PAPERS AND MONOGRAPHS OF THE FINNISH INSTITUTE AT ATHENS VOL. VII

THE GREEK EAST IN THE ROMAN CONTEXT
PROCEEDINGS OF A COLLOQUIUM
ORGANISED BY
THE FINNISH INSTITUTE AT ATHENS
May 21 and 22, 1999

Edited by Olli Salomies

HELSINKI 2001

ISSN 1237-2684
ISBN 951-98806-0-7

Printed in Finland by Vammalan Kirjapaino Oy, Vammala 2001

Cover: Statue base honouring M. Vettulenus Civica Barbarus (see p. 175, n. 208).
American School of Classical Studies at Athens: Agora Excavations. Inv. no. I 4922.

Contents

Memories of the Roman Republic in the Greek East

Christopher Jones

Memory, as an expression of collective values, is undergoing study in many academic fields, and for reasons easy to see. We need only think, for example, of the memorialization of the Holocaust, with its concomitant discussion of the uses of memory and memory's counterpart, "denial."

The subject of the present paper is memory in the ancient world. More specifically, I wish to consider the question in what way, and to what extent, the Greeks of the imperial period remembered the civil wars of the late republic, from Sulla down to Octavian and Antony. Many of these wars had been fought on Greek soil, and there is ample record in literature and on the ground of the traces that they left, for example of the destruction wrought by Sulla in Athens. This question of historical memory is connected with a more general discussion about the attitude of the Greeks to Roman rule. In a seminal paper, Ewen Bowie argued that the Greeks of the Second Sophistic had little interest in the late republic. "The Roman civil wars were written about until the end of the Augustan period; thereafter it is as likely that interest simply waned as that the subject was felt to be exhausted or perilous .... ." Similarly on Pausanias the Periegete: "[he] almost completely neglects monuments and dedications later than ca. 150 B.C. [since] the intervening years were of no interest to a Greek." So also with reference to Arrian: "It is not that he disapproved of the Roman empire, but that he admired the Greek past which could exhibit great men and great deeds. Such could not be exampled when autonomy was lost."[1]

There might seem to be an objection to such a view in the fact that modern knowledge of the history of the late republic comes precisely from authors of the second and third centuries - Plutarch, Appian, Cassius Dio. These authors, however, so it has been recently argued, certainly did not lack interest in this period, but their memories, or at least the memorials that they composed, were controlled by self-interest and a need to accommodate the ruling power. Thus Plutarch has recently been presented as "a Greek aristocrat living under Roman occupation."[2] Another author invokes the experience of modern colonization and its effects: "It might be expected that the Greeks' obsession with the past would have had some nationalistic import along the lines of the nationalist movements of new nations and regimes in modern times .... Better comparisons than the new nations are offered by the examples of societies still under colonial rule .... Local elites filtered their own power through a history acceptable to the rulers with the aim of furthering their own position and entrenching their own identity."[3]

The view that local concerns affected the shaping of historical memory will be one of the central themes of this paper. At the same time, to reconstruct the thought-world of local elites, it is necessary not only to question literature, but also the local manifestations of memory and forgetfulness that emerge from the evidence of archaeology, and particularly from coins and inscriptions. It is true that such an approach involves "relying

---

[1] E. L. Bowie, 'Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic', *Past and Present* 46 (1970) 3-41 (the quotations are from pp. 15, 22-3, and 27 respectively).

[2] J. Boulogne, *Plutarque: Un Aristocrate grec sous l'Occupation romaine* (Lille 1994).

[3] Simon Swain, *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50-250* (Oxford 1996) 68, 71.

on the ... heavily contextualized evidence of public discourse in the epigraphic record."[4] But what discourse is not "contextualized"? And why should the "discourse" of Greeks within their own communities, even if expressed in the form of monuments, city-titles, images, or processions, be more "heavily contextualized" than, for example, the speech addressed by a Greek to unruly Alexandrians or to a Roman emperor?[5] In the present paper I suggest that an attentive reading of both "discourses," of "literary" texts and also of texts which happen to be preserved in other ways, will show that the two "discourses" are not in contradiction, but instead corroborate and illuminate each other.

