RULING, INDUCING, ARGUING: HOW TO GOVERN (AND SURVIVE) A GREEK PROVINCE

By
C. KOKKINIA

“What about the 500 cities of Asia? Are they not all unguarded, yet obey one governor and the consular fasces?”¹ This famous statement of Josephus has been greeted with disbelief by many scholars, some of whom simply cannot believe it to be true, and others of whom attempt to preserve the historian’s veracity by interpreting Josephus to refer only to the lack of legions in Asia: the provincial guard consisted, then, of auxiliary forces.² But Josephus probably never intended the statement to be parsed so closely. It is, after all, part of a speech, and a rather desperate and emotional speech at that. At most, it should be taken to convey Josephus’ belief that the Greeks living in the province of Asia were not ruled by Roman military force chiefly. But this is no less interesting.

This is a paper about the style of Roman provincial government, about governors’ rhetorical tactics and their diplomacy when dealing with inferiors who did not always see themselves as inferiors; a paper about how representatives of a superpower used language to deal with the pride and quarrels of a provincial society with an old and greatly respected political culture. In this paper I will present four cases illustrating how provincial governors in the East, that is, the Roman officials dealing directly with the Greeks of the Roman empire, went about ruling this proud and quarrelsome folk.

The governor as leader (Beroia, Macedonia)

A recently discovered and exceptionally interesting epigraphical document preserves a Roman governor’s decisions in a controversy concerning the

¹ Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum* 2.366. I am indebted to J. E. Lendon for valuable corrections and suggestions. I should also like to thank M. Chatzopoulos, A. Chaniotis and P. Paschidis for discussing various aspects of this paper.

² M.P. Speidel, *The Roman Army in Asia Minor*, in: S. Mitchell, ed., *Armies and Frontiers in Roman and Byzantine Anatolia. Proceedings of a Colloquium Held at University College, Swansea, in April 1981, BAR Intern. Ser. 156* (Oxford 1984), 7-34; cf. W. Eck, ‘Prokonsuln und militärisches Kommando. Folgerungen aus Diplomen für prokonsulare Provinzen’, in: R. Frei-Stolba and M.A. Speidel, eds., *Die Verwaltung des römischen Reiches in der hohen Kaiserzeit*, vol. 2 (Basel 1998), 187-202, n. 5. Cf. *infra*, n. 54.

gymnasium of Macedonian Beroia in the second century A.D.³ The city had been forced to close its gymnasium due to lack of funds and a shortage of men prepared to undertake the costly office of gymnasiarch.⁴ Now the proconsul of Macedonia made detailed provisions aimed at insuring the continuous operation of the gymnasium in the future, after which a local man named [J]ulianus⁵ apparently spared no cost to provide his city with a *stele* making public and eternal the governor's rulings in over 130 neatly inscribed lines.⁶

Unfortunately, the inscription is only partly preserved, leaving us with the left half of each line and some guesswork to do. There are four pieces, of which A and B belong together, as do C and D. An unknown number of lines is missing between those these pairs of fragments, but such as they are, the remains are substantial, making it possible to infer the general context, at least in the introduction.

In addressing the matter of the gymnasium, the proconsul Lucius Memmius Rufus⁷ seems to have produced a remarkable piece of rhetoric. He begins by declaring his continuous interest, ever since he assumed office, in enhancing the prestige of the cities of his province, whether small or large.⁸

³ Α. Γουναραπούλου / M.B. Χατζόπουλος, *Επιγραφές Κάτω Μακεδονίας. Τεύχος Α. Επιγραφές Βέροιας* (Athens 1998), no. 7 = SEG 48, 742. This inscription has been edited by P. Nigdelis and G. Souris (henceforth: I. Beroia 7).

⁴ I. Beroia 7, line 6: ἔσθ' ὅτε λειτουργῶν ἐνδεία συνβέβηκεν τὸ γυμνάσιον κεκλεισθαι] the gymnasium has occasionally been closed down for dearth of liturgists; l. 8: ἐπειδὴν γυμνασιάρχος ἐλλίπη when there is no gymnasiarch; l. 74: εὐρεθῆ γυμνασιάρχος that a gymnasiarch be found.

⁵ Ibid., lines 33-35: Τῇ πόλει [---- ca. 10-11 ----] 'Ιουλιανὸς διὰ τῆς Γ(αῖου) Π[---- ca. 11-12 ----] ΠΑ [----- ca. 8-9 ---- ἐπιμ]ελείας τὴν στήλλην χα[ράξας ἀνέθηκεν ἐ]κ τῶν ιδίων.

⁶ Though Roman officials often prescribe that a document be publicly displayed, their demands never concern publication on stone. Cf. Eck 1998, op. cit. (n. 2), 359-381. We might expect that the purposes of preserving and displaying an important document would have been served just as well by an abridged version of the text, or even a listing of the provisions contained in it. Instead, the entire documentation, including an extensive introduction, was carved in stone.

⁷ This proconsul was until now unknown. The inscription has been dated to the first half of the second century AD based on the lettering. The editors promise more on this subject in a monograph in preparation.

⁸ Ibid. L. A+B 1-2: ἀφ' ἧς μόνον ἐπέβην τῆς τοῦ ἔθ[νους ἡγεμονίας]. Although ἐπιβαίνω usually requires a geographic term in the genitive, and thus one would expect τῆς ἐπαρχίας, an abstract noun such as ἡγεμονίας is also possible. Given the fact that ΕΘ... must be the beginning of ἔθνος, and that ἡγεμονία τοῦ ἔθνος is a common expression, Nigdelis and

He mentions Beroia's title as *metropolis* of Macedonia and confirms that the city deserves this honorific title, and then uses strong words to express his indignation over the fact that such an important community had to close its gymnasium for lack of citizens willing to support it.⁹ The solution, he says, will be to gather adequate resources for the city to fall back upon when none of its prominent citizens offer to carry the costs, and to guarantee that these resources will be available in the future.¹⁰ There follows a relatively extended section describing how the governor's plan was supported by the *protoi tes patridos*, the most prominent citizens. We can infer from repeated mentions (l. 20, 71, 78?) that one of these *protoi*, the priest of the imperial cult, a man named Flavius Paramonos, was involved, not only in the implementation, but very likely also in the conception of this plan. Apparently with line 13 the introductory part of the document ends, and the actual provisions begin. Of these, most concern the rededication of sums donated for various other purposes to the purpose of financing the gymnasium. This must have been a delicate matter, to say the least, because many donors went to lengths to prevent exactly this sort of misappropriation of their endowments. No doubt the governor needed strong support within the city to overcome the resistance such encroachments were bound to evoke. Many prominent citizens may have endorsed the plan because lacking a functioning gymnasium was indeed αἰσχιστον, as the governor put it.¹¹ Some will have gone along because the influential Flavius Paramonos had asked them to; others because they lacked enough clout to oppose Paramonos and his party when they sided with the governor; finally, some of those who had their own or their ancestor's endowments hijacked and put at the disposal of future gym-

Souris' restoration seems secure. For a parallel to the governor's stated concern for the prestige of cities, cf. ILS 705, translated by J.E. Lendon, *Empire of Honour. The Art of Government in the Roman World* (Oxford 1997), 125.

