarried at the nearby Docimeion.⁴¹

Finally, the Panhellenion. It has been argued that, as not infrequently in studies of this institution, its role in the present text has been exaggerated. Nonetheless, certain conclusions about its nature, its foundation, and its physical location emerge.

The precise nature of the Panhellenion has been much debated, and no certain answer is attainable. Some have made large claims for it as a political entity, seeing it as the precursor of the senate of Constantinople; others have urged that its main observable activities are the cult of the emperors, especially Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, and the supervision of the Panhellenia.⁴² The new text does not decide the question, but perhaps supports the cultic view by the considerable emphasis which it lays on Hadrian as an earthly manifestation of «Zeus Olympios Panhellenios» and as «the greatest of all kings».

To the same connection perhaps belongs the emphasis on Athens as «the Benefactress who gives reward (καρπός) of the Mysteries», where the word καρπός seems to have its frequent secondary meaning, and also to allude to its

³⁷ The most accessible text is SEG 30, 89; for recent discussion, Panhellenion 39–41; M. NAFISSI, *Ostraka* 4, 1995, 120–2, favoring a Hadrianic date; Décret 309.

³⁸ Cf. Aristides, *Or.* 49,38 (p. 422 KEIL), on an Asian earthquake under Pius or Marcus, ἐν πολλαῖς τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων πολλὰ ἐκινήθη.

³⁹ Accepting the very plausible restoration of Décret 309.

⁴⁰ This indeed was the suggestion of J. and L. ROBERT in *Bull. ép.* 1951, 2, p. 122; though I continue to think that there is no direct evidence of Synnada's membership, I now think that I overstated the case in Panhellenion.

⁴¹ L. ROBERT, *JS* 1962, 23–26 = *OMS* VII 89–92; J. C. FANT, *Cavum antrum Phrygiae*, Oxford 1989.

⁴² For a summary of the debate, Panhellenion 35–43.

basic meaning of «fruit». For some time evidence has been accumulating to suggest a close connection between the Panhellenes and Eleusis, and even that they had their meeting-place there.⁴³ Similarly, the new text adds to the growing evidence for Hadrian's concern with the food-supply of the empire, as the «nourisher» (τροφεύς) of certain cities and the initiator of alimentary schemes at Athens and elsewhere. This concern might have deepened the connection with Eleusis, even if the location of the Panhellenion is still an open question.

Another problem of the Panhellenion involves the responsibility for its foundation. Though modern scholars often talk of Hadrian as the founder, the only ancient author to mention it, Cassius Dio, says merely that he «permitted» the Greeks to establish it, as Augustus «permitted» the Greeks in Asia and Bithynia to set up temples to himself in 30 BCE. On this, the new text provides important new information. At least if the restorations proposed here are accepted, they show that the emperor prevailed upon the senate to approve the Panhellenion, and perhaps «invited» the Greeks to join and «gave them a share» in it. Cassius Dio was therefore very likely right in understanding that the initiative came formally from the Greeks, and that Hadrian's role was to represent them to his fellow-senators, as Tiberius for example had spoken on behalf of Greek cities after the earthquake of 17, and Marcus supported the desire of the Milesians to institute a new contest. However, Hadrian's active role in the formation of the Panhellenion, indicated not only by his action in the senate but by his attested concern for the rules of membership, show that at the very least it was a proposal he strongly favored.

A last question has already been touched on, that of the location of the Panhellenion. It is not in fact certain that the name designates a place as well as a representative body, but the chances seem good that it does both. A possible analogy is the Museum of Alexandria, which besides being a sanctuary of the Muses had members who are said by Strabo to «have a share in» it.⁴⁴ FOLLET and PEPPAS-DELMOUSOU have pointed out that the find-spots of the various fragments show that the stele of the Thyatirans comes from the acropolis, and that the same is true of a similarly worded decree of Sardis, and possibly also the decree of Synnada discussed above. Now the Synnadan decree contains the phrase «we pray to all the gods» (θεοῖς εὐχόμεθα πᾶσι). The editors infer that the site of all three inscriptions is the Pantheon or «sanctuary common all the gods» which Pausanias mentions among Hadrian's gifts to Athens.⁴⁵ But this phrase is by no means rare: it occurs in the opening sen-

⁴³ Panhellenion 36, 42, following CLINTON and WÖRRLE; see now also C. ANTONETTI, *Ostraka* 4, 1995, 149–56; CLINTON in: M. C. HOFF – S. I. ROTROFF, *The Romanization of Athens*, Oxford 1997, 175.