I begin with a literary text, the *Annals* of Tacitus. In Books III and IV Tacitus reports two somewhat similar transactions. One involves the embassies of various cities of the empire to protect their rights of asylum in 22 (*Ann.* 3.60-3); the other is the competition in 26 between cities of *Asia provincia* competing for the right to house the temple of Tiberius, Livia and the senate (*Ann.* 4.55-6). In the first debate, the Ephesians rehearse the sanctity of their temple of Artemis, beginning from mythic times and going down to the Macedonians and the Romans. Magnesia on the Meander produces decisions of L. Scipio Asiaticus, consul in 190, and of Sulla; Aphrodisias and Stratonicea in Caria produce decrees of Caesar and Augustus; Hierocaesarea in Lydia begins with Cyrus and ends with Servilius Isauricus under Julius Caesar. So also in the contest for the temple, one of the two finalists, Sardis, begins with its mythic history and ends with "letters of generals (*imperatorum*) and treaties struck with us in wars against the Macedonians." The Smyrnaeans similarly begin with myth, but "pass to the claims in which they had most confidence, their services to the Roman people." The most signal of these are their temple of Rome, founded in 195, and their help given to Rome in the war of Aristonicus; concerning the latter they adduce "testimony" of Sulla, presumably contained in some letter which he wrote during or after his campaign against Mithridates.[6]

All these appeals and claims evince strikingly little sentiment of common Greekness. What matters for the competing cities is their own particular past, the historical rights of their sanctuaries, their claims on Rome in the wars of the later republic. So far from the late republic being of "no interest to a Greek," a time when Greece could no longer "exhibit great men and great deeds," it is a period fertile in examples of another kind, of services (*officia*) given and received. We should not assume that renown derived only from "glory," from "great men and great deeds": it flowed also from the system of benefaction and mutual obligation which was as deeply embedded in Greece as in Rome.

Nor is this particularism, and this sense of services given and received, merely something produced by competition among Greek cities before the Roman senate: it is also visible in Greek authors of the imperial period. The clearest example is not an Asian Greek, but one from Boeotia, Plutarch. In his preface to the *Lives of Cimon and Lucullus*, Plutarch tells how his city of Chaeronea was collectively accused of having murdered a Roman citizen. The Chaeronean ambassadors appealed to the testimony of Lucullus, the Roman governor wrote to him, and Lucullus' reply won the city its acquittal and its salvation. "Those who were saved then," continues Plutarch, "set up a marble statue of Lucullus in the agora beside the (statue of) Dionysus. I myself, though I am many generations later, think that the debt of gratitude extends to those of us who live now. Thus, believing that a statue that reproduces the character and the manner is much more

---

[4] Swain (previous n.) 71.

[5] For criticism of Swain's rejection of "the *Stadt und Fest* approach to the history of Greeks under Rome" (Swain 8), see the review by G. W. Bowersock, *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 4 (1998) 477-80.

[6] On this incident, A. G. Lewis, 'Sulla and Smyrna', *CQ* 41 (1991) 126-9. Compare the letter of Q. Oppius to Aphrodisias, J. M. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome*, *JRS* Monographs 1 (London 1982) no. 3, especially lines 44-8: "When I arrive in Rome, I will declare to the senate and the people what you have done".

beautiful than one which reproduces the body and face, I will include Lucullus' deeds in the writing of the *Parallel Lives*" (*Cimon* 2.2).

An archaeological parallel to Plutarch's commemoration of Lucullus is provided by a statue-base found at Synnada in Phrygia. The inscription honors Lucullus as proquaestor, and so between 85 and 80, but the lettering is of the imperial period, roughly between 150 and 200. The inscription must therefore have been recut, perhaps because of some benefit conferred by Lucullus which the citizens still remembered.[7]

This is only one of several passages in which Plutarch uses the first person when talking of Chaeronea. By contrast, he seems rarely if ever to do the same when talking of the Greeks collectively. Thus when Flamininus announces his liberation of Greece at the Isthmia of 196, the biographer represents the assembled Greeks as meditating on the fortunes of their country. He here gives a remarkably dispassionate account of Greek history, without ever speaking in the first person of Greece and its achievements (*Titus* 11). By contrast, he gives a vivid vignette of how Chaeronea was saved by the news of Actium, citing "my grandfather Nicarchus" and speaking of "the citizens" and "the city" as if he could mean none other than his own (*Ant.* 68.7-8).

