

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

THE PROVINCE STRIKES BACK
IMPERIAL DYNAMICS
IN THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN

edited by
Björn Forsén and Giovanni Salmeri

HELSINKI 2008

© Suomen Ateenan-Instituutin säätiö (Foundation of the Finnish Institute at Athens),
Helsinki 2008

ISSN 1237-2684

ISBN 978-951-98806-8-6

Printed in Finland by Ekenäs Tryckeri.

Cover: James Skene, *The Parthenon from the southeast*, 1838. Watercolour on paper
(Museum of the City of Athens, Vouros – Eutaxias).

Layout: Vesa Vahtikari

Contents

Preface		i
Björn Forsén and Giovanni Salmeri	<i>Ideology and Practice of Empire</i>	1
Vincent Gabrielsen	<i>Provincial Challenges to the Imperial Centre in Achaemenid and Seleucid Asia Minor</i>	15
Cédric Brélaz	<i>Maintaining Order and Exercising Justice in the Roman Provinces of Asia Minor</i>	45
Suraiya Faroghi	<i>Local Elites and Government Intervention in the Province of Anadolu</i>	65
Angelos Chaniotis	<i>What Difference Did Rome Make? The Cretans and the Roman Empire</i>	83
Maria Georgopoulou	<i>Crete between the Byzantine and Venetian Empires</i>	107
Antonis Anastasopoulos	<i>Centre–Periphery Relations: Crete in the Eighteenth Century</i>	123
Giovanni Salmeri	<i>Empire and Collective Mentality: The Transformation of eutaxia from the Fifth Century BC to the Second Century AD</i>	137
John Haldon	<i>Provincial Elites, Central Authorities: Problems in Fiscal and Military Management in the Byzantine State</i>	157
Björn Forsén	<i>Empires and Migrational Trends: The Case of Roman and Ottoman Greece</i>	187
Ilias Arnaoutoglou	<i>‘διά δόξαν ἐκείνων καὶ κλέος τοῦ ἔθνους’ The Philomousos Society of Athens and Antiquities</i>	201
List of Contributors		215

Empire and Collective Mentality: The Transformation of *eutaxia* from the Fifth Century BC to the Second Century AD

Giovanni Salmeri

1. The numerous workshops held over the last seven years as part of the international network *Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, c. 200 BC – AD 476)* have explored the transformations and innovations produced by a structure like the Roman Empire on the spheres of economy, administration, religion and so on, but have not taken into consideration that of collective mentality.

To my mind this is due primarily to the fact that international research in the sector of Roman history has for several decades now been the province of British and American scholars and those following their tradition who, naturally with a few exceptions,¹ tend to take a pragmatic approach to the subject. Thus even when dealing with cultural history,² they do not readily set about investigating such an ‘intangible’ aspect as mentality (*mentalité*). To date it is really only French historiography which has traced the history of mentalities (*histoire des mentalités*). Following the ground-breaking work of Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre several outstanding studies, featuring the medieval and early modern ages in particular, have thrown light on, for example, the sense of death or the idea of justice in certain periods and regions.³

But if the prevalence of the pragmatic approach to Roman history – especially concerning the Imperial age – focusing on institutions or specific economic, social and religious phenomena has undoubtedly impeded the development of a real interest in the history of mentalities, it is also true that the ambiguous nature of this history – to use the definition of Jacques Le Goff⁴ – may well be considered an obstacle. It is no easy matter to define the history of mentalities, and there are no convenient frameworks to call on. As Le Goff himself has put it, the vocation of the history of mentalities is to give a sense to the residue of historical analysis, to the *je ne sais pas quoi* of history. Furthermore it is difficult to pin down shifts in mentality. When does one mentality give way to another? There is no hard and fast procedure to follow in constructing the history of mentalities. According to the topic in question, one must combine and juxtapose various kinds of sources: from the clinical records in a psychiatric hospital to the horoscopes in newspapers or on a papyrus scroll and the funerary inscriptions which political historians invariably dismiss; from the comedies and farces of popular theatre to masterpieces of literary achievement. This compound of causes has meant that the history of mentalities currently plays no more than a marginal role in the domain of the history of the Roman Empire.

Naturally this does not mean that we have no significant treatments of the subject. At least two appeared in the 1980s, written by Michel Foucault and Paul Veyne

¹ For instance Woolf 1994, and now Morgan 2007.

² See Morris 2000, esp. 9-17 and Burke 2004.

³ See Burke 1997 and Poirrier 2004. Several excellent studies of the emotions in the Greek and Roman world have appeared in recent years in England and in the United States (e.g. Konstan 2001, Harris 2001, Kaster 2005), but they bear little relation to the history of mentalities.

⁴ Le Goff 1974.

respectively. In *Le souci de soi* Foucault⁵ analyses the vast Greek and Latin literary output in the first and second centuries AD to show how an individualistic mentality emerged for the first time in the ancient world, with a new emphasis on the private sphere. He also identifies the development of an autonomous personal morality, independent from the public sphere and quite unlike the totalising vision of Christianity, whereas Veyne in a long essay on private life in the Roman Empire⁶ sets out to reconstruct the mentality of figures like the city notable and the freedman. He also discusses such stimulating topics as the existence in the Roman world of oral doctrines or theories which corresponded to the standard mentality, being common to all social classes and having a bearing on all possible matters. According to Veyne they were in fact authentic philosophies, just as Marxism or psychoanalysis were the principal doctrines or theories in the West two or three decades ago.

Another comprehensive study which can *lato sensu* be included in the domain of the history of mentalities is Clifford Ando's⁷ recent exploration of how the subjects in the provinces sought to conform to imperial ideology. There are, however, virtually no instances of research which go beyond the merely stylistic, literary or indeed philosophical approach involved in lexical analysis and seek to penetrate the collective mentality of the Imperial age. In order to set about rectifying this state of things, this chapter is devoted to analysing the development of the term *eutaxia* and its associated adjectival, adverbial and verbal forms starting from Aeschylus, and particularly Thucydides, and tracing them into the Imperial age, to seek to identify vestiges of the mentalities of different periods and the transformation processes. For the Imperial age in particular, we hope to show how *eutaxia*⁸ – having shed almost entirely those associations with the military sphere which had been so predominant at the beginning, and having come to mean simply 'orderliness' – was able to become a political slogan for the notables of the Greek world, accurately reflecting their mentality as individuals, characterised by the pursuit of decorum and the care of the self.

2. The scholars who have had most to do with the term *eutaxia* have rightly highlighted its associations with the military sphere.⁹ The matter, however, cannot be left there, and it has to be shown how it comes to relate also to the spheres of politics and ethics.

The fundamental starting-point for the investigation is a passage in the sixth book of Thucydides reporting a speech by Hermocrates aimed at raising the spirits of his fellow citizens in Syracuse following a severe defeat at the hands of the Athenians during their military expedition to Sicily of 415-413 BC. After dealing with some practical aspects such as the institution of compulsory military training, Hermocrates declares that "they (the Syracusans) had the courage already, and the discipline (*eutaxia*) would come with experience. There would, in fact, be an automatic improvement in both respects, as

⁵ Foucault 1984. Ten years earlier K. Dover published a book in England which, based on non-philosophical literary sources, sought to reconstruct *Greek popular morality in the time of Plato and Aristotle*, meaning the value system and mentality of the ordinary Greek people in the fourth century BC. See also Whitehead 1993, drawing on epigraphic material.

⁶ Veyne 1985.

⁷ Ando 2000.

⁸ In this chapter ϵ and \omicron are used to transliterate respectively η and ω .