⁹ The title *metropolis* is supplied in a plausible restoration in line A+B 4: ἡ πρωτεύουσα τῆς Μακεδονίας καὶ κατὰ ἀξίωμα [μητρόπολις --] the first city of Macedonia and [metropolis] in accordance with its rank (or reputation). L. A+B 6: αἰσχιστον most shameful.

¹⁰ Ebd., lines A+B 7-9. Only the general sense can be inferred: ἐπεμελήθη καὶ [-----] ἵον τῇ πόλει μείναι, ὥστε ἐπειδὴν γυμνασίαρχος ἐλλίπη, μ[.]νο[---- ca. 36 ----] ὑπαρξιν διηνεκίαν χ[-----] ὡς ἀφθαρτον φυλάσσεσθαι. The [---]ον in line A+B 7 possibly belonged to ἀρχαίον or κεφάλαιον (in both cases capital) or ἀργύριον (money).

¹¹ L. A+B 6.

nasiarchs may have felt compensated by a honourable mention of their family's name on this ornate monument.¹²

Just as the inscription will have been pleasing and honourable to some, it will have been displeasing and dishonourable to others – a quality of major public inscriptions which is often neglected. The tight-fisted who had refused to become gymnasiarch are not listed, but everyone will have known who they were, given the “face-to-face” quality of life in ancient cities, and how small the ruling class was.¹³ The monument made permanent and spectacular the governor's reproach to them, and was posted in or near the gymnasium,¹⁴ where their sons would spend hours every day, and visitors of the city and future Roman officials would read it in years to come.

Yet Rufus' actions, however contentious locally, would have met the approval of another, better known governor, Pliny the Younger. In his letters to Trajan, Pliny presents himself standing well above the local elite, but always willing to lead various campaigns in worthy causes. Pliny's activism will have produced situations similar to that in Beroia.¹⁵ He too was always eager to marshal local support for ambitious projects, such as connecting a river to a lake, or turning sad architectural ruins into an elegant bath. On these occasions, Pliny assures Trajan that funding could be secured from local resources. Some provincials may have indeed applauded Pliny's zeal, but others would no doubt have preferred to govern their cities without his interference and his yearning to change everything for the better, which will have left the cities of Bithynia at sixes and sevens, at least at the outset.

In his introduction to the edict, Memmius Rufus strives to make the need for his reform as compelling as possible to the proud and patriotic leadership of Beroia. The governor contrasts cities that are “smaller”

¹² So perhaps Neoptolemos Neoptole mou, I. A+B 24, Philippos, I. A+B 26, Plautianus Alexander, I. A+B 28, Tharsunon, I. A+B 31, Eulaios, I. A+B 33, Menander, I. A+B 35 and the young men Appius und Severus, I. A+B 72.

¹³ Beroia was the second most important city in Macedonia at that time, and is called πόλις μεγάλη καὶ πολυάνθρωπος by Lucian almost a century later (*Lucius, or the Ass*, 34). Nevertheless, all but the largest ancient cities were small by any modern standard. See A. Tataki, *Ancient Beroea. Prosopography and society* (Athens 1988). R. MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations* (New Haven 1974), 64-65, on how one's doings and reputation were “a matter of common report” in such a city. Pages 57-87 of this book offer a most valuable and vivid description of life in an ancient city.

¹⁴ Fragment A, the biggest of the four, was excavated at the site of the ancient gymnasium; I. Beroia p. 101.

¹⁵ See R. Talbert, ‘Pliny the Younger as governor of Bithynia-Pontus’, in: C. Deroux, ed., *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, vol. 2 (Brussels 1980), 412-435.

(μεικρότεραι) and “remote” (ἀνακεχωρηκυῖαι) with the city addressed, which he names the “first” (πρωτεύουσα) city of the province and “deserving” (κατὰ ἀξίωμα) holder of the title “*metropolis*”.¹⁶ There is more to some of these expressions than immediately meets the eye of the modern reader. Ἀνακεχωρηκός of places meant remote in a geographical sense. In association with things and words, it could mean unfamiliar, obscure. In literary sources of Roman date, and referring to people, the term meant isolated, detached from society, having abandoned civic life.¹⁷ Of course the word *polis* denotes a body of citizens at least as much as it denotes an urban settlement. And by speaking of small and ἀνακεχωρηκυῖαι *poleis*, the governor seems to have chosen his words to allude as much to the culture of the inhabitants as to the physical remoteness of their cities, and so to arouse associations of cultural and political insignificance. Citizenship of a proper *polis* was a prerogative of Hellenism, as was the education provided in the *polis*, in particular in its gymnasium. In this context therefore, ‘small and remote’ could well be read as ‘mean’ and, as it were, ‘ungreek’. Failing to maintain a functioning gymnasium, Beroia did not deserve a role in the life of the Greco-Roman empire: this must have been the force of the Roman’s allusion and the Beroians will have sensed it.

¹⁶ L. 3-4. On use of the city’s titles as a way of manipulating the inhabitants cf. Lendon 1997, op. cit. (n. 8), 136-7.

¹⁷ The latter meaning may be traced back to one of the most famous texts of classical philosophy dealing with the duty of citizens to respect the laws and serve one’s country at all events, Plato’s *Crito* (51 B): τὸ δίκαιον οὕτως ἔχει, καὶ οὐχ ὑπεικτέον οὐδ’ ἀναχωρητέον οὐδὲ λειπτέον τὴν τάξιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν πολέμῳ καὶ ἐν δικαστηρίῳ καὶ πανταχοῦ ποιητέον ἃ ἂν κελεύῃ ἡ πόλις καὶ ἡ πατρίς (‘...shouldn’t give way or *withdraw* or desert...’). Socrates’ elegant rhetoric is repeated in Stobaeus’ anthology in the chapter περὶ πατρίδος. Later, Plutarch sees in the political quietism endorsed by the Epicureans an attitude ‘indifferent to humanity’ (βίος ἀνέξοδος καὶ ἀπολίτευτος καὶ ἀφιλόανθρωπος, Mor. 1098 d). In the second century AD ἀνακεχωρηκός could have such negative connotations, that we find it among a host of undesirable dispositions fostered by a hazardous stellar constellation (Claudius Ptolemaeus’ astrological work *Apotelesmatica* is a rich source on moralizing vocabulary of Roman era Greek): Claud. Ptol. 3.14.11: ἐναντίως δὲ καὶ ἀδόξως κείμενος (ὁ Κρόνος) ῥυπαροῦς, μικρολόγους, ἀδιαφόρους, κακογνώμονας, βασκάνους, δειλοῦς, ἀνακεχωρηκότας, κακολόγους, φιλερήμονες, φιλοθρήνους, ἀναιδεῖς, δεισιδαίμονας, φιλομόχθους, ἀστόργους, ἐπιβουλευτικούς τῶν οἰκείων, ἀνευφράντους, μισοσωμάτων (ποιεῖ). Ἀναχωρῶ and related words were used in a positive sense by Christian authors as meaning ‘to abstain from earthly matters’. In a medical work of the seventh cent. AD, by contrast, it is, again, applied as a synonym for ‘unsocial’: Paulus Medicus 7.9 (ed. J.L. Heiberg, *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* 9): χρηστέον προηγουμένως ἐπὶ μελαγχολικῶν, εὐπαροξύντων, ὀργίλων, μισανθρωπούντων ἢ ἀναχωρητικῶν.