⁴⁴ Strabo 17,1,8, C 794, τὸ Μουσεῖον ... ἐν ᾧ τὸ συσσίτιον τῶν μετεχόντων τοῦ Μουσείου φιλολόγων ἀνδρῶν.

⁴⁵ Paus. 1,18,9; Décret 306–08.

tence of Demosthenes's *De corona*, and there are abundant examples in literature and inscriptions.⁴⁶ We may recall, for the last time, the evidence of Cassius Dio that the Panhellenion was an «enclosure» (σηκός) which Hadrian permitted the Greeks to erect in his own honor: he uses this noun only once elsewhere, referring to a memorial shrine for Julia Drusilla, the sister of Caligula.⁴⁷ Perhaps after all the Panhellenion was not in the lower city of Athens, where it has been sought in vain, nor yet at Eleusis, but on the acropolis.

Appendix: The senatorial ban of 62 on thanks to provincial governors

In his account of the year 62, Tacitus gives considerable space to a debate in the senate which led, first to an intervention of Thrasea Paetus, and then to the passing of a measure under which the provincial subjects were forbidden to «thank» their ex-governors. It is usually held that so many surviving texts, especially inscriptions on statue-bases, show such «thanks» being rendered that the ban must quickly have fallen into abeyance. Review of the evidence suggests that the facts are more complicated.⁴⁸

Tacitus begins his account from a trial in the senate at which an eminent Cretan, Claudius Timarchus, was accused among other things of having insulted the senate. He had boasted that his influence determined whether thanks were paid to the proconsuls of the province (*in sua potestate situm, an pro consulibus, qui Cretam obtinuissent, grates agerentur*). During the debate, Thrasea inveighed against the disgrace of Roman governors currying the goodwill of provincials, and moved that «the offering of thanks» (*gratiarum actio*) be banned altogether. The consuls objected on the ground that there was no motion before the senate to that effect. Nonetheless, in due course (*max*) the Fathers passed a measure, with the emperor as sponsor (*auctore principe*), which forbade «introducing a motion in a council of the allies in order to express thanks to proconsuls or proprætors before the senate, or performing such an embassy» (*ne quis ad concilium sociorum referret agendas apud senatum pro prætoribus prove consulibus grates, neu quis ea legatione fungeretur*).

As commentators on Tacitus have observed, this measure is not without antecedent. According to Cassius Dio, Augustus in 11 A.D. «ordered the sub-

⁴⁶ Demosth. 18,1, τοῖς θεοῖς εὐχόμεθα πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις. Cf. F. JACOBI, ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΘΕΟΙ, diss. Halle 1930; H. WANKEL, Demosthenes, Rede für Ctesiphon, Heidelberg 1976, I 108–09.

⁴⁷ Cass. Dio 69,16,2, cf. Panhellenion 30–2.

⁴⁸ Tac. Ann. 15,20–22 (it is usually assumed that Tacitus refers to a *senatus consultum* and not a *lex*). For scepticism see, besides the commentators such as FURNEAUX and KOESTERMANN, J. DEININGER, Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit, Munich 1965, 166–7; P. A. BRUNT, Roman Imperial Themes, Oxford 1990, 81–2. For a view similar to that taken here, J. NICOLS, Chiron 9, 1979, 257–9.

jects not to give any honor to the governors set over them, neither in their time of office nor within sixty days after they had left». We hear nothing more of this measure, nor do we know whether it banned all such honors or, as is more likely, only those which were intended for transmission to Rome.⁴⁹