⁹ E.g. J. and L. Robert, *Bull. Ep.* 1970, 453 (see also *infra*); Pritchett 1974, 236-238; Whitehead 1993, 70; Ma 2002, 115-116; Chaniotis 2005, 93-94.

discipline would be learnt in the school of danger, and courage would rise to greater heights of heroism when supported by the confidence that comes from experience”.¹⁰ Thus here *eutaxia* alludes explicitly to that orderliness on the battlefield which is indispensable for obtaining victory. Besides, the adverbial form *eutaktôs* had already been used by Aeschylus in the *Persians* in describing the way in which the right wing of the Greek fleet advanced towards victory at Salamis.¹¹ Similarly Xenophon, writing later than Thucydides, used the adjective *eutaktos* in the *Agésilas* to extol the efficiency of the *phalanx*: “Surely nothing is wanting to the strength of that battle-line which keeps in formation (*eutaktos ousa*) on account of its obedience [...]”.¹²

In addition to these passages there are others, particularly in Xenophon, in which *eutaxia* refers to the orderly, disciplined behaviour of troops in general, without any particular reference to the battlefield. Indeed in some cases *eutaxia* loses all trace of its active function as an instrument of victory and becomes the means of defence and refuge for an army in difficulty, as is seen in one of Xenophon’s speeches in the *Anabasis*.¹³

Moving away from the military sphere, in Aristophanes’s *Birds*, written in 414 BC, *eutaktos* is associated with *polis*. Euelpides declares that a city in which Athena, “a woman born, a goddess, stands full-armed, and Cleisthenes assumes a spindle” cannot be “well ordered (*eutaktos*)”.¹⁴ For the playwright a city like Athens, in which the traditional roles and occupations of men and women were not respected, could not be considered *eutaktos*. Several decades later, some time before 350 BC, Isocrates is also speaking of Athens when he refers in the *Areopagiticus* to *eutaxia* as a quality of former times which saw “citizens so schooled in virtue as not to injure each other, but to fight and conquer all who attempted to invade their territory”.¹⁵ In fact *eutaxia* is attributed quite naturally – indeed with other virtues – to Sparta,¹⁶ possibly also in recognition of this city’s care in maintaining its military organization.

Turning to the personal sphere we find Xenophon, in the *Memorabilia*,¹⁷ using the verb *eutaktein* to characterise Socrates’s “scrupulous obedience to public authority in all that the laws required, both in civil life (*kata polin*) and military service (*en tais strateiais*)”. The pair of definitions *kata polin* and *en tais strateiais* clearly evoke the whole field of Socrates’s experience. It is significant that Xenophon felt the need to spell out the two components, as if the prevalently military connotation of the verb *eutaktein* risked causing his readers to think he was referring exclusively to Socrates the soldier.

Thus as early as the fifth and first half of the fourth century BC we find all the diverse associations which were to characterise *eutaxia* in the centuries to come, although associations with the military sphere were undoubtedly predominant in common mentality. Moreover, Aristotle in the *Politics* not only assimilates law (*nomos*) and order (*taxis*), but also puts forward the coupling of *eunomia* and *eutaxia*,¹⁸ without taking the matter any

¹⁰ Thuc. 6.72.4, cf. 2.89.9, 7.77.5, 8.1.4.

¹¹ Aesch. *Pers.* 399.

¹² Xen. *Agés.* 6.4.4.

¹³ Xen. *Anab.* 3.1.38, cf. 3.2.30.

¹⁴ Ar. *Av.* 829, see Dunbar 1995, 496-497.

¹⁵ Isoc. *Areop.* 82, cf. 39; cf. also [Demosth.] 25.24.

¹⁶ E.g. Pl. *Alc.* I 122C.

¹⁷ Xen. *Mem.* 4.4.1.

¹⁸ Arist. *Pol.* 7. 1326a.29-32; on *eunomia* see Ruzé 2003.

further. Also in the *Politics* the philosopher states that an oligarchic regime can only ensure its continuity by relying on *eutaxia*, presenting the latter as a quintessentially conservative political ideal.¹⁹ Here then we see a new application for our term in the sphere of politics, and this was to prove crucial in the Roman Imperial age.²⁰ In general, however, the term most widely used to refer to order in the Greek world in the fifth and fourth centuries BC is not *eutaxia* but rather *kosmos*, found already in Homer and subsequently in Herodotus and Gorgias in a cultural and political usage and in the philosopher Empedocles with the sense of world-order.²¹ *Eutaxia* could hardly compete with a term laying claim to such a pedigree as *kosmos*!

3. Following the defeat inflicted on Athens by Philip II at Chaironeia (338 BC), “la cité grecque n’est pas morte”, as L. Robert put it on more than one occasion, just as it did not perish in the centuries to come. “Certes, Athènes et Sparte ne jouent plus le rôle que ces cités jouaient dans la Méditerranée – ou dans l’Egée. Mais cette décadence dans le pouvoir international efficace ne change rien aux rouages de la vie civique, à son activité, à ses responsabilités et à ses dangers”.²² For Athens itself, the fifteen years that followed Chaironeia were a period of peace in which the city was able to devote itself to important reconstruction work and above all to reinforce its civic spirit. Indeed this period has even been characterised as manifesting a peculiar “spirit of [...] renaissance”.²³

One particularly significant development was the reform of the training of the ephebes, established by the law of Epicrates in 336/5 or more probably 335/4 BC.²⁴ Another development was what we can describe as an ‘explosion’ of *eutaxia*. During the fifth and first half of the fourth century BC the term had not had a particularly high profile, but in Athens in the aftermath of Chaironeia it suddenly came into the limelight.

An inscription dating from 333/2 or 332/1 BC, which poses some problems of interpretation, provides the only evidence at our disposal for a liturgy called *eutaxia* performed by two men from each of the tribes (only one from Hippothontis).²⁵ We do not know precisely what this liturgy was, but it appears to have been connected with public games. There is a relief dating from the same years showing a male figure with a shield at his side being crowned by the *Dêmos* (?), with a personification of *Eutaxia* on the right side, her name being clearly legible in the border above her head.²⁶ If we combine the presence of the shield next to the man being crowned with a passage from the *Athenaion Politeia*²⁷ – “the second year, after giving a public display of their military evolutions, on the occasion when the assembly meets in the theatre, the ephebes receive a shield and a spear from the city [...]” – we can imagine that the *Eutaxia* competition, funded by the liturgists mentioned above, may have involved military exercises performed by the ephebes.

¹⁹ Arist. *Pol.* 6. 1321a. 3-4.

²⁰ See *infra* § 8.

²¹ See Cartledge 1998, 3-4. In Arist. *Pol.* 6. 1321b. 7-8 *eutaxia* and *kosmos* are both presented as objectives of public offices (*archai*).

²² Robert 1969, 42.

²³ Habicht 1997, 16.

²⁴ In favour of 336/5 BC is Habicht 1997, 16, *contra* Knoepfler 2001, 381-382 who prefers 335/4 BC.

²⁵ *IG* II² 417, see now Lambert 2001, 53-60 (with previous bibliography).

²⁶ Palagia 1975, 181-182; Lawton 1995, no. 150.

²⁷ [Arist.] *Athen. Pol.* 42.4.