In fact, Beroia had been an important civic centre for centuries and its role as such had not diminished at all during the high empire.¹⁸ There are no traces of neglect in the urban landscape of Roman imperial Beroia, quite the contrary: so far as its architecture is concerned, the city was thriving. In that sense, it was κατὰ ἀξίωμα μητρόπολις. So why had the gymnasium found so little support? Maladministration and civic discord could well be responsible. Alternatively or additionally, part of the citizenry may not have been interested in the gymnasium at all, for Beroia had a considerable Jewish population. Paul had found it worthwhile to preach in the synagogue there and, if we may trust *Acts*, his teaching was received with eagerness. He managed during his stay in Beroia to convert many Jews, along with a number of prominent Greek men and women, to his new faith.¹⁹ Some Jews did receive education in the gymnasium,²⁰ and in the days of Memmius Rufus, adherents of Greek traditions almost certainly remained the largest and strongest group in cities like Beroia. But it is important to keep in mind that their pre-eminence was no longer uncontested, and this will have made the Beroians even more sensitive to the nuance of some further observations of the governor. For following another reference to the size of Beroia, this time explicitly mentioning its *demos*,²¹ Rufus seems to have said that it was ‘one of the most shameful things’ for any city to close its gymnasium, ‘all the more so for you, who have been proud of your diligence in such matters’. This, apparently, is uttered as a subordinate clause in the course of saying how he, the governor, has now decided to take the matter in hand.²² This mix of praise and criticism emphasized to the local Greek elite the importance of their traditions and the need to uphold them. The governor deplores the present situation, points to the right course of action, and reserves for himself

¹⁸ See Gounaropoulou and Chatzopoulos 1998, op. cit (n. 3), 37-52 and Laurence Brocas-Deflassieux, *Ἡ Βέροια κατὰ τὴν Ἀρχαιότητα: μελέτη τοπογραφίας* (Beroia 1998).

¹⁹ *Acta Apost.* 17.10, see now F.Ó. Fearghail, ‘The Jews in the Hellenistic cities of Acts’, in: J.R. Bartlett, ed., *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities* (London 2002), 39-54, 45f. on Beroia.

²⁰ See T. Brady, *The Gymnasium in Ptolemaic Egypt* (Missouri 1936), 9-20, cf. L. H. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World* (Princeton 1993), 57-61. On Jews in Beroia see now ‘A. Κουκουβοῦ, ‘Ἡ Ἑβραϊκὴ κοινότητα τῆς Βέροιας στὴν Ἀρχαιότητα. Νέες ἐπιτύμβιες ἐπιγραφές’, *Τεκμήρια* 4 (1998-9), 13-28.

²¹ L. A+B 5: τοιοῦτω δήμῳ

²² See προενό[ησα?] in line A+B 4 and ἐπεμελήθην in line 7.

the leading role in the undertaking. Truly a Roman champion of Greek *paideia*.²³

The governor as partner (Patara, Lycia)

In the year AD 42, a Lycian ambassador stood before a Roman emperor who had an exceptionally good education, but also a bad temper, a stammer, and hardly any public experience at all. The emperor addressed the Lycian with a question in Latin. The Lycian didn't understand the question, and so the Lycian lost his Roman citizenship: one should know Latin to be a Roman, grumbled the emperor Claudius.²⁴ The poor man's disgrace took place during an investigation, conducted by the emperor, of a *stasis* that had

²³ Despite the similarity of the letter forms, we are not necessarily dealing with a single document here, or in fact with a single stele. Though unusual for a stele, a height of more than 2,61 m is not unthinkable – the Lindian Chronicle was inscribed on a stele 2,35 m in height. But if this was indeed a single document, it would be at least four times longer than the longest proconsular edict known (*IK Ephesos* Ia 27 C, lines 333-369; cf. C. Kokkinia, 'Letters of Roman authorities on local dignitaries. The case of Vadius Antoninus', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 142 (2003), 197-213, Appendix no. 39). More likely, the fragments A+B and C+D belonged to two stones, possibly standing next to each other and, most importantly, carrying two separate documents concerning the gymnasium of Beroia. Apart from a gap of unknown length between parts A+B and C+D, there is also a marked difference of style between the two sections. The difference becomes apparent if we isolate those utterances directly relevant to the governor's handling of the situation, more precisely, to the particular way his solutions to the problems at hand are expressed: A+B 7: ἐπεμελήθη I took care that...; 53: καλῶς ἔχον εἶναι μοι δοκεῖ I regard as a good thing...; 55: κατ' ἐμὴν εὐχὴν as I wish...; 58: ἐλπίζω I hope...; 74: εὐχομαι καὶ ἐλπίζω I wish and hope...; 91: γεινέσθω be it... by contrast, C-D 6: ἔνοχος ἔσται will be guilty of..., 10: τῷ διατάγματι διορθῶσαι to correct through this edict..., 11: κελεύω I command..., 18: οὐκ ἐφείημι γείνεσθαι· εἰ γὰρ τολμήσειέν τ[ις] I don't want to happen. And if someone dares to..., 23: [συ?]ναρπάζεται τῇ ἐπείξει μου, κελεύω is seized through my pressure (urging), I order..., 24: μηδὲ διὰ ταύτης τῆς ἀυθαδίας either through such obstinacy... 29: τοὺς τοῦτο τολμώντας ποιεῖν those who dare do this... It can be reasonably deduced from the remnants of fragments C+D that the document they once belonged to addressed violations of existing laws, or of a previous ruling, possibly – but not necessarily – directly in connection with the case presented in A+B. Whatever grievances lay at the core of the second ruling, they are addressed by the issuing authority in a very different style. The problems at hand concern the gymnasium and seem to be of a fiscal nature no less than those dealt with in the first edict, but here threats are held out, there is talk of perpetrators and punishments. In short, C+D must belong to a second document that, together with A+B, was part of a dossier concerning the gymnasium. The second edict is interesting both with regard to the means of deterrence and prosecution available to provincial governors, and as a contrast to the diplomatic approach of the first ruling.