In his account of the debate of 62, Tacitus allots ample space to the issues involved, and gives no sign that the resulting measure fell into disuse. One apparent unclarity in his account can surely be resolved. Though the issue at the trial of Timarchus was his boast that votes of thanks to governors depended on himself, the motion that was finally passed forbade thanks being expressed by the provincials *in the senate*. A problem that cannot be resolved from Tacitus' language, even if not of great importance here, is whether Timarchus claimed power over decrees of the kind eventually forbidden by the senate, that is, those intended for transmission to Rome. The fact, however, that his boast «had gone so far as to insult the senate» (*ad contumeliam senatus penetraverat*) supports this interpretation. It also seems likely, as PETER BRUNT has observed, that the final measure as passed by the senate also covered similar decrees passed at the level of less powerful units such as the city or the tribe (*ethnos*). If the intention of the measure was to prevent improper pressure being applied to Rome's subjects, a fortiori it should have applied to groupings smaller than provincial councils.⁵⁰

There is now a supplementary piece of information not available to older commentators on Tacitus, though its value is hard to assess. In 1956 there was published a fourth- or fifth-century parchment fragment containing some of the Sentences of Paul, the juriconsult of the early third century. This states that «a person is liable under the law of *repetundae* if either in a senate-house or in a council he proposes that honors be decreed to a governor or his assistants, makes a proposal to that effect, or causes such a proposal to be made» (*lege repetundarum tenetur quicumque in curia vel concilio auctor fuerit honoribus praesidi comitibusque eius decernendis decretumve super ea re fecerit decernendumve curaverit*).⁵¹ Paul must be referring to the *lex Iulia repetundarum*, though in a form relevant to his own day, and in turn his language may well have undergone modification to suit the circumstances of the late empire. Beginning with the reign of Constantius II, even the erection of statues to a governor in his province required imperial authorization.⁵² Though governors certainly continued to receive these

⁴⁹ Cass. Dio 56,25,6. On this measure see NICOLS (previous n.), 247–8.

⁵⁰ BRUNT (n. 48), 82.

⁵¹ G. G. ARCHI and others, *Pauli Sententiarum Fragmentum Leidense*, Leiden 1956; R. CAVENAILLE, *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum*, Wiesbaden 1958, no. 74; M. H. CRAWFORD, ed., *Roman Imperial Statutes*, London 1996, II no. 55, especially p. 771. For *curia* denoting a local council (*boule*), Thes. Ling. Lat. IV 1485–6.

⁵² A. VON PREMERSTEIN, *JOEAI* 15, 1912, 215–17; D. FEISSEL, *BCH* 108, 1984, 548–50.

and similar honors, it may well be that by this time a city desiring to offer any such tribute to a governor had first to consult the emperor, and could not pass a decree on its own initiative.

Whatever the situation in Paul's day or later, the measure mentioned by Tacitus is not shown to be invalid by inscriptions on statue-bases which refer to merely local decrees, without mention of the Roman senate. To take two examples, M. Roscius Lupus Murena, governor of Crete under Marcus, was voted a statue both by the *koinon* of the province and by the council and people of Gortyn. As often, someone with a special interest in the case, in this instance the governor's own wife, Lar(cia?) Isidora Nea, undertook the expense of setting the statue up.⁵³ Similarly, after the date of Paul, an inscription from Tlos (Lycia) honors the governor, Tib. Pollenius Armenius Auspex, consul in 244. Here the expense was defrayed by one M. Aurelius Dionysius, «as he promised in the general council» (καθὰ ἐν τῷ κοινοβουλίῳ ὑπέσχετο).⁵⁴

Why, then, has it been so generally assumed that Tacitus' measure had become a dead letter? FURNEAUX in his commentary alleged three literary texts which are worth a brief inspection.

In his Panegyric delivered in 100, the younger Pliny praises the emperor Trajan for bringing to the senate (*senatui adlegandum putasti*) the excellent conduct which a recent quaestor had displayed in one of the provinces (it is usually thought that this is Sex. Quintilius Valerius Maximus of Alexandria Troas, recipient of a letter from the same author).⁵⁵ According to Pliny, Trajan's action had inspired younger senators «when they knew that you knew everything, whatever is done well by anyone in the provinces» (*cum sciret, quidquid a quoque in provinciis bene fieret, omnia te scire*). Trajan's action will benefit the provincials as well, since they will not be compelled to complain about their governors, confident in the omniscience and paternal care of their ruler. Pliny ventures a proposal of his own: «I myself wish the past governor of a province to cite not just the testimonials of his friends, nor requests wheedled out of city cliques (*urbana coniuratione eblanditas preces*), but decrees of the colonies and of the cities. It is good for cities, people and tribes to be involved when consulars canvass for office. The most effective way to campaign on a behalf of a candidate is to thank him.»