This remains an isolated, specific case. In the gymnasia of the Greek world over the next few centuries *eutaxia* progressively lost its strong military connotation and became one of the most important ‘judgement’ contests, often accompanied by *euexia* (“maintien”) and *philoponia* (endurance).²⁸ *Eutaxia*, in fact, came to mean ‘discipline’ or ‘good conduct’ in terms of individual behaviour. In the specific context of Athens, a significant number of inscriptions show *eutaxia* to have been one of the few prominent qualities, sometimes together with *kosmiotês* (decorum), for which the ephebes were commonly praised.²⁹ The term was thus subsumed into the domain of the gymnasia, maintaining only a faint trace of the meaning it had when used by Thucydides’s Hermocrates. An early instance of this shift, coming hard on the heels of the reform of the ephebes’ training, is the occurrence of the term *eutaxia* and its associated forms in the ephebic monument of the Cecropic tribe, 334/3 BC.³⁰

We feel justified in speaking of an ‘explosion’ in the use of the term *eutaxia* in Athens in the aftermath of Chaironeia thanks also to an inscription, dating from the year 329/8 BC, found in the Amphiaraion at Oropos,³¹ which the Athenians seem to have retrieved in 335 BC.³² The inscription features a decree honouring the ten men elected by the *dêmos* to serve as *epimelêtai* for the games and other rites at the sanctuary. Towards the end it records an official who is defined as *hairetheis epi tèn eutaxian*. It is not certain what his duties were: he may have been responsible for the *Eutaxia* competition at the Amphiaraic games of 329/8 BC, but it is by far preferable to think that he was charged with maintaining orderliness at the festival.³³ This would then be an early example of the need for the maintenance of law and order at public events in the Greek world which was to persist until the Roman Imperial age.³⁴

How are we to explain the ‘explosion’ in the use of the term *eutaxia*? At first sight its sudden prominence in so many different forms in Athens in the fifteen years after Chaironeia would seem to indicate its great versatility in a variety of contexts, without ever completely losing its original military connotation. However, to venture further into the domain of the history of mentalities, there is a passage in Thucydides³⁵ which seems particularly apposite. It occurs at the beginning of the eighth book, and describes the Athenians’ initial reaction of panic at the news of defeat in Sicily in 413 BC, and their subsequent decisions. Thucydides concludes: “Under the spur of fear, as is the way of the *dêmos*, the Athenians were ready to put everything in order (*eutaktein*)”.

Thus the decision to “put everything in order” is attributed by Thucydides to the fear aroused in the Athenians by defeat and to the need to avoid the worst by setting about a radical reordering of their affairs. In all likelihood this also happened after Chaironeia, and we can see a sign of this in the ‘explosion’ of *eutaxia* that echoes the passage in Thucydides.

²⁸ Crowther 1991; Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 102-104, 104-105; Kah 2004, 79-80. “Maintien”: Knoepfler 1979, 174.

²⁹ E.g. *IG* II² 1156 (*Syll.*³ 957) ll. 39-40; see also Pelekidis 1962, 38.

³⁰ See *supra* n. 29.

³¹ Schwenk 1985, no. 50 = *IOrop* 298.

³² Knoepfler 2001, 367-389, *contra* Faraguna 1992, 218-219 (338 BC).

³³ Lambert 2001, 56; Brélaz 2005, 179-180 n. 483.

³⁴ See *infra* § 5.

³⁵ Thuc. 8.14.

4. In the Hellenistic age the term *eutaxia* was subsumed into the domain of the gymnasia, while specifically in the military sphere (in common usage, of course) it lost the active, propulsive sense associated with victory in battle that it had in Hermocrates' words.³⁶ *Eutaxia*, along with its adjectival, adverbial and verbal forms, came to denote orderliness, the 'discipline' of campaigning armies and especially of the garrisons sent by the kings to keep the Hellenistic cities under control.

Foreign garrisons and mercenaries were part and parcel of daily life in the Hellenistic cities, whether in the economic, social or religious spheres, and their integration with the local population was never easy,³⁷ as we know from accounts of violent unruliness.³⁸ One particularly incisive account concerning a campaigning army features in a letter sent by a Hellenistic monarch to the city of Soloi in Cilicia.³⁹ In view of such situations of tension and conflict it is not difficult to believe that *eutaxia* was considered a quality of prime importance by the Hellenistic cities, which were only too ready to honour those commanders and troops who maintained an exemplary behaviour.

One case in point is the decree, dating apparently from the end of the third century BC, found at Apollonia under Salbake in Caria, honouring the Seleucid hipparch for, among other things, ensuring strict discipline (*eutaxia*) among his soldiers.⁴⁰ Something similar is found in inscriptions from Iasos in Caria, Colophon in Ionia, and Rhamnous, Megara and Delphi in Greece, to cite just a few other examples.⁴¹ There is a decree from Amyzon in Caria in which both the contingent of troops and their commander are honoured for their *eutaxia*.⁴² Then in a decree from Metropolis honouring the memory of Apollonios, the deceased is praised as the commander of a contingent of *neaniskoi* sent to Thyateira in support of the Romans against Aristonikos for, among other things, keeping strict discipline (*eutaxia*) among his men.⁴³

In these inscriptions *eutaxia* is presented as a quality prized by the cities for the sake of their well-being. There are other instances, however, in which it is prized also by the ruler, because it prevents him having his plans disrupted by the actions of unruly troops. This transpires clearly in a letter from a high-ranking officer (probably Zeuxis) in the service of Antiochos III,⁴⁴ who during the closing years of the third century BC transmitted to troops stationed in Caria the sovereign's command that they should behave with order and discipline (*eutakteite*), avoiding setting up camp at Labraunda or causing any disturbance in the vicinity of the sanctuary.

In the Hellenistic age military organization and the conduct of war changed with respect to practice in the fifth century BC, above all with the introduction of large contingents of mercenaries,⁴⁵ and the usage of *eutaxia* reflects this change. With the shift in focus from autonomous city states waging war on each other to cities inserted into a

³⁶ See *supra* n. 10.

³⁷ Launey 1949-50, 633-651; Chaniotis 2005, 88-93.

³⁸ *Ataxia* is the Greek term used to denote indiscipline among soldiers, see Robert 1976, 216-219.

³⁹ Welles 1934, 136-140, no. 30 favours one of the Ptolemies; Virgilio 2007, 217-228 favours Antiochos III.

⁴⁰ Robert 1954, 285-286, no. 166, ll. 3-4.

⁴¹ Robert 1927, 121; Robert 1936, 75 n. 5; Robert 1954, 289 n. 1; Robert 1983, 198 n. 1.

⁴² Robert 1983, 196-198.

⁴³ *IvMetropolis* I A.1. 28; on the inscription in general see Jones 2004.

⁴⁴ Robert 1983, 139-140; see also Ma 2000, 304-305, no. 15.

⁴⁵ Chaniotis 2005.

state such as the Seleucid Empire, it came to denote above all the discipline of a foreign contingent in a garrisoned city.

5. The existence of an official charged with maintaining *eutaxia* at the Amphiaraic games in 329/8 BC has already been noted.⁴⁶ Another use of the term in Athens in the context of games and festivals is recorded in an inscription dating from soon after the mid-third century BC. Timokrite, priestess of Aglauros, is honoured for, among other things, “ensuring that orderliness (*eutaxia*) reigned during the night-festival (*pannychis*)”.⁴⁷ It is a mistake to try to explain these two occurrences of *eutaxia* by taking them in isolation. At the beginning of the Hellenistic age the role of the officials known as *mastigophoroi*, *rabdouchoi* and *rabdophoroi* was transformed from that of assistants to the judges in competitions, or indeed judges in their own right, to guards responsible for maintaining order among the spectators during festivals and games.⁴⁸

It is not possible here to go into the reasons for such an ‘institutionalisation’ of the task of controlling and sanctioning crowd behaviour on public occasions from the last decades of the fourth century BC, but it would seem that this new trend corresponds to a new emphasis on order and discipline in Hellenistic society which manifested itself also in the shift of usage of the term *eutaxia* in the military sphere. Festivals, games and spectacles, with all their potential for unruliness, were kept under strict control in the Hellenistic cities by means of officials created *ad hoc*. This same form of surveillance, possibly indeed on a still more institutional footing, continued throughout the Roman Imperial age. We know that considerable importance was attributed to this aspect from a series of inscriptions concerning the institution of festivals such as the *Démostheneia* at Oenoanda in Lycia in the first half of the second century AD⁴⁹ and the regulations for societies like the *Iobacchoi* in Athens at the time of Herodes Atticus.⁵⁰

Eutaxia is the term used for the orderliness to be maintained on public occasions, apart from Athens, also at Ilion in Troad, as we know from an inscription dating from the second century BC. This text records the decisions of the city concerning the running of the foundation set up by Hermias, son of Skamandrios. One of the regulations specifies that *eutaxia* is to be ensured during the planned procession by people armed with sticks entitled to lay about any unruly elements.⁵¹ While according to the new regulations concerning the conduct of the ceremonies of the mysteries of Demeter and Kore at Andania in Messenia (92 BC), twenty *rabdophoroi* were to be appointed to ensure that the participants behaved seemingly (*euschêmonôs*) and in a disciplined manner (*eutaktôs*).⁵²

To indicate proper order at festivals and spectacles, however, we find also another term, *eukosmia*,⁵³ which, particularly during the Roman Imperial age, seems to prevail

⁴⁶ See *supra* § 3. On the Amphiaraic games see Parker 1996, 149, 247, 250.