The attitudes of Plutarch and other writers to the Roman empire have been discussed almost to exhaustion, but there is still room for a general observation about the filtering which Greek authors have undergone in the Middle Ages, and about the effect of that process on the present question. Although Plutarch's attachment to Chaeronea and Boeotia is visible even from the extant works, it must have emerged much more clearly from works that are lost: the biographies of local heroes such as Heracles, of poets such as Hesiod, of historical figures such as Daiphantus of Hyampolis, and antiquarian writings such as one *On the descent to Trophonius*, referring to the famous cave at Lebadeia. From antiquity in general there survives no extant work of local history or antiquities earlier than Malalas on Antioch, though a recently published inscription from Halicarnassus reminds us how proudly cities maintained such records.[8] The nearest approach to such a work is Pausanias' *Description of Greece*, but this does not provide the local history of any one city, but subsumes the work of many previous antiquarians. The reason for this Panhellenic bias is surely to be sought in the process of Byzantine selection: Pausanias' work, however slender the thread by which it survived, had a better chance of doing so than the compilations of local authors who were no longer of interest. So also with Arrian: his history of Alexander survives, and one or two shorter works, but not the *Bithyniaca*, which went down to the death of the last king, Nicomedes IV. This was still used by Eustathius in the twelfth century, but then disappeared, perhaps in the destruction of the Fourth Crusade. Philip Stadter has plausibly attributed its preservation to the Byzantines' interest in Bithynia as a core region of their empire.[9]

The advantage of texts and images preserved on stone or metal is that they survive from a period before this Byzantine winnowing, and moreover they represent a comparatively random sample. I turn, therefore, to the material evidence for memory of the Roman republic in the Greek east, drawing on literature only for illustration and parallel, and I begin with local Greek benefactors in the first hundred years of *provincia Asia*. From a modern perspective it might seem that this era failed to "exhibit great men and great deeds." But that was not necessarily the view of contemporaries. Two men who were

---

[7] *IGR* 4.701; *MAMA* 4.52; Kl. Tuchelt, *Frühe Denkmäler Roms in Kleinasien: Beiträge zur archäologischen Überlieferung aus der Zeit der Republik und des Augustus*, *IstMitt* Beiheft 23 (Tübingen 1979) 63, 243.

[8] Plutarch's works of local history: Lamprias Catalog (*Plutarchus*: Moralia 7, ed. F. H. Sandbach [Leipzig 1967] 1-10), nos. 34, 35, 38, 181. Halicarnassus: H. Lloyd-Jones, *ZPE* 124 (1999) 1-14, 125 (1999) 63-65.

[9] P. A. Stadter, *Arrian of Nicomedia* (Chapel Hill 1980) 155-6.

certainly great in the eyes of their fellow-citizens have become known only from inscriptions published in 1989. Polemaeos and Menippos of Colophon in Ionia lived near the end of the second century before our era, and were commemorated in the chief sanctuary of Colophon, Claros. The decree for Polemaeos was carved on a large marble base at the beginning of the Sacred Way; the column on the base carried a gilded statue of the honorand. The similar base for Menippos was at the other end of the Sacred Way, just near the temple of Apollo Clarios. Very much as we find Plutarch advising in his *Political Precepts*, the careers of Polemaeos and Menippos show them at one and the same time preserving Colophon from unwelcome interference by the Roman authorities, and yet maintaining the best personal relations with individual Romans and the senate. Thus for Polemaeos: "He profitably undertook the most honorable embassies, on matters of the greatest moment, to the Roman leaders themselves and to the senate. He allowed the rest of the citizens to remain undisturbed in possession of their own goods, and he himself, undertaking danger on behalf of everyone, and by sea and land risking body, soul, and all his existence on the people's behalf, met with the leading Romans, was considered worthy of their friendship, and turned the profit which he gained from this to his fellow-citizens, contracting ties of patronage [*patrôneia]* with the best men."[10]