It is surprising that this passage has been adduced to show that the measure of 62 was in abeyance. At present, so Pliny implies, the emperor could bring to the attention of the senate his own knowledge of a magistrate's conduct in a

⁵³ ICret IV 297. For Isidora, M. RAEPSAET-CHARLIER, *Prosopographie des femmes de l'ordre sénatorial*, Louvain 1987, no. 484.

⁵⁴ TAM II 572; on the honorand, PIR² P 536.

⁵⁵ Pliny, Paneg. 70; Ep. 8,24; ILS 1018. On the identification, R. SYME, *Historia* 34, 1985, 329–30 = Roman Papers 5, Oxford 1988, 446–7.

province; in addition, though the panegyrist's meaning is not quite clear, an ex-magistrate could cite petitions of «urban conspirators», presumably requests directed to the emperor from cities whose politics were dominated by cabals. He could not however cite «decrees of the colonies and of the cities». The obvious reason for this restriction is that such decrees were forbidden, presumably by the measure of 62.

FURNEAUX's second instance is from the *Historia Augusta's* Life of Alexander Severus, a source much more suspect now than it was in the early twentieth century. Even so, this too does not show that the measure of 62 had fallen into abeyance. The biographer alleges (Alex. Sev. 22,6) that «when (Alexander) found that governors of provinces were praised truthfully and not by intrigue (*factionibus*)», he would show them especial respect. This recalls Pliny's observations on the petitions of «city cliques» and on Trajan's omniscience, but if it has any independent worth it again refers to praise transmitted to the emperor directly. Ancient observers often comment on the multiple channels of information which the emperors enjoyed: officials such as procurators, spies such as the *frumentarii*, even well-placed citizens with whom they were in correspondence.

FURNEAUX's last example is interesting in that, though it concerns the later fourth century, it shows precisely how emperors could gather information about governors through their own channels. Ammianus (30,5,8–10) tells how the praetorian prefect, Petronius Probus, in the year 375 compelled the Epirotes to send a delegation praising him. One member of the delegation, the philosopher Iphicles, was compelled against his will to lead the delegation, and when questioned closely by Valentinian revealed that in fact the Epirotes had sent the embassy «groaning and unwilling» (*gementes atque inviti*).⁵⁶ Though this has no bearing on the measure of 62, it is still significant for illustrating a practice which emperors since Augustus had been concerned to stamp out. Like the requirement that provincials obtain permission in order to honor governors with statues, Valentinian's furious reaction at the news of Probus' behavior suggests that fourth-century emperors were inclined to place stricter limits on governors even than their predecessors.

To return to the early empire, indirect corroboration of the measure of 62 and its effects is perhaps to be derived from the notable scarcity of decrees in honor of governors and their staffs, apart from those decrees which ordered the setting up of statues locally. I list the very few examples known to me which might be alleged:

(1) The well-known dossier concerning the calendar of Asia under Augustus contains, among other items, a resolution of the *koinon* of Asia by which it

⁵⁶ On this incident, P. BROWN, *The Making of Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, Mass. 1978, 32.

bestows a crown on the proconsul, Paullus Fabius Maximus, as a reward for devising the greatest honors for the emperor. The text also praises him in terms not unlike those which the decree of Thyatira uses for Mettius Modestus.⁵⁷ This of course shows nothing about the situation prevailing after 62, but is still interesting in that the honors decreed for the proconsul are purely local, and not for transmission to Rome.