⁴⁷ SEG XXXIII 115, see Lambert 2001, 60.

⁴⁸ Brélaz 2005, 171-173.

⁴⁹ Wörrle 1988, 10 (ll. 63-64), 219-220. Here the *mastigophoroi* appear to be responsible for maintaining *eukosmia* in the theatres.

⁵⁰ Sokolowski 1969, 95-101, no. 51 ll. 72-90, 134-146. For a translation of the inscription see Tod 1932, 86-93. The person responsible for maintaining order and decorum in the assemblies of the *Iobacchoi* is called *eukosmos*.

⁵¹ *IvIlion* 52 ll. 27-29.

⁵² Sokolowski 1969, 120-134, no. 65 ll. 41-45.

⁵³ See *supra* nn. 49-50.

over *eutaxia*.⁵⁴ In parallel, to go back for a moment to the context of the gymnasia, we can recall that the *kosmêtês* was responsible not only for *eukosmia*, but also for *eutaxia* among the ephebes.⁵⁵

6. So far, with only rare exceptions,⁵⁶ we have seen *eutaxia* used in connection with the behaviour of groups: from the army of Athens, Syracuse or Sparta to the ephebes in the gymnasia and their contests; from the garrisons sent to Hellenistic cities to the crowds attending games and festivals. The usage of *eutaxia* to indicate an individual quality, on the basis of inscriptions dating above all from the second century BC, will now be taken into consideration.

One of the pseudo-Menandrian *monostichoi*⁵⁷ – *Karpos d'aretês dikaios eutaktos bios* – can be cited by way of introduction. Here a just, ordered life is held to be the product of virtue; *eutaxia* appears devoid of military associations and fully integrated into the civil sphere. Significantly, two distinct presentations of *eutaxia* are present in a decree from Aegina in honour of the Pergamene *epistatês* Cleon,⁵⁸ dating from the central decades of the second century BC. In this inscription *eutaxia* is defined on one hand as *pragmatikê*, with reference to Cleon's official duties, and on the other as *kata bion* for the strictly personal sphere.⁵⁹ The formula *kata bion* is in fact quite often found in the inscriptions discussed below, almost as if to emphasise that here *eutaxia* is a quality pertaining to the individual conduct of the various figures honoured and not to the military sphere or the gymnasium.

The inscriptions in question are of the honorary type and relate, to use the words of Louis and Jeanne Robert, to “étrangers en séjour, médecins, musiciens, ambassadeurs, résidents”.⁶⁰ With respect to the “médecins” we have a quite outstanding document: a decree issued in the second century BC by the *damos* of Halasarna on the island of Cos. The subject is the physician Onasandros, whose entire career is recorded and whose praises are sung for his services to the inhabitants of the *damos*. In particular it is stated that early on in life, at Halasarna, Onasandros was the assistant of the famous physician Antipatros and displayed great competence in his art (*kata tan technan empeiria*) and an orderly way of life (*kata ton bion eutaxia*).⁶¹ Menekles too, one of two envoys sent by Teos in Ionia to Crete to confirm the city's *asylia* (ca 170 BC) is praised, for two reasons. The honorary decree, emanated by Knossos, speaks of his *eutaxia* and of his ability to perform the compositions of Timotheos of Miletus, Polyidos of Selymbria and the old Cretan poets, accompanying himself on the *kithara*, as befits a well educated man (*anêr pepaideumenos*).⁶²

⁵⁴ In any case *eutaxia* is part of the title of some of the centurions responsible for maintaining order at the regional level in the Near East, see Brélaz 2005, 85-86 n. 84.

⁵⁵ Pelekidis 1962, 38.

⁵⁶ See *supra* n. 17.

⁵⁷ [Men.] *Mon.* 418

⁵⁸ *OGIS* 329, see Allen 1983, 105.

⁵⁹ *OGIS* 329, ll. 9-10.

⁶⁰ Robert 1989, 25 n. 85.

⁶¹ *SEG* XLI 680 (ll. 11-12), see Jouanna 1999, 370-372.

⁶² *IC I* 11*, see Chaniotis 1988, 154.

In a decree found at Claros Polemaios, who was sent by Colophon as *theôros* to Smyrna, is said to have been praised by the inhabitants of the latter city for his *peri ton bion aretê kai eutaxia*,⁶³ a formula which features no less than three of the terms present in the Menandrian *monostichos* cited above. In some inscriptions found at Priene⁶⁴ *eutaxia* is extended beyond the categories of physicians, envoys and *theôroi* to the *grammateis* (secretaries) who accompanied those who, according to a normal practice in the Hellenistic world, were despatched – on request – by the city to administer justice elsewhere.⁶⁵ It is interesting to note that in the honorary decrees sent by Iasos to Priene for judges and *grammateis*, the former are extolled for their *aretê* and *kalokagathia* (nobleness) and the latter for their *eutaxia*.⁶⁶ Thus in the hierarchy of the qualities attributed to individuals, *eutaxia* ranked lower than *aretê* and *kalokagathia*.

In conclusion, the process of personalisation of *eutaxia* that characterised the second century BC was in effect limited to certain categories of the inhabitants of the Hellenistic world – physicians, envoys, *theôroi* and the *grammateis* who accompanied the judges – most of whom practised their occupations outside their *patris*.⁶⁷ We can see here the premises for the attribution of the quality of *eutaxia* to much more extensive categories in the Greek world during the centuries of Roman domination.

7. There has never been agreement among historians as to the reasons which induced Rome to enter the Hellenistic world. Some have seen it as an aggressive expansionism, others more as the city safeguarding its interests and spaces.⁶⁸ In a book which I consider to be still fundamental, Eric Gruen goes beyond such an antithesis and focuses on the political and diplomatic reality of the encounter of Rome and the Greek world, underlining the aspect of interaction. He emphasises “both Rome’s receptiveness to Hellenic principles, which she found congenial, and the Greeks’ ability to take advantage of Roman presence within a system familiar to themselves”, and concludes: “Hellas ultimately fell under Roman authority not because the Romans exported their structure to the East, but because Greeks persistently drew the westerner into their own structure – until it was theirs no longer”.⁶⁹

Thus Gruen pays attention to the cultural dynamics, but he does not give any consideration to the transformations produced in the collective mentality by the coming of Rome to the Hellenistic world. Certainly during the third and second centuries BC the Greek cities in Asia Minor had been incorporated into centralised states like the Hellenistic kingdoms, but it was the introduction of the Roman provincial system which

⁶³ Robert 1989, 12 (ll. 43-44), 27.

⁶⁴ *IvPriene* 49 l. 3; 53 l. 25 and II l. 53; 54 ll. 22-23, 49.

⁶⁵ See Robert 1973; Crowther 2006, esp. 38-39.

⁶⁶ *IvPriene* 53 and 54.

⁶⁷ Robert 1964, 161 rightly points out that *eutaxia* “est toujours appréciée chez qui est à l’étranger et qui sait se tenir à sa place”. It appears to be preferable not to use the category of liminality proposed in Ma 2002, 115 as a “common denominator” among groups (ephebes, foreign soldiers serving as a garrison) and individuals (travelling artists, foreign judges) to whom *eutaxia* is applied. Liminality, among other things, carries political and social implications which establish a clear distinction between, for example, ephebes and foreign judges. Moreover, from a heuristic point of view it seems more appropriate to keep separate the groups and individuals to whom *eutaxia* is applied.