²⁴ Cassius Dio 60.17.3-4.

troubled Lycia and resulted in their proud ἔθνος coming under direct Roman rule. Any doubts that may have existed as to the historicity of this state of faction, as reported by literary sources, have recently been put aside by an extraordinary find, the Claudian monument at Patara.²⁵

On what was originally a column over five meters tall, consisting of nearly sixty blocks, we find a long list of roads built under Claudius and a honorific inscription dedicating the monument to the emperor. “To the emperor” Claudius (with complete titulature), by “the Lycians, friends of the Romans and of the emperor, faithful allies, freed from faction, lawlessness and brigandage through his divine foresight, having recovered concord, the fair administration of justice and the ancestral (?) laws”²⁶ ... “the conduct of affairs having been entrusted to the distinguished councillors, set apart from the promiscuous crowd”.²⁷

²⁵ *Editio princeps*: F. Isik, H. Iskan and N. Cevik, ‘Miliarium Lyciae: Das Wegweisermonument von Patara: Vorbericht’, *Lykia* 4 (2001), 107-109. See now C.P. Jones, ‘The Claudian monument at Patara’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 137 (2001) 161-68.

²⁶ As translated by Jones 2001, op. cit. (n. 25), 163, with minor deviations. I prefer ‘friends of the Romans and of the emperor’ instead of ‘Rome- and Caesar-loving’ as a translation of φιλορώμαιοι καὶ φιλοκαίσαρες, and I am translating πιστοὶ σύμμαχοι as ‘faithful allies’ instead of Jones’ ‘faithful, allied’. On *philosebastos* applied to cities see L. Robert’s comments in: J. des Gagniers, ed., *Laodicée du Lycos. Le Nymphée* (Québec 1969), 281 f., esp. 288-89; cf. the discussion of φιλοσέβαστος, φιλοκαίσαρ and φιλορώμαιοι by K. Buraselis, *Kos between Hellenism and Rome. Studies on the political, institutional and social history of Kos from ca. the middle second century B.C. until late Antiquity* (Philadelphia 2000), 101-108.

²⁷ τῆς πολιτείας τοῖς | ἐξ ἀρίστων ἐ[π]ιλελεγμένοις βουλευταῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀκρίτου | πλήθους π[ι]στευ[θ]εί[σ]ης is an intriguing sentence. The difficulty lies in the interpretation of ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀκρίτου πλήθους. “Ακριτος can have various meanings, all of them clearly negative: whether the crowd is here characterized as “undistinguishable, confused, undecided, doubtful, unpredictable, reckless, indiscreet, not exercising judgement or indiscriminating” (*LSJ*), it is clearly being spoken of badly. And if, as it has been recently suggested by Jones 2001, op. cit. (n. 25), ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀκρίτου πλήθους means that this crowd entrusted the government to the *aristoi*, the phrase is nearly nonsense. Best to begin again by assuming that ἀπὸ is not, as it seems at first, a substitute for ὑπό, but instead that this phrase involves somewhat unusual, maybe forced or affected, syntax. But its ancient audience would nevertheless know what to make of it, because they had heard enough aristocratic/aristotelian rhetoric immediately to recognize the connotations of words such as πολιτεία, ἐξ ἀρίστων ἐπιλεγμένοι and ἄκριτον πλήθος (on words indicating the attitude of the upper classes towards the lower in Greek and Roman authors, see Z. Yavetz, ‘*Plebs sordida*’, *Athenaeum* 43 (1965), 295-311, and MacMullen 1974, op. cit. (n. 13), 138-141. A passage by Plutarch on Thucydides of Alopecce, the aristocratic opponent of Pericles, is

The emperor had united, reconstituted and saved the state by entrusting it to its distinguished citizens. The dedicants call themselves “the Lycians”. There is no mention of a decree, or a body that might issue one. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to assume that no one would use this name in such a context, unless they spoke on behalf of the provincial *koinon*.²⁸ More precisely, the dedicants will be the faction that prevailed in the preceding strife, most likely with Roman support, those now in a position to pass decrees in the governing body of the Lycian confederation.

The triumphal rhetoric of this document presents the contest as having been between good and noble citizens and the mean and lawless. But we may want to apply some scepticism to this picture, for the inscription does not offer much insight into the nature of the events in Lycia. Was this in fact a clash of *aristoi* against the ἄκριτον πλῆθος, as the inscription wants us to believe, or the rich against the poor, as a modern scholar supposes?²⁹ The associations and clubs often blamed for upheavals in the East had rich patrons, and factions had leaders that were likely to come from the higher

characteristic: “For he would not suffer those who were called the honest and good (persons of worth and distinction) to be scattered up and down and mix themselves and be lost among the populace, as formerly, diminishing and obscuring their superiority amongst the masses; but taking them apart by themselves and uniting them in one body, by their combined weight he was able, as it were upon the balance, to make a counter-poise to the other party” (*Pericles* 11.2, transl. J. Dryden, 1932). Here is how Plutarch describes Theseus’ activity immediately after the synoicism of Athens (*Theseus*, 25.1-2): οὐ μὴν ἄτακτον οὐδὲ μεμειγμένην περιεῖδεν ὑπὸ πλῆθους ἐπιχυθέντος ἀκρίτου γενομένην τὴν δημοκρατίαν, ἀλλὰ πρῶτος ἀποκρίνας χωρὶς Εὐπατρίδας καὶ Γεωμόρους καὶ Δημιουργούς,... δόξη μὲν Εὐπατριδῶν, χρεῖα δὲ Γεωμόρων, πλήθει δὲ Δημιουργῶν ὑπερέχειν δοκούντων. The parallels in the vocabulary of this passage with that in our inscription are striking. The ἄκριτον πλῆθος is no acceptable supporter of a new πολιτεία. To begin with, the εὐπατρίδες or ἄριστοι are to be set apart. Plutarch’s source here appears to be Aristotle, whom he names immediately after this passage. I suggest that ἄκριτον πλῆθος has the sense ‘promiscuous’, in its old, non-sexual sense in contrast to the ἐξ ἀρίστων ἐπιλεγεμένοι, and that ἀπό here denotes separation, distance, a meaning much less common than ἀπό for ὑπό but more fitting in this context. J. Thornton, independently, interprets this passage in a way similar to the one proposed here; see J. Thornton, ‘Gli aristoi, l’ akriton plethos e la provincializzazione della Licia nel monumento di Patara’, *Mediterraneo Antico* 4, (2001) 427-446.