These two monuments are conspicuously located at the heart of Colophon's most sacred space, and there is no sign of their destruction in antiquity, so that they must have been visible to the citizens and the countless visitors for hundreds of years. True, we do not know how many of the viewers knew what the statues represented. How many Londoners have any idea who stands on top of Nelson's Column, or why? But these analogies are perhaps misleading, in that they are drawn from huge modern metropoleis with millions of inhabitants, many only recently arrived. In a community like Colophon, with perhaps some ten or twenty thousand inhabitants and a small élite of old families, such monuments are the reification of collective memory, and this memory persists well into the period of the empire. It is a curious but instructive contrast that, according to Plutarch, the memory of Aratus of Sicyon had largely faded by his time: "most of his honors have ceased through the passage of time and other matters" (*Arat.* 53.7).

While local benefactors such as Menippos and Polemaeos of Colophon and Diodoros Pasparos of Pergamon tend to receive much more fulsome and detailed tributes than are paid even to kings and generals, they tend to be commemorated only in their own city, though sometimes by the general council (*koinon*) of the province. In the late republic, much more widespread tributes are paid to Roman generals and governors, several of whom figure largely in Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*, especially Sulla, Lucullus, Pompey, and Caesar. Thus the same Sacred Way of Claros contained statues of Lucullus, Pompey, and Quintus Cicero.[11] Such dignitaries were remembered not only as the honorands of statues but, even more importantly, as the issuers of rights, privileges and testimonials to the subject cities: we may recall the "testimonial" of Lucullus which saved Chaeronea at a critical moment, and that of Sulla which the Smyrnaeans cited in 26. A full collection of the extant documents up to 1969 was made by Robert Sherk, but such published collections raise a question not easy to answer.[12] How long were such documents visible? We know that the visibility of epigraphic lettering was enhanced by the addition of color, usually red or blue: was this coloring maintained in later centuries? To what extent were such documents called upon in the life of the city?

An example published too recently to be included by Sherk survives on a marble block, apparently from an *anta* or a wall, which is now in the Adana Museum. The

---

[10] L. and J. Robert, *Claros* I: *Décrets hellénistiques*, Paris 1989 (*SEG* 39, 1243-44). The passage quoted is Robert, p. 12, col. II lines 11-31 (*SEG* 39, 1243).

[11] Tuchelt (n. 7) 160-169; J.-L. Ferrary will publish the relevant inscriptions.

[12] Robert K. Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (Baltimore 1969).

provenance is Mopsouhestia in Cilicia. The text shows that Lucullus as quaestor of Sulla, and so during the first Mithridatic War, confirmed the asylia or inviolability of the sanctuary "as also the *imperatores* (*autokratores*) before me have judged." Subsequently, though this document appears earlier on the stone, Sulla wrote his own letter to the city mentioning previous decisions of the "kings" (evidently Seleucid ones) and declaring his own concession of the *asylia* "because of my reverence for the goddess and in accordance with the request of Lucullus."[13] We thus have a continuous chain of such concessions, stretching back to the "kings" and going down to the present time. The inscription is contemporary with the letters, but must have remained visible for much longer. As with the claims mentioned by Tacitus, when the asylia of a sanctuary was challenged, the city concerned could always appeal to the paper documents which formed the originals of these inscriptions; or possibly, if those were lost or damaged, it might have made use of the inscriptions themselves. The documents issued by these two generals were thus, in effect, permanently in the city's memory, as that was embodied in the local archives. Perhaps not all the members even of the ruling class remembered the documents in detail, but functionaries could summon them up when needed, just as the citizens of Smyrna called on testimony of Sulla in the Tiberian senate.

The archives (*archeia*, *grammatophylakia*) in which such papers were preserved are almost all lost, but inscribed dossiers survive which document the privileges of a city, or of a group within it such as the *gerousia*. These are sometimes called "archives," but it would be less confusing to call them "document-displays." The largest of these is from Aphrodisias in Caria, and was uncovered on the walls of the north parodos, or entrance-way, of the theater when this was excavated in the late 1960's.[14] The earliest items are, once more, from the First Mithridatic War, two letters of the proconsul Quintus Oppius; other documents of republican date are a letter which has been identified as coming from Nicomedes IV, the last king of Bithynia, but is surely from a Roman official, perhaps Julius Caesar; and a triumviral decree and two *senatus consulta* of the year 39, with a covering letter from Octavian transmitting them and ordering that they be stored in the public archives (*en tois dêmosiois grammasin*). The whole collection began to be inscribed probably under Septimius Severus, and additions were made up to the reign of Decius.[15] The republican documents had clearly remained "in the public archives" which, here as no doubt everywhere, served as the city's collective memory. Over two centuries later, the Aphrodisians decided to make an epigraphic copy of these documents, visible to the public eye and destined to last as long as the city itself, and so the paper record was transformed into a sumptuously inscribed one. At that time the documents must have re-entered the consciousness of the Aphrodisians, if indeed they had ever left it, and thereafter they served both as a source of pride and as an assertion of the city's rights and privileges.