(2) An inscription from Mantinea, almost certainly of Augustan date, honors a citizen called Euphrosynos. Among his other services, «going as ambassador on behalf of the city, he was pleasant to the most divine senate, not bringing accusation of proconsuls but praise» (προσηνῆς ἐγένετο καὶ τῇ θειοτάτῃ συνκλήτῳ, μὴ κομίζων κατηγορίαν ἀνθυπάτων ἀλλ' ἔπαινον).⁵⁸

(3) A group of inscriptions from Rome, now lost, apparently came from a large statue-base in which several cities of Pontus and Bithynia honored a governor with the *cognomen* Rufus. The old view that this is C. Cadius Rufus, governor of the province in the reign of Claudius, and subsequently found guilty under the law of *repetundae*, has been generally abandoned; the only certainty is that the monument cannot be later than the reign of Claudius, when the city of Prusias *ad mare* reverted to its old name of Cios.⁵⁹ This text shows the kind of conspicuous honor which a governor back in Rome could receive from his provincial subjects; it may well have been accompanied by a decree brought before the senate by the several ambassadors, though it must precede the measure of 62.

(4) A dossier of texts from Histria contains decisions of governors of Moesia in the reign of Nero. One of them is a letter of Ti. Plautius Aelianus to the city which contains the following: «Your ambassadors. . . gave me your decree, in which you asked for an escort for the embassy thanking our most honored Sabinus (Flavius Sabinus, brother of Vespasian, and Silvanus' predecessor in the province); I would have granted it simply on Sabinus' account.» Sabinus ended his tenure in or about the year 60, so that this letter is dated just before the measure of 62.⁶⁰

(5) A decree of Smyrna, fragmentary and now lost, did indeed honor a governor of Asia called M. Aefulanus, whose tenure is usually put near the end

⁵⁷ V. EHRENBERG – A. H. M. JONES, Documents illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius², Oxford 1955, no. 98, 44–49; U. LAFFI, SCO 16, 1967, 22.

⁵⁸ HILLER, IG V 2, 268, 29–30; id., Syll.³ 783. Cf. L. ROBERT, Études épigraphiques et philologiques, Paris 1938, 228 (on the verb θρησκειν); R. J. A. TALBERT, The Senate of Imperial Rome, Princeton NJ, 1984, 414.

⁵⁹ IGR I 139 = MORETTI, Inscriptiones Graecae Urbis Romae I, Rome 1968, no. 71, with discussion of the honorand on p. 65.

⁶⁰ D. M. PIPPIDI, Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris Graecae et Latinae I, Bucharest 1983, no. 67, lines 37–42 = 68, 40–44 (SEG 1, 329). On this passage, J. and L. ROBERT, Bull. ép. 1966, 276.

of the reign of Nero.⁶¹ Even if that is right, the decree does not say anything about transmission to Rome.

(6) The so-called «Thorigny marble» is a collection of texts honoring a citizen of Viducasses, a city of the Three Gauls, in the year 238. The honorand, T. Sennius Sollemnis, had prevented the council of the province from undertaking the prosecution of a governor. His argument was that in choosing him as a *legatus*, his fellow-citizens «had not given him instructions concerning an action, but rather had praised (the governor, sc.)». ⁶² Whatever the background of this transaction, which might well have involved some kind of collusion between a governor and a wealthy provincial, it concerns only Sollemnis' instructions as delegate to the council.

The extreme rarity of any decrees in honor of governors, and the lack of evidence for the infraction of the measure of 62, suggests that it did in fact remain on the books; it may underlie Pliny's remarks in the *Panegyricus* about «decrees of the colonies and of the cities». To return finally to the decree of Thyatira, if this praised Mettius Modestus as proconsul in 119/20 as well as the emperor, the measure of 62 may help to explain both why the Thyatirans waited so long to praise Mettius, and why they chose the forum of the Panhellenion. In so doing, they were not bringing their thanks before the Roman senate; yet by setting up the decree in a place which the senate had sanctioned, they were using an excellent channel for their gratitude towards their benefactor, and a channel which had only become available with their admission to the Panhellenion. Whether other members also used the new institution to thank their senatorial benefactors is unknown, but it would be no surprise.

Department of Classics
Boylston Hall, 2nd Floor,
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02138
U.S.A.

⁶¹ IGR IV 1410; ISmyrna (IGSK 24,1) II 591. On the year of Aefulanus' tenure, B. E. THOMASSON, *Laterculi Praesidum I*, Göteborg 1984, 215 no. 60.

⁶² CIL XIII 3162, right-hand side, 14–26; H.-G. PFLAUM, *Le Marbre de Thorigny*, Paris 1948.