²⁸ Cf. *Fouilles de Xanthos* (henceforth; FdX) VII 38, where “the Lycians” honor an ancestor of the same provincial governor involved here. See also the Opramoas monument, TAM 2, 905 and C. Kokkinia, *Die Opramoas-Inschrift von Rhodiapolis* (Bonn 2000), XI G 14: here Antoninus Pius apparently refers to a provincial honorific decree in this manner (partly restored). Also individual cities sometimes use the collective noun instead of naming particular civic bodies; see *Fouilles de Xanthos* VII, 40 (Ξάνθιοι).

²⁹ Thornton 2001, op. cit. (n. 27).

classes of society.³⁰ Στάσις, ἀνομία and ληστεῖται could very well mirror the sequence of events in Lycia: violent conflict may have resulted in anarchy and the breakdown of law and order. But calling your enemies brigands and pirates, especially, but not necessarily, when they included criminal elements or slaves in their alliance, was very common practice throughout the ancient world and a conventional trick of propaganda, a trick which can be paralleled, for example, in the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*.³¹

We cannot be sure what the losers in the conflict would have called themselves, but they – or at least the leading figures among them – probably did not call themselves bandits. Defeating bandits before installing a new glorious state is a *topos* of literary tradition. Theseus did it too, before founding the city of Athens.³² As for the evidence of Suetonius and Cassius Dio, it does not necessarily point to an uprising either. These authors use *discordia* (Suetonius, *Claudius* 25.3) and στάσις (Dio 60.17.3) to describe the events in Lycia, words that could denote social unrest of any sort, therefore also a revolt, but more commonly refer to factional strife.

This is not to call into question that the Lycian people may have had reasons and the means to stage an insurgency against their aristocracy; it is only to emphasize that *latro*, ληστής, is to be taken with caution. The leading figures of an opposing party could be called brigands or worse if they were

³⁰ O. van Nijf, *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East* (Amsterdam 1997), 110 f.

³¹ R. MacMullen, 'The Roman concept robber-pretender', *RIDA* sér. 3, 10 (1963), 221-225; cf. A. J. L. van Hooff, 'Ancient robbers: reflections behind the facts', *Ancient Society* 19 (1988) 105-124, esp. 114: "there is a strong rhetorical tradition in which *latro* etc. is used in the very wide sense of a person who lacks humanity and rightfulness. He who harms people without discretion is a robber, the person who hurts his friends is a parricide". Cf. *Dig.* 49.15.24 (Ulpian): "Enemies (*hostes*) are those against whom the Roman people has formally declared war, or who themselves have declared war against the Roman people; others are called robbers or bandits". See also B.C. McGing, 'Bandits, real and imagined, in Greco-Roman Egypt', *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 35 (1998), 159-183. Interesting on evidence of ties between local elite members and bandits: K. Hopwood, 'Bandits, elites and rural order', in: A. Wallace-Hadrill, ed., *Patronage in Ancient Society* (London 1989), 171-187. On 'pirates' as a term of political abuse, see P. de Souza, *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World* (Cambridge 2000), esp. 1-9 and 193-200. Nevertheless, bandit groups could apparently form the nucleus of a rebellion, as Dio Cassius' account of AD 6 seems to indicate (55.28.3): "they began from banditry and then moved on to a very dreadful war" (cited in Hopwood, *ibid.*, 174); and they often enjoyed local support; see *CJ* 9.39.2.3.

³² Plutarch, *Theseus* 6.4; 10.2.

already in exile.³³ As for their lowly followers, those that may have actually behaved as ληστές and ἄνομοι during the unrest, they were perhaps rotting in chains, if they were lucky enough to be alive.

The triumphant party in this conflict raised a monument to the emperor. At the end of the inscription appears the name of the governor Quintus Veranius. This governor Quintus Veranius is well known, and his governorship of the new province Lycia falls in the years 43 through 47.³⁴ But what exactly did he do in connection with this monument or the events which precipitated it? The text grows more fragmentary towards the end, but there is hardly room for an extensive catalogue of the governor's contributions. In line 32 C.P. Jones, I believe rightly, proposes to restore "*dia*" – that either the acts of the emperor or the putting up of the monument were done "through" the governor. In other inscriptions too, emperor or provincials appear to act similarly "through" the governor without much indication to help us pinpoint the governor's exact role in the process.³⁵ But whatever the precise reading of the text, the inscription presents the governor's role as secondary, not as the central point of interest (as the Beroia inscription does). The text of this honorary inscription is – or, if the governor's staff had anything to do with its formulation, pretends to be – penned by members of the Lycian elite. Quintus Veranius, a very important man, who held the first governorship of the province for years, appears on an equal, or even inferior footing with the political coalition that emerged victorious from a period of unrest. The governor is presented as a mere partner in glorifying the emperor for ridding the province of discord, bandits – and the dedicants' rivals.

The governor as the emperor's servant (Aizanoi, Phrygia)

Over 90 governors' letters and edicts survive on stone from the Eastern part of the empire. Of those well enough preserved to allow a glimpse at the circumstances under which they were produced, most suggest that the governor was acting upon the request of the provincials themselves. Even in an edict such as the one from Beroia already discussed, where the proconsul

³³ Unlike real brigands, such exiles are known to have enjoyed the hospitality of an aristocratic lady; on Junia Theodora D. Pallas et al., 'Inscriptions Lyciennes trouvées à Solomos près de Corinthe', *BCH* 83 (1959), 496-508 = SEG 18 (1962), 143.

³⁴ See A. E. Gordon, *Quintus Veranius consul A.D. 49: a study based upon his recently identified sepulchral inscription* (Berkeley 1952) and the titles cited in Jones 2001, op. cit. (n. 25), 4.

³⁵ Cf. e.g. TAM 2, 270, 275, 396, 557, 1188, I. Eph. 1499.

goes to lengths to advertise his own initiative, there are clear indications that local notables had played a major role, usually inviting Roman intervention. Our evidence, then, seems to suggest that governors usually acted on request – or, when they did not, they produced communications that were seen by locals as unattractive for inscription upon stone.³⁶ Let me now discuss a possible exception.

On the *pronaos* of the temple of Zeus at Aizanoi in Phrygia, there is an inscription reproducing four documents.³⁷ Numbers two, three and four of this dossier are among the rare examples of documents inscribed in Latin in this part of the world. In these, the emperor (Hadrian), a governor and a procurator exchange rather short communications concerning the temple lands of the sanctuary. Curiously, the last Latin letter, a letter of the procurator Hesperos to the governor, was left unfinished on the inscription. Heading the dossier is a much more generously worded document in Greek, preserving the governor Avidius Quietus' letter to the city of Aizanoi. We are in the year 126 AD. Some 300 years earlier, two Hellenistic kings had given to Zeus of Aizanoi land divided into *kleroi*, the revenue from which was payable to the temple. Over time, the original pattern of land ownership shifted, the size of the original *kleroi* was forgotten, and the levies ceased to be paid.³⁸ This, apparently, meant substantial loss of public revenue to the city.³⁹ The city therefore called upon the Roman authorities for help in establishing a mean size for the *kleroi* and dealing with tenants unwilling to pay their dues.