It is true that a city like Aphrodisias, which was in effect founded by Rome, might have retained a particularly vivid memory of the republican period. We can presume a similar attachment to the Roman past in other cities of the east which were either founded or re-founded by *imperatores* under the late republic. One of Sulla's legates in the First Mithridatic war, L. Licinius Murena, remained behind as governor of Asia, and proved himself an active administrator, who checked piracy and deposed a local tyrant of Cibyra. According to Memnon of Heraclea, this Licinius also founded a city in Pontus whose

---

13 M. H. Sayar, P. Siewert, H. Taeuber, *Tyche* 9 (1994) 113-130; *SEG* 34, 1227; Kent J. Rigsby, *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley 1996) 466-71 no. 217.

14 Published by Reynolds (n. 6); the imperial letters also in James H. Oliver, *Greek Constitutions of early Roman Emperors* (Philadelphia 1989).

15 Reynolds, nos. 2 and 3 (Oppius), 4 ("Nicomedes IV": but cf. C. P. Jones, 'A Letter to Aphrodisias', *Classical Views* 29 [1985] 309-31, arguing in favor of Caesar), 6-8 (documents of 39), 25 (Decius).

name, corrupted in the manuscripts, seems to have been *Licinia*. The inscription from Ephesus listing the administrative districts (*dioicêseis*, *conventus*) of Asia includes a city in the *conventus* of Sardis with the name *Murenia*, and this must be another foundation of Murena. [16] We do not know how conscious the citizens of Licinia or Murenia were of their Roman *ktistês*. Modern analogies might suggest, not very much: how many New Yorkers know that their city is named for James, Duke of York, later the king James II? But again such an analogy is probably misleading. These foundations were doubtless small towns, with few claims to civic identity and pride. A connection with a legate of Sulla was not so good as a mention from Homer, but it was at any rate worth remembering and cherishing.

A clearer instance of civic memory is provided by Pompeiopolis in Cilicia. Under its previous name of Soloi, this was devastated by Tigranes of Armenia, who in true Hellenistic fashion transported many of its inhabitants to populate his new foundation of Tigranocerta. Pompey re-founded the city by settling there some of the previous inhabitants, together with some of the recently defeated pirates. From henceforth he was the *ktistês*, and the city took the name *Pompeiopolis*. So far from showing an ungrateful forgetfulness, the citizens of this ancient and honorable Greek city clung to the new name, used an era dating from the re-foundation, and commemorated Pompey on many of their issues. They do so with particular insistence in the 229th year, which must be 163/4 or 164/5. Aline Boyce argued some thirty years ago that these issues reflect the presence of Lucius Verus in the city at the time of his Parthian War, and if she is right then there is a clear connection between this commemoration and contemporary circumstances.[17] Several other cities of Asia Minor and Syria preserve the names of Roman commanders who founded or re-founded them.[18]

The case of Pompeiopolis raises another aspect of the civic commemoration of benefactions, that of eras.[19] Expressions like "the Sullan era," "the Pompeian era," might suggest that such eras were imposed on cities or provinces by the Roman administration, but the great variety of practice shows rather that here, too, local considerations were paramount. Each city was free to mark its era from the event or events which the citizens saw as a turning-point in their existence; we should remember that, in Greek and Roman thought, to be saved was often to begin a new existence, as when Rome was "born" in Cicero's consulate. Thus the so-called Sullan era of 85/4, frequent in cities of Asia, though it commemorates Sulla's "reconquest" of the province, should rather be seen as marking the cities' liberation from the domination of Mithridates.[20] The era of Pompey used by Pompeiopolis is unusual in Cilicia, but frequent in cities of the erstwhile Syrian kingdom which Pompey had "liberated" from their Seleucid overlords.[21] Other cities counted from

---

16 On Murena, F. Münzer, *RE* 13 (1926) 444-6 no. 122; T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* (New York 1952) 2.56, 61. Memnon: *FGrHist* 434, 26.1. Inscription from Ephesus: Habicht, *JRS* 65 (1975) 64-91, esp. 75 on *Murenia* (*SEG* 37, 884 col. I 15).

17 On Pompeiopolis in general, bibliography in Jones, *Culture and Society in Lucian* (Cambridge, Mass. 1986) 163 n. 12; for this conjecture, A. A. Boyce, 'The Foundation Year of Pompeiopolis in Cilicia', *Hommages à Marcel Renard* (Brussels 1969) 3.87-103.

18 For a list, C. P. Jones, 'Appia in Phrygia and Appius Claudius Pulcher', *Studi Ellenistici* 13 (forthcoming).

19 W. Leschhorn, *Antike Ären*, *Historia* Einzelschr. 81 (Stuttgart 1993), esp 416-32, "Politisch-historische Aspekte der Ära".

20 D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton 1950) 1.240; cf. Leschhorn (previous n.) 216-21.

21 H. Seyrig, 'Antiquités syriennes 56: Ères pompéiennes des villes de Phénicie', *Syria* 31 (1954) 73-80, especially 78-80 on the spontaneous and local adoption of these eras.

Pharsalus, making Caesar their liberator; others reckoned from Actium, treating Augustus in the same way; Cibyra in Phrygia and other cities, rebuilt by Tiberius after the earthquake of 23, calculated from an era dated to 24/5.[22] Once again, modern parallels can mislead; though the Christian era is in almost universal use, a truer analogy is perhaps with those peoples who continue to count from special figures in their own past, for example the year of Abraham or of Muhamad.

From memory we may finally turn to forgetfulness. In the context of the Greek east, this takes several forms, not always easy to distinguish. There is the compulsory amnesia often associated with the Romans and dubbed *damnatio memoriae*. Yet erasure of names and other reminders of "non-persons" goes back at least to ancient Egypt, and occurs in the Greek world as early as the sixth century.[23] The most conspicuous in the late republican period is that of Mark Antony. At Rome itself, Antony's name was officially condemned after Actium, but the ban was later lifted by an emperor descended from him, probably Caligula.[24] A spectacular example from Sardis has been excellently published by Peter Herrmann. This is a large stele from the bed of the Pactolus which, once again, refers to the privilege of inviolability.[25] The original grant was made in favor of the local Artemis by Julius Caesar shortly before his assassination. Being in possession of his papers, Antony transmitted the dictator's decision by a letter which was originally inscribed at the top of the stone, but was then carefully erased after Actium. Later documents, however, reflect Antony's rehabilitation. Thus his name survives intact in the two *senatus consulta* from the theater of Aphrodisias mentioned above. Similarly, two copies survive of a letter which he wrote to the general council of Asia, protecting and extending the privileges of the international guild of athletes, and again his name stands intact. Publishing the papyrus copy, F. G. Kenyon observed, "Why it was transcribed .... cannot even be guessed with any confidence," a comment quoted with approval by Sherk. Yet the reason is surely patent. Egypt was a famous breeding-ground of athletes, and the worldwide guild would always have wanted to maintain the extensive privileges granted by Antony. For this numerous and influential association, the triumvir's memory remained very green in the second century, as for different reasons it remained for Plutarch.[26]

A more insidious kind of amnesia, and one attested both by authors and inscriptions, is the re-use of old statues. Even so thoroughly Hellenic a city as Rhodes adopted this practice, against which Dio Chrysostom railed in one of his longest speeches (*Or.* 31). His complaint does not show the Rhodians' indifference to the Roman past: on the contrary, they placed the names of contemporary Romans on statues which had previously honored their own benefactors, presumably Greeks or at least Greek-speakers. Dio also excoriates Athens, the very capital of Hellenism, for the same reason (31.116-

---

22 Era of Pharsalus: Magie (n. 20) 2.1261 n. 9; Leschhorn (n. 19) 221-5. Actian era: Magie 1.440, 2.1289 n. 37; Leschhorn 225-8. Era of Tiberius: Magie 2.1358 n. 23; Leschhorn 352-9.