⁶⁸ On this see Salmeri 1987.

⁶⁹ Gruen 1984, 730.

eventually brought about significant changes – without provoking drastic breaks – in the conduct of city politics, in the making and advancement of the ruling class and in the mentality of the individuals.⁷⁰

The presence of Rome throughout the Eastern Mediterranean was less tangible than it was in the West. To give just one example, Latin only came into very limited use in Asia Minor; it did not really take root even in the few colonies established in the area. The administrators sent out from Rome to the provinces of Asia Minor often used Greek to communicate, especially in the Imperial age; this was also the language used during court sessions, but for sentencing Latin was normally used. In the cities the time-honoured Greek political and religious institutions, although transformed, continued to exist and function.⁷¹

This state of things must not, however, be taken to mean that the action of Rome in the Eastern Mediterranean, and particularly in Asia Minor, was guided by the local reality. Right from the outset, with the creation of the province of Asia in 129 BC, Rome was fully aware of the economic potential of the area. During the Imperial age, moreover, tax revenue from Asia Minor – and from the province of Asia in particular – represented a significant part of the Empire's budget.⁷² In terms of our enquiry it is even more significant that Rome was aware that the type of administrative organization adopted in Spain and Gaul would not do for an area like Asia Minor, characterised by robust urbanization especially along the Aegean coast: therefore she allowed the numerous Greek cities and their political structures to continue in existence. In addition to setting up *conventus iuridici* (assize districts), which in Asia Minor often served to neutralise long-standing ethnic and territorial aggregations,⁷³ the decisive innovation in the Republican age was to make membership of the city councils for life, thereby consolidating a local ruling class that was loyal to the centre and could take charge of internal law and order.⁷⁴ In the Imperial age, on the other hand, Rome intervened above all by granting immunities and privileges, which had most impact on the hierarchies of the cities in the various provinces.⁷⁵ As for the less urbanized areas, for a long period Rome refrained broadly speaking from direct intervention, entrusting its interests to local dynasts who were, however, of Greek culture and possessed an urban mentality.⁷⁶

Thus in Asia Minor Rome was represented not only by its governors but also by the notables of the Greek cities. Building on the structures of the Hellenistic kingdoms, Rome maintained the *poleis* within a wide-ranging framework under a unified administration. To some extent all this prepared the ground for the growth of a united Hellenic consciousness, at least at the cultural level.⁷⁷ At the same time, however, given the considerable political responsibility they were entrusted with, the notables of Asia Minor found their ties with

⁷⁰ Salmeri 1991, 571; Salmeri 2000, 53.

⁷¹ Salmeri 2000, 54 and n. 6; Adams 2003.

⁷² See Hopkins 2002.

⁷³ See Salmeri 2000a, 165, 176; Campanile 2003.

⁷⁴ See Salmeri 2000, 55 and n. 11 (with bibliography).

⁷⁵ Salmeri 2005, 196-197.

⁷⁶ See Braund 1984; Kaizer and Facella forthcoming.

⁷⁷ Salmeri 1987, 793; Salmeri 1991, 575.

their native cities strengthening, and with them the desire to spend the rest of their lives in their homeland, following a pattern unparalleled in the western provinces.⁷⁸

When Paul Veyne and Michel Foucault⁷⁹ came to investigate the mentality of the Imperial ruling class, they took a special interest in the notables of the Greek world. The fact is that the Greek world, and Asia Minor in particular, makes a happy hunting ground for such research, since in the first and second centuries AD many of the writers and intellectuals came from there. It is hardly necessary to repeat what Veyne has to say concerning the increasing attention which, above all from the end of the first century AD, the urban upper classes – quite independently from the progress of the Christian religion – paid to their own inner world, and the rapid disappearance of the form of ‘bartering’ which characterised pagan religion in the face of a more personalised relationship with the divine world.⁸⁰ It is more interesting to consider what lay behind this shift, although the French historian pays little attention to this question. He merely suggests that the origin of the shift towards the inner world lies in the transformation of the forms of competition – political, social, economic and so on – in the Imperial age.⁸¹ With the support of the writings of Plutarch and Dio of Prusa,⁸² we can take the matter further by recognising that the new emphasis on interiority from the end of the first century AD in the eastern area of the Empire was linked to the transformations in the conduct of political life introduced following the advent of Rome, and above all after the institution of the Empire.⁸³

The outcome was not, as an old cliché would have us believe, the end of politics in the cities of the Greek East, with the withdrawal of the local ruling classes into private life. By redrawing the political and administrative profile of the cities and significantly reducing – through the provincial form of government – their ability to project themselves outwards, Rome in fact forced them to concentrate on internal matters.⁸⁴ The literary sources featuring Asia Minor in the first centuries AD reveal quite clearly the levels of conflict reached in the cities’ political life. The aim of the notables – Dio and Plutarch *in primis* – was to keep the representatives of Rome out of the running of their *polis* as much as they possibly could, for the governors could intervene drastically in cases of serious disorder and decide, in cases of financial mismanagement, to verify the accounts of a city.⁸⁵ In connection with this state of things it is surely quite legitimate to suppose that the Greek notables developed a new absorption with their own interiority and its safeguarding, and several passages in Plutarch and Dio bear this out. In particular we can single out a passage from the latter’s tenth oration.⁸⁶ Dio, using Diogenes as his mouthpiece, states that if an individual takes care to know himself, thereby attaining wisdom, there is no longer any need to consult the oracles. One almost feels one is listening to Dio inviting his

⁷⁸ Quass 1982; Salmeri 2000, 55-56. This must not, however, be taken to mean that Asia Minor did not also provide a certain number of senators who played their part in the administration of the Empire at large, see Halfmann 1982 and Salmeri 1991, 569-575.

⁷⁹ See *supra* nn. 5 and 6. On Foucault’s conception of ancient and Christian sexuality, see e.g. Gaca 2003.

⁸⁰ Veyne 1983.

⁸¹ On all this see Salmeri 1999, 112-113.

⁸² On Plutarch and Dio of Prusa, see Swain 1996, 135-241; Swain 2000.

⁸³ On political life and its forms in the Greek world during the Roman period, see Salmeri 2007.

⁸⁴ Salmeri 2007, §§ 1 and 2.

⁸⁵ Salmeri 2000, 70-77.

⁸⁶ *Or.* 10. 27-28.

fellow-citizens – in his political speeches – to resolve their conflicts within the city rather than calling on the intervention of the Roman authorities.

This then is the context for our investigation of *eutaxia* in the centuries of the Roman Empire. We left the term at the end of the second century BC, when the association with the military sphere had long since faded, and *eutaxia* had passed from being an instrument of victory on the battlefield to indicating the ‘disciplined’ behaviour of groups or certain categories of individuals. In the first century BC, and increasingly so thereafter, this trend in its usage strengthens. Corresponding to the shift towards interiority outlined above, the most indicative application of the term *eutaxia* emerges in the “decrets de consolation”, as Louis Robert called them, honouring a citizen on his death.⁸⁷

These decrees are characteristic of the Imperial age, and to judge by the material available to us they seem to have been particularly in vogue at Aphrodisias and Amorgos, with other examples coming from Iasos, Aizanoi, Herakleia under Salbake and elsewhere in Asia Minor.⁸⁸ Of particular interest are two decrees from Herakleia under Salbake. The first commemorates Euneikos, who having died young was honoured among other things for his *sôphrosynê* (temperance), *eutaxia* and *kosmia agôgê* (well-ordered training).⁸⁹ The second commemorates a woman called Ammia who had lived *eutaktôs*, *sôphronôs* (discreetly) and *axiôs tês tôn progonôn aretês* (showing herself worthy of the virtue of her forebears).⁹⁰ In these two texts *eutaxia* is no longer a quality reserved for certain categories such as envoys and *grammateis*, but is attributed more generically to young men and women. This is borne out by some of the decrees referred to above, such as one from Aphrodisias which honours a woman for living *eutaktôs* and *kosmiôs*,⁹¹ and one from Iasos in which *eutaxia* figures among the qualities ascribed to a youth.⁹² It can also be recalled that *eutaktôs* is the word used for the behaviour of the son of Apollonius in the *consolatio* dedicated to the latter contained in the *corpus* of Plutarch’s works.⁹³ And in the *Praecepta coniugalia*, the author of Chaironeia repeatedly presents *eutaxia* as a requisite for every bride.⁹⁴

How is it that the quality of *eutaxia* came to be extended to youths and women, naturally of the upper classes? For the former the answer must lie in the practice of the gymnasium, while for the latter we can only point to the gradual turning inwards of mentality in the Imperial age.⁹⁵ In this respect *eutaxia* in its meaning of obedience and decorum could well be attributed as a female quality.