I have oversimplified a complex affair, in order to move on to what interests me most about these rich documents: Avidius Quietus' Greek letter to the city, which displays another Roman governor's rhetorical tactics for dealing with another case of civic discord. For this matter had divided Aizanoi's citizens, as Quietus says in lines 5-7 and implies again in lines 16-

³⁶ Cf. F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (London 1977), 320 f. and Eck 1998, op. cit (n. 6), 359-381.

³⁷ U. Laffi, 'I terreni del tempio di Zeus ad Aizanoi' *Athenaeum* 49, NS (1971), 3-53; B. Levick, S. Mitchell et al., *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua IX. Monuments from the Aezanitis* (London 1988), p. xxxvi-xliii; henceforth: MAMA 9, xxxvi-xliii.

³⁸ MAMA 9, xxxix-xlii.

³⁹ This document speaks clearly of a strong interdependency, if not identity, of interests between sacred and civic authorities in Aizanoi. I do not find B. Dignas' arguments to the contrary conclusive; see *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor* (Oxford 2002), 178-186.

18.⁴⁰ To understand the governor's rhetoric, it is necessary to investigate the possible reasons for inscribing these documents on the temple.

At first blush it might appear that this inscription served a purely utilitarian function, the documents simply demonstrating the right of the temple to receive dues from its lands. The letters, after all, were inscribed at a height to be read easily from the ground. But as these documents stand, they do not in fact make up a clear and unambiguous definition of the temple's rights. What size *was* established for the *kleroi* and how much *was* to be paid for them? The reader is not told. This information may have been provided in the last part of the procurator's letter to the governor, but that part of the letter was not inscribed. So it is not obvious why the officials of the temple or the city would inscribe the letters: rather than clearly documenting the outcome of the dispute, these letters seem rather to document the process by which this problem was attended to.

What, then, was the motivation behind inscribing the dossier, and who arranged for it to be done? In this case we cannot be confident that the governor acted at the request of interested parties. No particular citizens are mentioned or even alluded to in the documents, apart from the losers, those *τινές* (l. 16) who had long deprived the city of its revenues and were about to be deprived of this privilege. *They* certainly did not want the letter on the wall. Perhaps the procurator Hesperus had a personal interest in seeing these documents inscribed: but if so, he would hardly have truncated his own letter. Very likely, communications from such high persons were valued simply because they increased the sanctuary's prestige,⁴¹ and that would explain, at least in part, why they were inscribed on the temple. But it was

⁴⁰ L. 5-6: δύο τὰ μάλιστα τὴν διαφορὰν ὑμεῖν κεινοῦντα, two things which especially stir up the dispute among you; L. 16-17: ἵνα μὴ πάλιν τινές ἀμφισβητοῦντες περὶ τοῦ τέλους τοῦ] βράδειον ἀπολαῦσαι τὴν πόλιν τῆς [προσηκούσης προσόδου παραίτιοι] γένωνται, 'in order that certain persons may not again dispute about the sum, and become responsible for delaying the city's enjoying the benefit of the revenues due to it' (transl. Levick and Mitchell). The restorations were proposed by Laffi 1971, op. cit. (n. 37). They were accepted on good grounds by Levick and Mitchell, despite their details being "obviously open to question" (MAMA IX, xxxviii). They fit well into the general sense of the passage and, it must be added, they are well in agreement with the length of the lacuna; see the photograph provided by Laffi, Tav. II. "Some people" (*τινές*, l. 16) are mentioned as responsible for depriving the city from its revenues. These, the governor says in a critical tone, have profited long enough from the situation. He is obviously referring to the owners of the *kleroi*.

⁴¹ Cf. Lendon 1997, op. cit. (n. 8), 132; 215-6.

especially letters from the emperor which were so highly valued, and in this case the emperor did not write.

Yet the problem *had* been dealt with by the emperor – as the governor Avidius Quietus puts it, “by the forethought of the greatest emperor, who combined justice with humanity and concern for judicial matters” – and the emperor had been invited to intervene by the author of the letter, the governor. The governor’s letter to Aizanoi centres around his relationship with the emperor. Right from the start, with his opening sentence, Quietus points to Hadrian: the good news the governor is about to announce, that is, the resolution of their long standing ἀμφισβήτησις, is a benefaction from the emperor. Then the proconsul explains *in extenso* how this desirable intervention came about: “I wrote to him and explained the whole situation, and asked what to do, and said that two things are mainly responsible for the discord among you, and for the intractable and obscure nature of the matter”.⁴² And so the emperor took action.

Quietus’ letter belongs to a group of governors’ communications the main theme of which could be paraphrased as: ‘behold, behind me stands the emperor’. Some governors obviously sought to reinforce their own position by evoking the emperor. To various degrees, they represented themselves as appendages to him, their actions as effects of his awesome power. In their letters to cities, such governors tend to make excessive use of the adjective ‘sacred’ to denote everything imperial. This characteristic, of course, is not exclusive to documents deriving from governors, but we are more used to

⁴² The phrase δύο τὰ μάλιστα...παρεχόμενα seems confusing at first. Levick and Mitchell write that “the Greek, as it stands, is not syntactically cogent” (MAMA 9, xxxvii). I should like to suggest that the syntax here may be deliberately sophisticated rather than wrong. The participles κεινούνται and παρεχόμενα depend on δηλῶν, the verb denoting the governor’s main contribution to the city’s cause: the fact that he explained the whole situation (τὸ πρᾶγμα ὅλον) to the emperor. Following that, he asked for advice (ἠρόμην τε ὃ τι χρὴ ποιεῖν). The phrase δύο τὰ μάλιστα ... παρεχόμενα gives an indication of exactly how the governor formulated his report, and is therefore a clarification to “δηλῶν τὸ πρᾶγμα ὅλον”. He did not simply state the facts, rather, in his letter to the emperor he offered an analysis of the problem at hand. In his letter to Aizanoi, the governor inserted the sentence ἠρόμην τε ὃ τι χρὴ ποιεῖν between the phrase δηλῶν τὸ πρᾶγμα ὅλον and its clarification, δύο τὰ μάλιστα ... παρεχόμενα, probably in order to present the two main purposes of his correspondence with the emperor, his report on the situation and his request for advice, together. The result is a rather artificial or affected style that may not have been entirely unwelcome to the author of this letter.

this ‘imperial theology’ – as De Ste Croix⁴³ once called it – coming from the subjects, not the rulers. Obviously, some governors saw a gain in assimilating themselves to their subjects and using a language that pointed to the central authority as the source of power. They were ‘borrowing honour’, as J.E. Lendon would put it.⁴⁴

One of the interested parties who arranged for this inscription, then, was perhaps the governor, and at least one purpose of the inscription was to advertise the governor’s connection to the emperor, the supreme font of power.