23 In Greece, A. Wilhelm, 'ΑΙΓΥΠΤΙΑΚΑ', *SBAW* 224, 1 (1946) 4-10 = *Akademieschriften zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* (Leipzig 1974) 3.143-8; on the Roman period, M. Kajava, 'Some Remarks on the Erasure of Inscriptions in the Roman World', in *Acta Colloquii epigraphici Latini Helsingiae .... habiti, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 105 (Helsinki 1995) 201-10.

24 On the *damnatio* of Antony see now J.-L. Ferrary, *CRAI* 1999, 838-39 with n. 46 (for the fragments of the *lex Fonteia* from Cos see now *SEG* 46, 1088).

25 P. Herrmann, *Chiron* 19 (1989) 127-164 (*SEG* 39, 1290).

26 Papyrus copy: Sherk (n. 12), no. 57, citing Kenyon, *CR* 9 (1893) 476. Epigraphic copy from Tralles: F. B. Poljakov, *Die Inschriften von Tralles und Nysa*, IGSK 36, 1 (Bonn 1989), no. 105. Plutarch: *Ant.* 28.3-12, 68.7-8.

17). Here he is corroborated by Pausanias (1.18.3), who saw statues of Miltiades and Themistocles at Athens that had been reinscribed with the names of a Roman and a Thracian; the second is perhaps Rhoemetalces III, the Thracian king who served as Athenian archon in 36/7.[27] Pausanias noted the same practice in Mantinea, where the statue of a fourth-century hero, Podares, had been reassigned to his descendant, another Podares "who had reached a sufficient age to partake of the Roman citizenship" (8.9.9).

Since this paper has involved a large number of disparate topics and examples, I give a brief summary. If we wish to study the Greeks under Roman rule, we cannot confine ourselves to the literary texts which Byzantine choice has preserved for us. We must use those texts in conjunction with all the available evidence, verbal and visual, and we must take into account the local identity of a Greek like Plutarch or Pausanias, and not only the panhellenic one.

Adopting such an approach to the question, "Did the Greeks of the East remember the republic?," there is no basis for the view that this period was "of no interest" or that Greeks only "admired the Greek past which could exhibit great men and great deeds." Greek cities like Colophon proudly displayed the monuments of those citizens who had helped the city in the difficult years after the establishment of the province. Such cities also preserved the memory of those great Romans (Sulla, Pompey, Caesar, Antony) whose actions had saved them from enslavement or destruction. For cities of Greece and of western and central Asia Minor, the first Mithridatic War is an especial focus of memory, perhaps all the more for those cities that had not resisted the lure of Mithridates; but whatever their loyalties, this event, even more than the actual beginning of Roman rule, formed an epoch in their relations with Rome. A similar concentration on the conquests of Pompey, and for similar reasons, is visible in Cilicia and Syria. Memory is kept alive by gratitude (notably towards the memory of Lucullus and Pompey); by pride in the services which the cities had performed for Rome; and by a desire to maintain the privileges which Roman *imperatores* had conferred on cities, on temples, or on corporations like the guild of athletes.

In the end, texts and artifacts are not at variance. The same persons who so often recur in the inscriptions and on coins also appear in the pages of Plutarch, Appian, and Cassius Dio. But we cannot read those pages without sometimes raising our eyes from our books. As well as printed texts, we must study maps, coins, images, inscriptions, and perhaps, if we are very adventurous, actually visit the places that we talk and write about.[28]

---

[27] On this passage of Dio, Jones, *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom* (Cambridge, Mass. 1976) 29. For this conjecture about the "Thracian", J. and L. Robert, *Bull. Epigr.* 1973, 14; on Rhoemetalces at Athens, L. Robert, 'Deux épigrammes de Philippe de Thessalonique', *JS* 1982, 145-6 = *Opera Minora Selecta* 7 (Amsterdam 1990) 513-4.

[28] I am very grateful for comments received both at the Colloquium and when I presented a version of this paper at the University of Michigan in April 1999.