In the same centuries we find a parallel development of the term, corresponding to usage in the “decrets de consolation”, in medical and philosophical texts. Here too *eutaxia* refers to an orderly, sober behaviour on the part of an individual. In Epictetus we read a ‘recipe’ for ensuring victory in the Olympics: “You have to submit to discipline (*eutaktein*), follow a strict diet, give up sweet cakes, train under compulsion, at a fixed

⁸⁷ Robert 1965, 229-31.

⁸⁸ See *supra* n. 87; *Ivlasos* 118-120; J. and L. Robert, *Bull. Ep.* 1976, 304-305, no. 676; Robert 1954, 177.

⁸⁹ Robert 1954, 177, no. 70.

⁹⁰ Robert 1954, 177-178, no. 71.

⁹¹ Robert 1965, 229-230.

⁹² *Ivlasos* 119.

⁹³ Plut. 119f.

⁹⁴ Plut. 141e, 142a, 145a. See Robert 1964, 161, and for the Hellenistic period Zanker 1993.

⁹⁵ See Salmeri 1999.

hour, in heat or in cold; you must not drink cold water, nor wine just whenever you feel like it; you must have turned yourself over to your trainer precisely as you would to a physician”.⁹⁶ In this passage *eutaktein* covers all the restrictions and limitations which an athlete must submit to in order to be victorious, bearing out the notion that in Imperial times *eutaxia* was one of the most representative terms alluding to the need for self-control. Indeed the term was used in common parlance to indicate sexual continence.⁹⁷ And it is highly significant that in the Imperial onomastics, where terms of quality and competence are particularly prized, *Eutaxia* and *Eutaktos* figure as nouns applied to all classes of society, from slaves to the upper echelons.⁹⁸ Nothing of the kind would have been conceivable in the Athens of the fifth and fourth centuries BC.

8. So much, then, for the individual sphere. During the Imperial age the term *eutaxia* also came to be used in the political sphere, and this was a highly innovative departure. As we have seen, in Aristotle’s *Politics* there are some references to *eutaxia*,⁹⁹ but it was in the Imperial age, and especially in the first half of the second century AD, that it came to feature in political debate in the cities of Asia Minor. Before looking at some specific cases it is worth recalling its use by Dio of Prusa in describing the constitution (*politeia*) of Rhodos.¹⁰⁰ This usage – for a state that was certainly not considered by the ancients as a democratic one¹⁰¹ – seems somehow to be connected to the Aristotelian characterisation of *eutaxia* as the guarantee of continuity for an oligarchic regime,¹⁰² confirming the inclusion of the term in the sphere of conservation and safeguarding of the existing order.

It is once again Dio of Prusa who enables us to appreciate the role of *eutaxia* in the political debate that characterised the Greek cities during the Imperial age. Of particular significance are three of his speeches delivered in the first decade of the second century AD, one in Alexandria and the other two in Tarsus. His aim on each occasion was to ensure the return of law and order following episodes of disorderly behaviour on the part of the inhabitants, while civic life in Tarsus in particular was marred by fierce contrasts at all levels.¹⁰³

To judge from what he himself says in the course of his speeches, Dio seems to have been invited by local people to address the inhabitants of Alexandria and Tarsus, and of other *poleis* in Asia Minor, on account of the prestige he had acquired during his long life for his oratorical skills and, above all, his sound wisdom.¹⁰⁴ In his missions as ‘counsellor’ to cities Dio used the term *eutaxia* no less than five times in the speeches he

⁹⁶ *Encheiridion* 29.

⁹⁷ Gal. 8.451K; Suet. *Domit.* 10.2. In the latter it is the senator L. Aelius Lamia who uses *eutaktein* to indicate sexual continence, showing the term’s diffusion in this sense also in Rome in the last decades of the first century AD. In *De off.* 1.142 Cicero states that in Latin *eutaxia* is usually rendered by *modestia* (“quo in verbo modus est”), but adds that it can also be understood as “ordinis conservatio”. In the military sphere *eutaxia* seems to have been translated as *disciplina*; for the cult of *Disciplina militaris* or *Augusti*, see *AE* 1993, 15, no. 26.

⁹⁸ Robert 1964, 160-162.

⁹⁹ See *supra* nn. 18-19.

¹⁰⁰ *Or.* 31.146.

¹⁰¹ Strabo 652C; see Gabrielsen *et alii* 2000.

¹⁰² *Supra* n. 19.

¹⁰³ *Or.* 32 (Alexandria), *Or.* 33-34 (Tarsus); see Salmeri 2000, 73, 81-83.

¹⁰⁴ Salmeri 2000, 76-81.

delivered in Alexandria and Tarsus. In one case, in the Egyptian city, *eutaxia* is presented as the right way for the city to respond to the goodwill shown by the Emperor.¹⁰⁵ It is associated with *kosmos* and with the inhabitants' ability to show themselves sane and steady (*sôphrones*, *bebaioi*). In Tarsus, on the other hand, Dio presents *eutaxia* as the instrument for maintaining the privileges obtained from the central power.¹⁰⁶ More generally, in Alexandria Dio – associating *eutaxia*, among other things, with *praotês* (gentleness), *homonoia* (concord) and *kosmos politeias* (civic order) – declares that a city should be praised for these qualities rather than for a large population, abundance of trade or the size of its fleet.¹⁰⁷ At Tarsus he cites *eutaxia* and *sôphrosynê* as the two qualities which once ensured the city's reputation.¹⁰⁸ In one final passage of outstanding importance, Dio reminds his listeners in Tarsus that the Spartans, after losing their pre-eminence in Greece to Athens as a result of the Persian wars, gave up all their claims to the islands, Ionia and the Hellespont. At the same time they set about teaching themselves self-control and confined their attention to the affairs of the city, fully realising that nothing should be held more important than *nomos* and *eutaxia*.¹⁰⁹

Here *eutaxia* is associated with *nomos* just as in one of the two passages from Aristotle cited above,¹¹⁰ and moreover it is linked to taking care of one's own affairs and the inner dimension. It is presented as a quality for times of difficulty, when one is more inclined to turn in on oneself than to look outwards. As a key word in political debate in the *poleis* of the Imperial age, *eutaxia* is quite distinct from the terms associated with equality (*isêgoria*, *isonomia*) that characterised such debate in classical Athens.¹¹¹ It is much more concerned with conservation, evoking the maintenance of acquired privileges and the avoidance of Imperial intervention in the city's internal affairs.

This picture can be further elaborated if we look at the orations by Aelius Aristides composed a few decades later. In spite of some variants, his presentation of *eutaxia* does not really differ from that of Dio.¹¹² Nonetheless, in a passage from an oration in honour of Athena¹¹³ he attributes to the goddess the ability to banish, among other things, *ataxia* (disorder), *stasis* (faction) and *hybris* (violence), replacing them with *eutaxia*, *homonoia* and other positive qualities. Here *eutaxia* appears as a divine gift, lying like *homonoia* outside the sphere of human action, and this is certainly a departure from Dio of Prusa's approach to politics, characterised by rationality and concreteness. It brings to an end the development of the term *eutaxia* we have traced starting from Aeschylus and particularly Thucydides. This development involved transformations and indeed inversions in meaning but prior to the mid-second century AD the term was never associated with the supernatural sphere. The figure of Athena as purveyor of *eutaxia*, albeit in the context of an oration which is in effect an aretology, is quite incompatible with the historical outlook of Thucydides or the political outlook of Aristotle or indeed Dio of Prusa.

¹⁰⁵ Or. 32.95.

¹⁰⁶ Or. 34.25.

¹⁰⁷ Or. 32.37.

¹⁰⁸ Or. 33.48.

¹⁰⁹ Or. 34.49, cf. *supra* n. 35.

¹¹⁰ *Supra* n. 18.

¹¹¹ See Meier 1983, 283-284; Salmeri 2007, § 3. On *isonomia*, see Levy 2005.

¹¹² See e.g. Aristid. Or. 23.34, 34.63.

¹¹³ Or. 37.27.

To conclude these reflections on *eutaxia*'s role as a key word in the political debate in the Greek world of the Imperial age, we can note that *homonoia*¹¹⁴ was the term more commonly used to express the need for law and order on the part of the notables in the various *poleis* so as to reduce the risk of interventions by the central authorities and maintain the status quo. At the same time, however, *eutaxia* as a political slogan appears to be more deeply rooted than *homonoia* in the contemporary mentality, because of its usage in the "decrets de consolation", the onomastics and in the writings of the moralists.¹¹⁵ In this material *eutaxia* shows itself as a quality implying control, associated above all with the world of women and youths, expressing the ideal of an orderly, submissive behaviour which was precisely what notables wished for on the part of the inhabitants of the *poleis* of Asia Minor. Thus we encounter a case of mirroring of the private sphere in the public sphere, and vice versa, which I believe to be unmatched for perspicuity in the Imperial age. *Eutaxia* in fact had remained in use for centuries without becoming worn out, and had proved its worth in manifesting a mentality grounded in that need for order and control that following Chaironeia had characterised the transformation – not the end! – of the Greek city in the framework of large centralised states.

¹¹⁴ On *homonoia*, see Thériault 1996. In any case *eutaxia* is often found in association with *homonoia*, see *supra* nn. 107, 113.

¹¹⁵ See *supra* § 7.

References

- Adams 2003 = J.N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge 2003.
- Allen 1983 = R.E. Allen, *The Attalid Kingdom. A Constitutional History*, Oxford 1983.
- Ando 2000 = C. Ando, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*, Berkeley 2000.
- Braund 1984 = D.C. Braund, *Rome and the Friendly King. The Character of Client Kingship*, London 1984.
- Brélaz 2005 = C. Brélaz, *La sécurité publique en Asie Mineure sous le Principat (I^{er}-III^{ème} s. ap. J.-C.). Institutions municipales et institutions impériales dans l'Orient Romain*, Basle 2005.
- Burke 1997 = P. Burke, 'Strengths and Weaknesses of the History of Mentalities', in P. Burke, *Varieties of Cultural History*, Cambridge 1997, 162-182.
- Burke 2004 = P. Burke, *What is Cultural History?*, Cambridge 2004.
- Campanile 2003 = D. Campanile, 'L'infanzia della provincia d'Asia: l'origine dei *conventus iuridici* nella provincia', in C. Bearzot, F. Landucci Gattinoni and G. Zecchini (eds.), *Gli stati territoriali nel mondo antico*, Milan 2003, 271-288.
- Cartledge 1998 = P. Cartledge, 'Introduction: Defining a *kosmos*', in P. Cartledge, P. Millet and S. von Reden (eds.), *Kosmos. Essays in Order, Conflict and Community in Classical Athens*, Cambridge 1998, 1-12.
- Chaniotis 1988 = A. Chaniotis, 'Als die Diplomaten noch tanzten und sangen. Zu zwei Dekreten kretischer Städte in Mylasa', *ZPE* 71 (1988), 154-156.
- Chaniotis 2005 = A. Chaniotis, *War in the Hellenistic World. A Social and Cultural History*, Oxford 2005.
- Crowther 1991 = Ch. Crowther, 'Euexia, Eutaxia, Philoponia: Three Contests of the Greek Gymnasium', *ZPE* 85 (1991), 301-304.
- Crowther 2006 = Ch. Crowther, 'Foreign Judges in Thessaly in the Hellenistic Period: A Second Century Phenomenon', in G.A. Pikoulas (ed.), *Inscriptions and History of Thessaly. New Evidence, Proceedings of the International Symposium in Honor of Professor Christian Habicht*, Volos 2006, 31-48.
- Dover 1974 = K. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*, Berkeley 1974.
- Dunbar 1995 = Aristophanes, *Birds*, ed. with introd. and comm. by N. Dunbar, Oxford 1995.
- Faraguna 1992 = M. Faraguna, *Atene nell'età di Alessandro. Problemi politici, economici, finanziari*, Roma 1992.
- Foucault 1984 = M. Foucault, *Le souci de soi*, Paris 1984.
- Gabrielsen et alii 2000 = V. Gabrielsen et alii (eds.), *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society*, Aarhus 2000.
- Gaca 2003 = K.L. Gaca, *The Making of Fornication: Eros, Ethics, and Political Reform in Greek Philosophy and Early Christianity*, Berkeley 2003.
- Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993 = Ph. Gauthier and M.B. Hatzopoulos, *La loi gymnasiarchique de Beroia*, Athens 1993.
- Gruen 1984 = E. Gruen, *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome I-II*, Berkeley 1984.
- Habicht 1997 = Chr. Habicht, *Athens from Alexander to Anthony*, Engl. transl., Cambridge, Mass. 1997.

- Halfmann 1982 = H. Halfmann, 'Die Senatoren aus den kleinasiatischen Provinzen des römischen Reiches vom 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert (Asia, Pontus-Bithynia, Lycia-Pamphylia, Galatia, Cappadocia, Cilicia)', in *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio II (Tituli 5)*, Roma 1982, 603-650.
- Harris 2001 = W.V. Harris, *Restraining Rage: The Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity*, Cambridge, Mass. 2001.
- Hopkins 2002 = K. Hopkins, 'Rome, Taxes, Rents and Trade', in W. Scheidel and S. von Reden (eds.), *The Ancient Economy*, Edinburgh 2002.
- IOrop* = *Οι επιγραφές του Ωρωπού*, ed. by V.Ch. Petrakos, Athens 1997.
- IvIasos* = *Die Inschriften von Iasos I-II*, ed. by W. Blümel, Bonn 1985 (IK 28. 1-2)
- IvIlion* = *Die Inschriften von Ilion*, ed. by P. Frisch, Bonn 1975 (IK 3).
- IvMetropolis* = *Die Inschriften von Metropolis I*, ed. by B. Dreyer and H. Engelmann, Bonn 2003 (IK 63).
- IvPriene* = *Inschriften von Priene*, ed. by F. Hiller von Gaertringen, Berlin 1906.
- Jones 2004 = Chr. Jones, 'Events Surrounding the Bequest of Pergamon to Rome and the Revolt of Aristonicos: New Inscriptions from Metropolis', *JRA* 17 (2004), 469-485.
- Jouanna 1999 = J. Jouanna, *Hippocrates*, Engl. transl., Baltimore 1999.
- Kah 2004 = D. Kah, 'Militärische Ausbildung im hellenistischen Gymnasion', in D. Kah and P. Scholz (eds.), *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*, Berlin 2004, 47-90.
- Kaizer and Facella forthcoming = T. Kaizer and M. Facella (eds.), *Kingdoms and Principalities in the Roman Near East*, Stuttgart forthcoming.
- Kaster 2005 = R. Kaster, *Emotion, Restraint and Community in Ancient Rome*, Oxford 2005.
- Knoepfler 1979 = D. Knoepfler, 'Contributions à l'épigraphie de Chalcis', *BCH* 103 (1979), 165-188.
- Knoepfler 2001 = D. Knoepfler, *Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté* (Eretria XI), Lausanne 2001.
- Konstan 2001 = D. Konstan, *Pity Transformed*, London 2001.
- Lambert 2001 = S.D. Lambert, 'Ten Notes on Attic Inscriptions', *ZPE* 135 (2001), 51-62.
- Launey 1949-50 = M. Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques I-II*, Paris 1949-50 (repr. in 1987 with additional comments by Y. Garlan, Ph. Gauthier and Cl. Orrieux).
- Lawton 1995 = C.L. Lawton, *Attic Document Reliefs: Art and Politics in Ancient Athens*, Oxford 1995.
- Le Goff 1974 = J. Le Goff, 'Les mentalités. Une histoire ambiguë', in J. Le Goff and P. Nora (eds.), *Faire de l'histoire*, Paris 1974, 76-94.
- Levy 2005 = E. Levy, 'Isonomia', in U. Bultrighini (ed.), *Democrazia e antidemocrazia nel mondo greco*, Alessandria 2005, 119-137.
- Ma 2000 = J. Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford 2000.
- Ma 2002 = J. Ma, '«Oversexed, Overpaid, Over here»: A Response to Angelos Chaniotis', in A. Chaniotis and P. Ducrey (eds.), *Army and Power in the Ancient World*, Stuttgart 2002, 115-122.
- Meier 1983 = Chr. Meier, *Die Entstehung des Politischen bei den Griechen*, Frankfurt am Main 1983 (pocketbook ed.).

- Morgan 2007 = T. Morgan, *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire*, Cambridge 2007.
- Morris 2000 = I. Morris, *Archaeology as Cultural History*, Oxford 2000.
- Palagia 1975 = O. Palagia, 'A Draped Female Torso in the Ashmolean Museum', *JHS* 95 (1975), 180-182.
- Parker 1996 = R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History*, Oxford 1996.
- Pelekidis 1962 = Chr. Pelekidis, *Histoire de l'éphébie attique dès origines à 31 avant Jésus-Christ*, Paris 1962.
- Poirrier 2004 = Ph. Poirrier, *Les enjeux de l'histoire culturelle*, Paris 2004.
- Pritchett 1974 = W.K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War II*, Berkeley 1974.
- Quass 1982 = F. Quass, 'Zur politischen Tätigkeit der munizipalen Aristokratie des griechischen Ostens in der Kaiserzeit', *Historia* 31 (1982), 188-213.
- Robert 1927 = L. Robert, 'Études d'épigraphie grecque', *R.Ph.* 53 (1927), 97-132 (*Opera Minora Selecta* II, 1052-1087).
- Robert 1936 = L. Robert, *Collection Froehner I, Inscriptions grecques*, Paris 1936.
- Robert 1954 = L. and J. Robert, *La Carie. Histoire et géographie historique*, Paris 1954.
- Robert 1964 = L. Robert, 'Index commenté des noms des personnes', in N. Firatli, *Les stèles funéraires de Byzance gréco-romaine*, Paris 1964, 131-189.
- Robert 1965 = L. Robert, *Hellenica* XIII, Paris 1965.
- Robert 1969 = L. Robert, 'Théophraste de Mytilène à Constantinople', *CRAI* 1969, 42-64 (*Opera Minora Selecta* V, 561-583).
- Robert 1973 = L. Robert, 'Les juges étrangers dans la cité grecque', in Xenion. *Festschrift für P.J. Zepos*, Athens 1973, 765-782 (*Opera Minora Selecta* V, 137-154).
- Robert 1976 = L. and J. Robert, 'Une inscription grecque de Téos en Ionie. L'union de Téos et de Kyrbissos', *JS* 1976, 153-235 (*Opera Minora Selecta* VII, 297-379).
- Robert 1983 = J. and L. Robert, *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie I, Exploration, histoire, monnaies et inscriptions*, Paris 1983.
- Robert 1989 = L. and J. Robert, *Claros I, Décrets hellénistiques*, Paris 1989.
- Ruzé 2003 = F. Ruzé, *Eunomia. A la recherche de l'équité*, Paris 2003.
- Salmeri 1987 = G. Salmeri, rev. of Gruen 1984, *RSI* 99 (1987), 787-793.
- Salmeri 1991 = G. Salmeri, 'Dalle province a Roma: il rinnovamento del Senato', in *Storia di Roma* II. 2, Torino 1991, 553-575.
- Salmeri 1999 = G. Salmeri, 'La periodizzazione della storia romana imperiale e l'emergere del sé', *Storica* 13 (1999), 105-124.
- Salmeri 2000 = G. Salmeri, 'Dio, Rome, and the Civic Life of Asia Minor', in Swain 2000, 53-92.
- Salmeri 2000a = G. Salmeri, 'Regioni, popoli e lingue epicore d'Asia Minore nella Geografia di Strabone', in A.M. Biraschi and G. Salmeri (eds.), *Strabone e l'Asia Minore*, Napoli 2000, 157-188.
- Salmeri 2005 = G. Salmeri, 'Central Power Intervention and the Economy of the Provinces in the Roman Empire', in S. Mitchell and C. Katsari (eds.), *Patterns in the Economy of Roman Asia Minor*, Swansea 2005, 187-206.
- Salmeri 2007 = G. Salmeri, 'Le forme della politica nelle città greche dell'epoca post-classica', in A. Baroni (ed.), *Amministrare un impero. Roma e le sue province*, Trento 2007, 145-174.
- Schwenk 1985 = C.J. Schwenk, *Athens in the Age of Alexander. The Dated Laws & Decrees of 'the Lykourgan Era', 338 – 322 BC*, Chicago 1985.

- Sokolowski 1969 = F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques*, Paris 1969.
- Swain 1996 = S. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50-250*, Oxford 1996.
- Swain 2000 = S. Swain (ed.), *Dio Chrysostom. Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*, Oxford 2000.
- Thériault 1996 = G. Thériault, *Le culte d'homonoia dans les cités grecques*, Lyons 1996.
- Tod 1932 = M.N. Tod, *Sidelights on Greek History*, Oxford 1932.
- Veyne 1983 = P. Veyne, *Les Grecs ont-ils cru à leurs mythes? Essai sur l'imagination constituante*, Paris 1983.
- Veyne 1985 = P. Veyne, 'L'Empire romain', in Ph. Ariès and Ch. Duby (eds.), *Histoire de la vie privée I, De l'Empire romain à l'an mil*, Paris 1985, 19-224.
- Virgilio 2007 = B. Virgilio, 'L'esplorazione in Cilicia e l'epistola regia sulla indisciplina dell'esercito acquartierato a Soli', *MUSJ* 60 (2007), 165-240.
- Welles 1934 = C.B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period. A Study in Greek Epigraphy*, London 1934.
- Whitehead 1993 = D. Whitehead, 'Cardinal Virtues: the Language of Public Approbation in Democratic Athens', *C&M* 44 (1993), 37-75.
- Wörle 1988 = M. Wörle, *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien*, Munich 1988.
- Woolf 1994 = G. Woolf, 'Becoming Roman, Staying Greek: Culture, Identity and the Civilizing Process in the Roman East', *PCPhS* 40 (1994), 116-143.
- Zanker 1993 = P. Zanker, 'The Hellenistic Grave Stelai from Smyrna: Identity and Self-Image in the Polis', in A. Bulloch *et alii* (eds.), *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley 1993, 212-230.