The governor as loser (Rhodiapolis)

But the governor’s reliance upon the emperor could backfire. Provincials could get accustomed to referring directly to the highest authority, and there are many indications that they often did. They simply dropped the middleman; sometimes provincials did not refer a matter to the governor at all, or they applied to the emperor to overcome a governor’s objections. This, apparently, is what happened when the Lycian league’s decision to bestow a particular set of honours upon Opramoas met the resistance of the governor. In a unique document, the governor Cornelius Proculus appears to openly admit his defeat.⁴⁵ The crucial restoration [ἀντέτ]ατον (“I opposed it”) in line 3 is that of R. Heberdey. Having failed repeatedly in my efforts to find an alternative reading of this unusual document, I suspect that Heberdey’s restoration is to be accepted, and that this letter may therefore pose a historical, rather than an epigraphical ‘problem’: for it seems to reveal an aspect of the relations between the Roman governor and his subjects that we do not expect to find in epigraphical record.⁴⁶ Proculus’ letter reads:

⁴³ *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World* (London 1981), 394: “the theology of Roman imperial rule”.

⁴⁴ Lendon 1997, op. cit. (n. 8), 146-9.

⁴⁵ Kokkinia 2000, op. cit. (n. 28), doc. n. 29 = TAM II, 905, doc. n. 28 (VII F 13-VII H 11).

⁴⁶ E. Petersen and R. Heberdey read five letters at the end of line VII G 3 (cf. the drawings reproduced at the end of this article). E. Petersen’s reading in his sketchbook from the year 1882 seemed uncertain, particularly concerning the fourth letter from the right. Heberdey therefore inspected the stone again in 1894, and put down his own reading. Without copying the entire inscription on block VII G, he examined the third line. The intensity and thickness of his pencil stroke suggest strongly that he paid particular attention to the fourth letter from the end, that turned out to be another T. According to R. Heberdey’s drawing, the end of line VII G 3 reads clearly ATTON. Preceding this is a short lacuna. Its approximate length is securely provided by the certain restoration of the preceding line, as well as the fully

“Being present myself, I learned that the honours you were most eager to decree for Opramoas, even as I objected (*antetaton*), you wish to be able to bestow now and in the future, after the greatest emperor has granted the request of the Xanthians on the matter and has conceded to this. Also I consider Opramoas worthy of praise and honour from you, for everything; for his generosity, for caring for every city as he does for his own and for treating his private property as if it were a common good, and I praise you too that give the honours” [9 more lines then follow of which only fragments remain].

Why would a governor object to honours for a local dignitary? Perhaps because they were too expensive. But Opramoas apparently bore the expenses of such honours himself.⁴⁷ More likely, as another known case attests,⁴⁸ it was because other local luminaries opposed them. But how was a Roman who had just come to the province to decide which side was right in such ongoing, overlapping, entangled, local issues? Proculus was probably sucked into a dispute over a matter that he may have seen as trivial and,

preserved text of the following line; ca. 5-7 letters are missing in line 3. They belonged to the ending of one word and the beginning of another which concluded with the letters ATTON. There are very few words ending with these letters, and the Opramoas dossier provides clear indications that someone had objected to a set of honours intended for Opramoas by the Lycian league; cf. Kokkinia 2000, op. cit. (n. 20). Taking this into consideration, Heberdey's restoration ἀντέτατον seems secure. What seems doubtful however, is whether the last letter before the lacuna in line VII G 3 was in fact an O. Neither a photograph nor a squeeze, or a confirmation of this reading by another epigrapher is available, and judging by his sketch, Petersen seems to have been unable to discern this letter clearly. We may therefore be dealing with καί[τερ], ‘although’, instead of καὶ ὅ[τε], which sounds somewhat awkward (literally: ‘also when’). Nevertheless, its meaning is clear in this context: ‘even as’. Having accepted the restoration of the verb as ἀντέτατον, there remain a few questions. It is an active form, apparently without an object. This is an unusual construction, for, failing an object, one would expect a middle form of ἀντιτάσσω. Finally, ἀντέτατον can be a third person plural as well as a first person singular form of the verb. If we assume that we are dealing with a third person plural form, then a τινές would be indispensable, and would have to be supplied in the lacuna. But this restoration seems highly improbable, because Heberdey's revised reading shows the relation of the remaining letters in line 3 to those of line 2 above it. The last letters of the two lines, Y and N respectively, are nearly aligned. This should exclude the possibility that one line had 29 letters (line 2) and the other 36, as would be required to add a τινές in the lacuna of line 3. I therefore see no other possibility than to suppose that the governor speaks, as usual, in the first person.

⁴⁷ Kokkinia 2000, op. cit. (n. 28), II G 2-4, IX D 4-9.

⁴⁸ Iason of Kyaneai, cf. C. Kokkinia, ‘Verdiente Ehren. Zu den Inschriften für Opramoas von Rhodiapolis und Iason von Kyaneai’, *Antike Welt* 32 (2001), 17-23.

perhaps carelessly, he chose the wrong side. And the other side had better luck with the emperor. Now he glossed over the matter with an overzealous praise of both honourers and honorand. His embarrassed epistle is by far the longest of the 38 letters in the Opramoas dossier.

Conclusion: a balancing act

This is how, according to Cassius Dio, the emperor Caracalla concluded a letter to the senators of Antioch⁴⁹: “I know my behaviour does not please you; that is why I have weapons and soldiers, so that I do not have to pay attention to what people are saying about me”. Some one and a half centuries later, the Antiochians apparently hadn’t lost their talent for irritating emperors, as Julian’s *Misopogon* clearly demonstrates. That extraordinary piece of literature is the best known documentation of a non-violent clash between Roman authority and Greek subjects. Julian responded to the Antiochians’ mockery of his person with an angry, sarcastic monologue, inserted between the usual epistolary formulas and posted outside the governor’s *praesidium* like any other imperial response.⁵⁰

If two emperors had been obliged to resort to abusive language to counter the insolence of the quarrelsome citizenry of Antioch, one may guess that a governorship of the province of Syria would not be an obvious choice for a Roman grandee looking for a quiet post. On the other hand, supposing he had a choice, which Eastern province would he opt for? The *Pax Romana* of the Principate was a fertile ground for rivalries in and among Greek cities. Almost all of the Eastern provinces are known to have gone through considerable unrest at some point during the Principate, either from inner- or from inter-community disputes⁵¹. Judging from Dio Chrysostom’s works,

⁴⁹ 78.20

⁵⁰ M. Gleason, ‘Festive satire. Julian’s “Misopogon” and the new year at Antioch’, *Journal of Roman Studies* 76 (1986) 106-119.

⁵¹ See i.e. Plutarch, *Moralia* 815 D: under Augustus the Athenians burned a prominent citizen alive. For a quick overview of numerous internal disputes in the Greek East see R. MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order* (Cambridge Mass. 1966), 346 n. 23: cf. Th. Pekáry, ‘Seditio. Unruhen und Revolten im Römischen Reich von Augustus bis Commodus’, in: *Ancient Society* 18 (1987), 133-150; P.A. Brunt, ‘Charges of provincial maladministration under the early Principate’, *Historia* 10 (1961), 189-223, esp. 213f.; C. P. Jones, *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom* (Cambridge 1978), 83-94; on Asia, R. Merkelbach, ‘Der Rangstreit der Städte Asiens und die Rede des Aelius Aristides über die Eintracht’, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 32 (1978), 287-296; Bithynia, L. Robert, ‘La titulature de Nicée et de Nicomédie. La gloire et la haine’, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 81 (1977), 1-39.

almost every major Bithynian city had an on-going feud with one or more neighbouring communities and Pliny's occasional helplessness while governing that province often appears at least indirectly connected to the province's internal rivalries. Asia was permanently rent by strife over status and titles between its ancient and proud cities. A proconsul failing to secure the alliance of an exceptionally powerful magnate like Herodes Atticus would have a hard task governing Achaia under Pius. The feuds between Greeks and Jews will have given the prefect of Egypt enough to worry about – and the people of Alexandria were famously even more insolent than the folk of Antioch. Lycia perhaps, in view of the common traditions and ethnic conscience that the Lycians shared? Might that be a quiet destination? But Lycia became part of the empire under Claudius after the unrest discussed above.

In theory, a governor had unlimited powers in his province.⁵² Jurists such as Ulpian *recommended* that a provincial governor have regard for the decisions of his predecessors, respect local traditions, and uphold statutes of earlier emperors. But following such advice was optional. Providing he did not provoke imperial intervention, the governor was free to decide as he wished. And, as we now know, all governors, not only legates but also proconsuls, had at least one or two military units under their command.⁵³ Does this mean that the governor possessed sufficient means to enforce controversial decisions regardless of opposition? Quite to the contrary.

First, in a proconsular province of the size and with the population of Asia, the military presence was so absurdly small that it could be perceived as virtually non-existent, as the passage from Josephus cited at the beginning of this paper indicates.⁵⁴ Secondly, even if he had the means to repress

⁵² Dig. 1.16.8 (Ulpian): *et ideo maius imperium in ea provincia habet omnibus post principem*; 1.16.9: *nec quicquam est in provincia, quod non per ipsum expeditur*; 1.18.4: *Praeses provinciae maius imperium in ea provincia habet omnibus post principem*. The details are amusing: the governor can adopt and emancipate before himself (1.18.2), but he cannot be his own tutor or appoint himself to pass a judgement on himself (1.18.5)!

⁵³ Eck 1998, op. cit. (n. 2), 187–202.

⁵⁴ It is a speech by the king Julius Marcus Agrippa. Speidel 1984, op. cit. (n. 2), 12 and 26, following E. Ritterling, *Legio, RE XII* (1924), col. 1261–3., has put forward that this passage is to be understood as referring only to Roman legions. In fact, neither elsewhere in the *Bellum Judaicum* nor in his other works does Josephus use *φρουρά* to denote exclusively legions as opposed to *auxilia*. Tacitus does speak of *inermes provinciae* in that sense (*Historiae* 1.11; 1.16; 2.81; 3.5), but does so in a very different context. Eck 1998, op. cit. (n. 2), 187 n. 5, contends that auxiliaries would be irrelevant to Josephus' argument, but I do not see why this should be so. Such troops were used as garrisons and would serve the same

resistance by force, a Roman governor would be seen as having failed his duty if he were to resort to such means to rule a ‘pacified’ province. Armed conflict, as it occurred in Judea, was to be avoided.⁵⁵ It killed both soldiers and taxpayers.

It is common knowledge that Roman rule in the East was based on the cooperation of the local elites. But since Roman provincial authorities were not in a position to demand or impose such cooperation by force, we must conclude that the limits of governmental power were set by local realities. And these realities were not the idyll that Plutarch, for example, might have wished or imagined. The elite of a Greek province was far from constituting a group of enlightened leaders harmoniously cooperating to promote the common good. Local magnates formed alliances and carried on their bitter rivalries, they had followers and exerted influence through *hetaireiai*, the associations banned by Trajan for causing considerable unrest in Bithynia.

Arriving in his province, a Roman governor was not in a position either to disarm or to ignore such constellations of power, and, unlike the emperor, he was well advised to avoid confrontation through communications that abused his subjects, like those of Caracalla and Julian to the Antiochians. Even if he did succeed in enforcing unpopular decisions, a city united in discontent against a governor was likely to seek his prosecution through the provincial council after his departure. A governor had to win powerful allies among the locals without making powerful enemies. Moral authority, or the appearance of moral authority, cultural qualifications, public, social and, not least, communication skills must have been indispensable. Most of the governors known to have been prosecuted *de repetundis* had served in Hellenised areas. Some of them may have not been

purpose in the province as legionary troops. It may therefore be better to credit the argument made by king Agrippa in his speech: the Romans manage to keep great numbers of people, such famous for their culture, others for their prowess and love of freedom, by means of just a few thousand troops, because those people are less subjected by military force than by their admiration for the Romans’ *tyche* (Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum* 2.373). Cf. Aelius Aristides, *Roman Oration* 67a: “The cities are free from garrisons, but if anywhere a city because of its excessive size cannot maintain order by itself you did not begrudge these the men to stand by and guard them carefully.”

⁵⁵ On internal unrest and the role of the Roman army in the Eastern provinces see B. Isaac, *The limits of empire* (Oxford 1992), esp. chs 2 and 6. M. Goodman, *The ruling class of Judea: The origins of the Jewish revolt against Rome, A.D. 66-70* (Cambridge 1987), traces the outbreak of the Jewish revolt back to the local ruling class’s inability to exercise enough control over its people to ensure stability.

spectacularly corrupt; they may merely have failed to survive the social and political environment of a Greek province.

Heidelberg, November 2003

Sketchbook E. Petersen, 1882 *

Sketchbook R. Heberdey, 1894

* I have been able to inspect and obtain copies of the sketchbooks with kind permission from G. Rehrenböck, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien.