CULTIC HONOURS FOR BENEFACTORS IN THE CITIES OF ASIA MINOR

By
J.H.M. STRUBBE

A well-known Greek apophthegm explains: “What is a god?” – “Wielding of power”. Here is a key to the understanding of the ruler cult and emperor cult, but also to the explanation of cultic honours awarded to citizens in Greek cities. The power of these was so great and unmanageable (in succession of or even besides the mighty kings) that it could be conceived and expressed best in religious terms.¹ In fact, the wealthy notable citizens dominated the political life in their cities in the Hellenistic and Roman imperial periods and determined the well-being of their fatherland by their generous benefactions.

I intend to present in this article an overview of the cultic honours given to benefactors in the Greek cities of Asia Minor and above all of the benefactions in reward of which these honours were granted. I limit my subject to benefactors who were citizens. I exclude kings, generals, Roman magistrates and other officials who did not belong to the citizen body.² I leave aside the collective cult of *euergetai* and the cult of the Romans, *koinoi euergetai*.³ Since Asia Minor has produced the largest number of examples, a study of this area might reveal the essentials of the phenomenon.

What a benefactor is, needs no explanation. What cultic honours are, is not so clear. When a benefactor receives a priest, sacrifices, a cult statue in a temple, there can be no doubt. But if there is only a contest or festival named after him or organized in his honour, if sacrifices are offered near his grave on a memorial day, if there is only a public building named after him, the case is not evident. I have limited my overview to the cases which are fairly

¹ S. Price, *Rituals and power. The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge 1984), 52; the apophthegm is cited on 234. See also M. Sartre, *L'Orient romain* (Paris 1991), 117.

² To the last category belong Banabelos and Lachares, officials in the service of Achaïos, a member of the Seleucid family (οἰκονομῶν and ἐκλογιστής). They were honoured by the inhabitants of Neon Teichos and Kiddiou Kome near Laodikeia on the Lykos in 267 BC with the yearly sacrifice of a ram for each one of them (Th. Corsten, *I. Laodikeia am Lykos* I, 1).

³ For the *euergetai*, see L. Robert, *Revue des Études Grecques* 94 (1981), 358-360; *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 50 (1926), 499-500 (= *OMS* I, 63-64); A.D. Nock, *Essays on religion and the ancient world* I (Oxford 1972; reprint of a 1930 article), 244. For the Romans as *koinoi euergetai*, see the studies mentioned in SEG 38, 689 and 47, 2312.

clear, but in course I will also discuss some documents which are dubious in my opinion.⁴

I will present the documents concerning my theme in a chronological order, starting at the beginning of the second century BC.⁵

The second and early first (?) century BC

The first document is a decree found at the Letoon near Xanthos in Lycia.⁶ It is dated during the joint reign of the Seleucid king Antiochos III and his son, Antiochos, that is between 197 and 193 BC, most probably in the 116th year of the Seleucid era, that is in the year 196 BC. The decree honours Lyson, son of Demosthenes, gymnasiarch of the *neoi*, who was re-elected by the *neoi* as a gymnasiarch for the next year. The honours were awarded by the *neoi*, but since the decree was erected at the Letoon, approbation and permission must have been granted by the people of Xanthos. Lyson had rendered many services to the *polis* and to the *neoi*. In particular, as a gymnasiarch he had taken care of the construction or repair work of the gymnasium and had adorned it, spending much money out of his own pocket. The gymnasium may have been damaged by an earthquake or (more probably) by the army of Antiochos III, who captured the city of Xanthos in 197 BC. At the time of the decree the (re)building was probably not yet completed; that was the reason why Lyson was re-elected as a gymnasiarch, namely to guarantee the continuation of the work. Moreover, since Lyson was apparently a partisan of the Seleucids, his election and re-election must have been a political statement of the *neoi*, expressing in that way their loyalty towards the kings. It is not clear whether or not Lyson had played any role in the diplomatic field at the troubled time of the capture of the city; the decree does not mention it. The most important benefaction of Lyson, in fact the only one which is mentioned explicitly in the decree, is the (re)construction of the gymnasium.

⁴ For example the building called Menogeneion at Sardeis, named after the benefactor Menogenes (W.H. Buckler & D.M. Robinson, *I. Sardis* 17); the fire sacrifice of two bulls and the foot race for the deceased Antiochos at Miletos (A. Rehm, *Milet I*, 9 no. 368).

⁵ Outside Asia Minor, cultic honours were probably already awarded to citizens in the latter half of the 3rd century BC, sc. at Athens to Diogenes (229-ca. 220 BC), see Ph. Gauthier, *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs* (Paris 1985), 64-66. Diogenes liberated the city; a new gymnasium, called Diogeneion, was constructed, where he was buried.

⁶ Ph. Gauthier, *Revue des Études Grecques* 109 (1996), 1-27 (SEG 46, 1721; cf. Ph. Gauthier, *BE* (1997) 566); recently republished by J. Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor* (Oxford 1999), 325-327 no. 24 with translation.

Lyson was honoured by the *neoi* with an inscribed statue of bronze (*eikon*), set up in the most conspicuous place in the gymnasium. The *neoi* also decided to erect two altars in the most conspicuous place of the gymnasium, one of Zeus Soter and one of Lyson benefactor (or founder).⁷ They decreed that the yearly elected gymnasiarch had to sacrifice every year an ox (or two oxen?), three years of age, on the altar of Lyson. Apparently the *neoi* provided the sacrificial animal(s) out of certain revenues.

This inscription provides the earliest example of cultic honours for an ordinary citizen in a city of Asia Minor. It is notable that the honours were awarded by the *neoi*, not by the *demos*. At the time of the decree the gymnasium was still independent from the city and the gymnasiarch was not yet a regular magistrate. At the time of the decree, Lyson was still alive.

The following documents in this chronological overview are the honours for Anticharis, son of Amyntas, at Kyaneai in Lycia, and an honorary inscription from Synnada in Phrygia. Both are only roughly dated to the second century BC.

The benefaction of Anticharis probably was the gift of a certain sum of money (the beginning of the text, which is much damaged, mentions six thousand *drachmai*), possibly as a foundation.⁸ The money may have been donated to the gymnasium of the city, since ephebes, *neoi* and the gymnasiarch played a role in the honouring. Anticharis received many different honours (golden crown, bronze statue with inscription, *proedria*). It was also decided that the gymnasiarch had to sacrifice an ox on the altar that will be erected.⁹ It is generally accepted that this altar was an altar dedicated to Anticharis; it may have been erected in the gymnasium.¹⁰ Other honours mentioned in the decree, connected with cult, are a procession in which the ephebes and *neoi* (?) participated, and contests of men (*andres*), javelin-throwers, archers and shooters with the catapult (?).

⁷ Ll. 40-43: ἰδρύσασθαι δὲ καὶ βωμοὺς δύο ἐν | [τῷ ἐπιφανε]στάτῳ τόπῳ τοῦ γυμνασίου, τὸ μὲν | [τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Σ]ωτῆρος, τὸν δὲ ἄλλον τοῦ Λύσωνος | [τοῦ εὐεργέτου οὐ κτίστου.

⁸ R. Heberdey & E. Kalinka, *Bericht über zwei Reisen im südwestlichen Kleinasien*, Denkschriften Akad. Wien 45 (1897), 28-29 no. 28; restorations by L. Robert, *Études Anatoliennes* (Paris 1939), 399-405; for the restoration of L. 10, see also M. Launey, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques II* (Paris 1950), 833 note 4.

⁹ L. 8: θύεσθαι δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ γυμνασι]άρχου βοῦν ἐπὶ τοῦ βω[μ]οῦ τοῦ ἀνατεθ[η]σομένου T[---.

¹⁰ Robert 1939, op. cit. (n. 8); Gauthier 1996, op. cit. (n. 6), 22-23. I suggest restoring at the end of L. 8: τ[οῦ Ἀντιχάρ]ιδος. But one also expects an indication on the moment and recurrence of the sacrifice.

Again we have an example of cultic honours awarded to a living benefactor apparently in connection with the gymnasium. The honours were granted to Anticharis by the city and by the *neoi* of the gymnasium. The inscription on the bronze statue namely stated that the *neoi* honoured Anticharis as their benefactor.

The inscription from Synnada poses many problems.¹¹ The stone seems to contain two different decrees (Ll. 0-3 and 4-24), the first one for an anonymous man, the second one for Philonides, son of Herodoros, son of Limnaios. Since the decrees are not separated from each other by a blank, it is generally assumed that both decrees concern Philonides and this assumption has influenced the restorations of the text. In fact at the end of the second decree it is said that a marble statue (an *agalma*)(of Philonides) will be erected in the *naos*. The latter word is restored;¹² it is restored on the basis of the reading of the end of the first decree which mentions (in Ll. 2-3) a marble statue (*agalma*) (of the anonymous man) and that (this man) will be *sunnaos* and *sunbomos* with -- (here the text breaks off). The restoration also builds on the idea that an *agalma* is always a cult statue in a temple. S. Price, however, has shown that not all ἀγάλματα were recipients of cult; an ἄγαλμα was essentially an image that belonged to a sacred context.¹³

In an earlier study on consolation decrees I have questioned the date of the Philonides inscription. Philonides is a young man, who is deceased. He has achieved nothing yet in his life (no magistracies, no benefactions); the reasons why he is honoured are his personal qualities and the benefactions of his ancestors, especially his grandfather. The tone of the decree is highly emotional: his parents and the citizens are heavily upset and excessively afflicted at his death. In my view these facts point to the imperial period, the second century AD rather than BC (engraved then in an archaizing style).¹⁴ If that date is correct, it is improbable that young Philonides received cultic honour (as I will argue below). Moreover he does not fit into the scheme of

¹¹ W.M. Ramsay, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 7 (1883), 300-302 no. 24; A.E. Kontoleon, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 11 (1887), 218-220 no. 13; restored by A. Wilhelm, *Neue Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* I, Sitzungsberichte Akad. Wien, Philos.-hist. Klasse Bd. 166.1 (Wien 1910), 54-61 (= *Akademieschriften* I (Leipzig 1974), 73-80). Cf. K. Buresch, *Rheinisches Museum* N.F. 49 (1894), 436-437.

¹² Ll. 23-24: καὶ ἀγάλ]ματι μαρμαρίνῳι οὗ τὴν ἀνάστασιν γε[νέσθαι ἐν τῷ ναῷ (?); restoration of Wilhelm. Ramsay had restored: γε[νέσθαι οὗ ἂν δοκῇ.

¹³ Price 1984, op. cit. (n. 1), 176-179; εἰκόνες, usually interpreted as honorific images, sometimes received cult too.

¹⁴ J.H.M. Strubbe, *L'Antiquité Classique* 67 (1998), 70.

benefactors who received the very high cultic honours. Therefore I very much doubt whether his statue was erected *inside* the *naos*; I would rather think of a sacred place.

That leaves us with the first decree, in which is explicitly said “that he will be *sunnaos* and *sunbomos* with – ”.¹⁵ There is also mention of a marble statue (*agalma*) and possibly of sacrifices (but the latter word is restored). I wonder whether the first decree may have been issued in honour of an ancestor of Philonides. That may explain why the honorary decree for Philonides is engraved immediately below the first decree and why the heading of the second decree is rather short, as has been observed by previous scholars.¹⁶ If this is right, the first decree may date to the late Hellenistic period. Unfortunately nothing is known about the honorand and the reasons of the reward of the cultic honour, which at least consisted of the erection of an altar in the temple of some (god?).

The following items in the chronological overview are two inscriptions from the Carian cities of Knidos and Keramos. The text from Knidos is the honorary decree for Parasitas; it is dated to the 2nd-1st cent. BC.¹⁷ The text from Keramos is a similar decree for the son of Drakon (possibly named Apollonides); it is dated to the late Hellenistic period.¹⁸

The benefactions of Parasitas are not specified. The honours awarded are multiple: among other things several statues, *proedria*, *sitesis*, public burial after his death. It is also stated that the *damiorgos* should offer an immaculate sacrifice every year on the first day of a certain month (the text of the inscription is damaged here). This month was perhaps the month in which Parasitas will die; in that case the cultic honours only started after the death of the benefactor. I wonder whether the first day of the month may have been the birthday of Parasitas; possibly the honours started then during his lifetime. I restore the text so that the sacrifice has to be offered on the

¹⁵ Ll. 0-3: -- θυ]σίαις (Ramsay restored here -- δημo]σίαις) [καὶ ταῖς λ]οιπαῖς τιμαῖς καὶ ἀγάλ[μα]τι μ[α]ρμαρί]νοι κ[αὶ εἶναι α]ὐτὸν σύνναον καὶ σύνβω[μο]ν τῶ[ι] -- (Ramsay restored here τ[ῶ] | δῆ[μ]ο τῶν Συμμαδέων); his restoration was rejected by Buresch). Wilhelm 1910, op. cit. (n. 11), 58, suggested exempli gratia τῶ[ι πατρί] (anyway a short word). Could one think of the name of a god, like τῶ[ι Διῖ]?

¹⁶ Already suggested by Wilhelm 1910, op. cit. (n. 11), 58-59.

¹⁷ W. Blümel, *I. Knidos* I, 606; cf. A. Chanotis, *EBGR* (1992) 25, who restored L. 10 (see SEG 46, 1414): καθ'ἑ]καστον ἐν<ι>αυτὸν το[ῦ] μηνὸς ἐν ᾧ κα μεταλλάξει ? | τᾶι] νομηνίαι.

¹⁸ E. Varinlioglu, *I. Keramos* 9; for the date and the name of the honorand, see Ph. Gauthier & G. Rougemont, *BE* (1988) 21.

altar which will be dedicated (to Parasitas).¹⁹ In a cultic context is also the public torch race of the *neoteroi* and the *andres*, organized to honour Parasitas (ll. 16-22).

The text from Keramos likewise does not specify the benefactions of Drakon's son. He receives many honours, among which a statue with inscription, *proedria*, yearly proclamation of his honours at the *gymnikos agon*, yearly coronation at the first *agon* of the Dionysia, public burial after his death. It is also decided that a ram must be sacrificed to him by the *hieromnemes* every year on the twelfth day of the month Heraion, that is on his birthday, on the altar which will be dedicated (to him).²⁰ As an additional honour in cultic context games must be organized and prizes made available by the *hieromnemes* for the *paides* and the *ephebes*.

When we look back to the cultic honours, awarded in the second and early first (?) century BC, we see that these honours were given – in many cases – for benefactions concerning (the building or rebuilding) of the gymnasium of the city. The benefactions of Parasitas and of Drakon's son are not clearly connected with the gymnasium but the contests in their honour seem to take place there. All benefactors were alive at the time of the honouring and apparently received the cultic honours during their lifetime.

The first century BC

Next I will discuss as a group several benefactors who all received cultic honours in the first century BC. However, the earliest among them I will discuss in some detail. It is the famous Diodoros Paspáros, son of Herodes, from Pergamon. The chronology of the career of Diodoros and the chronology of the decrees in his honour are much debated. I follow here the results obtained by A.S. Chankowski in his study of 1998.²¹

¹⁹ I suggest restoring Ll. 9-12 on the basis of the inscription of Keramos: [κ]αὶ ῥέζειν τ[ὸν] δαμιουργὸν καθ' | ἔ]καστον ἐν<ι>αυτὸν το[ῦ] μην[ὸς] (name of the month?) | τ[αῖ] νομηνίαι ἱερεῖον τέλειον [ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τοῦ | ἀπ]οδειχθέντος. Cf. the honours for Drakon's son and the sacrifices for Barkaios in Kyrene, which found place on his birthday (see note 59). Blümel had restored: [κ]αὶ ῥέζειν Τ[ι] καθ' | ἔ]καστον ἐν<ι>αυτὸν το[ῦ] μην[ὸς] -- | τ[αῖ] νομηνίαι ἱερεῖον τέλειον [ὑπὸ τοῦ δαμιουργοῦ ? τοῦ ἀεὶ | ἀπ]οδειχθέντος.

²⁰ Ll. 14-17: θύεσθαι δὲ αὐτῷ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἕκαστον | [ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερομ]νημόνων ἐν μηνὶ Ἡραίῳ τῇ δωδεκάτῃ τοῖς | [γενεθλίοις αὐ]τοῦ κριὸν ἐπὶ βωμοῦ τοῦ ἀποδειχθέντος.

²¹ See the recent article of C.P. Jones, *Chiron* 30 (2000), 1-14, who presents earlier bibliography. The study of A.S. Chankowski appeared in *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellé-*

Before discussing the case of Diodoros, it should be noted that perhaps the father of Diodoros, Herodes, had a cult in the gymnasium. A much damaged and restored text seems to mention an *agalma* of Herodes in the gymnasium, by which Diodoros has brought sacrifices as beautiful as possible.²² Nothing is known about the circumstances.

Diodoros Paspáros received cultic honours after his return from an embassy to Rome, between 85 and 73 BC.²³ It was decided that a priest of him should be appointed in the electoral assemblies, when the other priests of the *euergetai* were also elected. A *temenos* for him had to be erected in the Philetaireia-district, named Diodoreion, in which should be built a *naos* of white marble, in which his statue (*agalma*) had to be dedicated.²⁴ The honorary inscription further mentions a procession on the day of the dedication from the *prytaneion* to his *temenos*, with i.a. the gymnasiarch, hypogymnasiarch and the ephebes, and with the *paidonomoi* and the *paides*. A sacrifice, as beautiful as possible, had to be offered.²⁵ Several contests of the *paides*, the ephebes and the *andres* had to be organized every year. Diodoros received still other honours, among which burial on the *agora* of Philetaireia after his death. The embassy of Diodoros to Rome brought relief from some of the indignities suffered by Pergamon in the aftermath of the First Mithridatic War. The city had been punished with the loss of its freedom for having surrendered to the king and for having massacred Roman citizens.²⁶

nique 122 (1998), 159-199. Chankowski adopts the 'low' chronology, now generally accepted.

²² H. Hepding, *Athenische Mitteilungen* 35 (1910), 409-411 no. 3 (cf. Chankowski p. 162-163 no. II); cf. Chankowski p. 190 note 122.

²³ IGR 4, 292 (cf. Chankowski p. 163 no. V); republished by F. Canali De Rossi, *ISE* III 190 with translation and commentary. For the date, see Chankowski p. 169; other scholars date the inscription around or shortly after 69 BC; Canali De Rossi favours a date around 81 BC. Gauthier 1985, op. cit. (n. 5), 62-63, points to the narrow links between the cult of Diodoros and the cults of the Attalids.

²⁴ Ll. 38-39: καθίστασθαι δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἱερέα ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαιρεσίαις, ὅταν | καὶ οἱ ἄλ[λο]ι ἱερεῖς τῶν εὐεργετῶν. Ll. 40-42: ἀνεῖναι δ[ὲ] | αὐτοῦ καὶ τέμενος ἐν Φιλεταιρεῖαι, ὀνομάσαντας Διοδῶ[δω]ρειον, ἐν ᾧ κατασκευασθ[ῆναι] | ναὸν λί[θου] λευκοῦ, εἰς ὃν ἀνατεθῆναι τὸ ἄγαλμα. For the restoration of l. 42, see SEG 36, 1125.

²⁵ L. 46: παρασταθείσης θυσίας ὡς καλλίστης.

²⁶ D. Magie, *Roman rule in Asia Minor to the end of the third century after Christ* I (Princeton 1950), 215, 237.

An honorary inscription, issued in the course of Diodoros' office as gymnasiarch, which is dated after 69 BC, mentions a sacrifice for Diodoros to his *agalma*.²⁷

Diodoros Paspáros received cultic honours at a second occasion, his gymnasiarchy of the *neoi* and the *presbyteroi*, which is dated by A. Chankowski, as mentioned before, after 69 BC. An inscription which honours Diodoros for his zeal as gymnasiarch in general and issued at the end of his office, mentions that the *neoi* had voted and erected a marble statue (*agalma*) in the exedra in which the *agalma* of Philetairos is placed.²⁸ Philetairos was probably the founder of the Attalid dynasty and the exedra, no doubt located in the gymnasium, must have been consecrated to the royal cult.

Diodoros was also honoured by *boule* and *demos* at the end of his office, for the renovation of the gymnasium of the *neoi*, which had fallen completely into decay and had become unusable. He also adorned the building with a portico. By doing all this he became the second founder (δεύτερος κτίστης).²⁹ Most scholars interpret that Diodoros was the second founder of the gymnasium; I take it that Diodoros was the second founder of the city, the first founders being the hero Pergamos and Philetairos.³⁰ An exedra was constructed for Diodoros in the gymnasium of the *neoi*, in which a marble statue (*agalma*) of him was dedicated, so that thanks to this *agalma* he was *sunthronos* with the gods of the *palaistra* (these are Hermes and Herakles).³¹ Before this *agalma* an inscription was placed, honouring Diodoros as *euergetes* of his *patris*.

Another decree again, issued some time after the preceding ones, honoured Diodoros because of his diplomatic activities and successes obtained with the (local?) Roman authorities. It mentions that the herald has to pray in the *prytaneion* to Diodoros *euergetes* after praying to Manius Aquil-

²⁷ M. Fränkel, *I.Pergamon* 256 (cf. Chankowski p. 163 no. III), republished by Chankowski p. 171-174 (SEG 48, 1491). L. 14: -- παρὰ δὲ τὸ ἄγαλμα παρασταθῆναι [θ]υσίαν αὐτῶ[ι] -. The same *agalma* is also mentioned in IGR 4, 294 Ll. 33-34.

²⁸ IGR 4, 294 (cf. Chankowski p. 162 no. I). Ll. 35-36: Τῶν δὲ νέων -- [-- καὶ φιλο]τιμότητα καθιδρυκότων τὸ ψηφισθὲν ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἄγαλμα ἐν τῇ ἐξέδρῃ ἐν ἣι τὸ τοῦ Φιλεταίρου ἄγαλμα καθίδρυται. For this *agalma*, see Chankowski p. 173-174.

²⁹ IGR 4, 293 Col. I (cf. Chankowski p. 164 no. VI-A) Ll. 41-45 and Col. II (cf. Chankowski p. 164 no. VI-D, somewhat later than VI-A) Ll. 60-66 (Ll. 61-62: γενόμενος καθάπερ εἴ τις δεύτερος | κτίστης).

³⁰ J.H.M. Strubbe, *Ancient Society* 15-17 (1984-1986), 260-261.

³¹ IGR 4, 293 Col. I Ll. 43-45: καὶ | [αὐτὸς διὰ τούτου τ]οῦ ἀγάλματος σύνθρονος ἦι τοῖς κατὰ παλ[α]ίστραν | [θεοῖς. For the meaning of σύνθρονος, see Chankowski p. 198-199: *sunthronos* is probably just a synonym of *sunnaos*.

lius, the consul of 129 BC who organized the new province of Asia.³² This shows – by the way – the high rank of the benefactor Diodoros. Lower down in the inscription it is said that all magistrates must well perform their duties towards Diodoros in order that, like he has taken good care of the city in previous times, he may now, being honoured with god-like honours (ἰσό-θεοι τιμαί), become more zealous in his devotion, since he has been rewarded with appropriate rewards for his benefactions.³³

The figure of Diodoros Paspáros may be considered a turning point in the award of cultic honours. On the one side he received these honours for his building activities in the gymnasium. On the other side he received cultic honours for obtaining from the Roman authorities favours of a constitutional kind. It should be noted that the honours in gratitude for the reconstruction of the gymnasium were awarded by the *neoi* and by the *polis* independently.

After Diodoros Paspáros comes a group of notables who all received cultic honours during the last two thirds of the first century BC. I will present their cases very briefly.

Gnaius Pompeius Theophanes from Mytilene on Lesbos is identified in an inscription with the god Zeus Eleutherios.³⁴ In that same inscription he is called saviour and benefactor and second founder of his father city. The inscription was probably erected in 36/35 BC, in any case after the death of Theophanes.³⁵ Theophanes was a friend, adviser and biographer of Pompey the Great. He accompanied Pompey on his campaign against Mithridates between 67/66 and 62 BC. He received the Roman citizenship from Pompey in 62 BC and obtained from him in that same year freedom for Mytilene.³⁶ It is not clear whether Theophanes received the cultic honour while alive (shortly after 62 BC) or after his death which occurred between 44 and 36 BC; the last option looks more likely.³⁷

³² IGR 4, 293 Col. II (cf. Chankowski p. 164 no. VI-G). For the date, see Chankowski p. 168. Col. II Ll. 1-42 are republished by F. Canali De Rossi, *ISE* III 191. Ll. 23-24: ἐμ μὲν τῷ πρυτανείῳ τὸν ἱεροκῆρυκα μετὰ Μάνιον Ἀκύλλιον ἐπεύχεσθαι καὶ Διοδώρῳ Ἡρώδου Πασπάρῳ εὐεργέτῃ; cf. Jones 2000, op. cit. (n. 21), 7.

³³ Ll. 38-39: καὶ νῦν ἰσοθέων ἡξιωμένος τιμῶν ἐκτενέστερος γίνηται τῇ προθυμίᾳ κομιζόμενος τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν ἀξίας τὰς ἀμοιβάς.

³⁴ IGR 4, 55b: [Θ]εῶ Δ[ι] Ἐλευθε[ρ]ίῳ φιλοπάτριδι Θεοφάνῃ. Recently republished by G. Labarre, *Les cités de Lesbos aux époques hellénistique et impériale* (Paris 1996), 277 no. 19b. For other sources, testifying to the divinisation of Theophanes (Tacitus, coins), see Labarre, 93.

³⁵ For the date, see SEG 35, 906.

³⁶ Strubbe 1984-1986, op. cit. (n. 30), 292; Labarre 1996, op. cit. (n. 34), 93-94.

³⁷ Labarre 1996, op. cit. (n. 34), 98 with note 27.

Gaius Julius Artemidoros from Knidos in Caria³⁸ was honoured with many rewards. An honorary inscription tells that he received among other things several crowns, several statues, *proedria*, *sitesis* and a public burial after his death in a tomb on the most conspicuous place of the gymnasium. The *demos* erected a golden statue (*eikon*) of him, *synnaos* with Artemis Hyakinthotrophos and Epiphanes, put up an altar, and voted sacrifices and a procession and a pentaeteric gymnastic contest, called Artemidoreia, and honoured him with god-like honours (τιμαῖς ἰσοθέοις).³⁹ Artemidoros together with his father had obtained the grant of freedom and exemption from taxation for his city from Caesar, shortly after the battle of Pharsalos in 48 BC.⁴⁰ The inscription then should be dated shortly after 48 BC, when Artemidoros was still alive.

The following case is that of Asklepiades from Kyzikos on the South coast of the Black Sea. His grandson Demetrios was honoured by the people with many rewards; he was also crowned at the contests of the Heroa, which were yearly organized in gratitude, for his grandfather Asklepiades, the founder (*oikistes*), and for those who had fought with him at Alexandreia in the war against Ptolemaios.⁴¹ L. Robert interpreted this text that a cult was celebrated in the gymnasium near the tomb of Asklepiades and his companions. These men belonged to the army with which Mithridates of Pergamon liberated Caesar when besieged in Alexandreia in 47 BC.⁴² Asklepiades no doubt obtained privileges for Kyzikos, but the nature of these is unknown; for this merit the title of *oikistes* was granted to him and he was

³⁸ W. Blümel, *I. Knidos* 59, who dated the text to the Augustan period.

³⁹ Ll. 11-19: ἐστάκει δὲ | [αὐ]τοῦ καὶ εἰκόνα χρυσέαν σύνναον | [τ]αῖ Ἀρτάμιτι τῇ Ἰακυνθοτρόφῳ | [κ]αὶ Ἐπιφανεῖ, ἃς καὶ αὐτὰς ἱερεὺς | [ὑ]πάρχει διὰ βίου· καὶ βωμόν | ἱδρυσάμενος καὶ θυσίας καὶ πομπὰν | καὶ γυμνικὸν ἀγῶνα πενταετηρικὸν | ψαφ[ι]-ξάμενος Ἀρτεμιδώρεια | τετιμάκει αὐτὸν τιμαῖς ἰσοθέοις.

⁴⁰ So Gauthier 1985, op. cit. (n. 5), 62; I had assumed in op. cit. (n. 30), 300 that Artemidoros' father, Caius Julius Theopompos, had obtained freedom from Caesar after Pharsalos and that Artemidoros had secured it in the time of Augustus. For the grants, see Magie 1950, op. cit. (n.26) I, 406.

⁴¹ IGR 4, 159 Ll. 10-13: ὁμ[ο]ίως δὲ στεφανοῦσθαι αὐτὸν καὶ | ἐν τοῖς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν τιθεμ[έ]νο[ι]ς εὐχ[α]ριστηρίοις ἀγῶσιν Ἡρώοις τῷ πάπ[π]ῳ αὐτοῦ Ἀσκληπιιάδῃ τῷ οἰκ[ισ]-τῇ καὶ τοῖς συναγωνισαμένοις αὐτῷ κατ' Ἀλεξανδρεῖαν ἐν τῷ [κ]ατὰ Πτο[λεμ]α[ί]ον πολ[έ]μῳ. Cf. L. Robert, *OMS* IV, 103; *Hellenica* VIII (Paris 1950), 96. Asklepiades achieved more than Price 1984, op. cit. (n. 1), 49 note 116 suggests ("he merely served in forces aiding Caesar").

⁴² Magie 1950, op. cit. (n. 26) I, 406, II, 1261 note 11.

honoured with games, either alive or after his death.⁴³ Personally, I wonder whether these games, organized in gratitude, are a sufficient indication of cult.

The honours for Gaius Julius Epikrates and his father Gaius Julius Apollonios from Miletos have been studied extensively by P. Herrmann. Two inscriptions mention that a building has been dedicated to each one of them after their death. It is possible that a heroic cult was celebrated for them in a special construction, possibly a *temenos* (cf. the Diodoreion at Pergamon).⁴⁴ Nothing is known about the father Apollonios. But the son, Epikrates, was *stephanephoros* in the time of the invasion of the Parthians under T. Labienus. Epikrates (possibly together with his father Apollonios?) may have played part in the resistance of Miletos against Labienus. Later an embassy was sent to Rome, which recovered the ancient status of freedom and autonomy (39/38 BC), which had been lost in the time of Sulla.⁴⁵ Epikrates (and his father) may have been members of that embassy; he died some time after 6/5 BC.

The next figures are Euthydemos and Hybreas from Mylasa in Caria. An inscription, found at Mylasa by L. Robert and still unpublished, apparently mentions a priest of the deceased Hybreas and the deceased Euthydemos.⁴⁶ There are three other documents which are often adduced as evi-

⁴³ Gauthier 1985, op. cit. (n. 5), 61 lists Asklepiades among the benefactors who obtained liberty for their city. As far as I know, Kyzikos was free after the First Mithridatic War and this freedom was confirmed in 73 BC after the Third War, see Magie 1950, op. cit. (n. 26) I, 328-330. Only in 20 BC Kyzikos will lose its independence. In 47 BC Kyzikos may have obtained e.g. enlargement of its territory, privileges concerning taxes.

⁴⁴ P. Herrmann, *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 44 (1994), 229-234; idem, *Milet* VI.1, 159 and 156; SEG 44, 942. Both dedications have ὁ δῆμος -- καθιέρωσεν and the name of the (deceased) person in the dativus.

⁴⁵ P. Herrmann, in: J.H.M. Strubbe c.s., *ΕΝΕΡΓΕΙΑ. Studies on ancient history and epigraphy presented to H.W. Pleket* (Amsterdam 1996), 4; Magie 1950, op. cit. (n. 26) I, 432. Later, as a friend of Augustus, Epikrates obtained several privileges for the city, see ibidem, 5-7.

⁴⁶ The inscription was first mentioned by L. Robert, *American Journal of Archaeology* 39 (1935), 335, but Robert did not mention the priesthood, only the names of the two deceased men and a priest of the god Sinuri. A few years later, concerning his 1947-1948 course at the Collège de France (1950, op. cit. (n. 41), 95 = *OMS* IV, 103), Robert wrote that Hybreas "jouit lui-même après sa mort d' un culte héroïque". A. Akarca, *Les monnaies grecques de Mylasa* (Paris 1959), 28(-29) n. 2 argued that the inscription made known a priest of the hero Hybreas. L. Robert, *L'Antiquité Classique* 35 (1966), 420 (= *OMS* VI, 44) similarly mentioned an heroic cult of Hybreas with a priest of the cult. Only in 1974 Robert wrote concerning his 1973-1974 course at the Collège de France, that Hybreas "à sa mort il fut

dence of a cult of Hybreas: three inscribed altars of Hybreas, deceased (*heros*), are dedicated, one by a group of 18 huntsmen (κυνηγοί, *bestiarii*), another by a group of 23 men, the third by one single man and his sons.⁴⁷ It should be noted, however, that the altars are not dedicated to Hybreas (as with Epikrates) but that several altars of the deceased Hybreas are dedicated. There is no indication that the *kynegoi* acted in honour of Hybreas. It seems more likely, as G. Marasco has suggested, that Hybreas had to do with these men as a magistrate or as *euergetes*, that he had been involved during his life in the organization or the financing of the games, for example through a foundation. I suggest that these games may have been part of the Imperial cult of Roma and Augustus: Hybreas was hereditary high priest, most probably of this cult.⁴⁸

The reasons why Euthydemos and Hybreas received cultic honour is not known. Both were famous orators and leading politicians at Mylasa, opponents of each other. Euthydemos, an almost tyrannical leader, did much good to Mylasa but achieved nothing exceptional, as far as we know.⁴⁹ Hybreas, on the other hand, played an important role in the resistance against Labienus, mentioned before.⁵⁰ Under his leadership the people of Mylasa rebelled and massacred a garrison of Labienus during a feast. In revenge Labienus destroyed the city, which Hybreas and the citizens had left, and the territory. After this episode, Hybreas played an important role in the reconstruction of the city, according to Strabo. G. Marasco has recently argued that the cultic honour was awarded to Hybreas for his reconstruction works

divinisé et eut un prêtre de son culte, tout de même qu' Euthydémós (le prêtre leur était commun)" (*OMS* V, 53). On the inscription, see also G. Marasco, *Fra repubblica e impero* (Viterbo 1992), 56-58.

⁴⁷ W. Blümel, *I. Mylasa* 534-536. No. 534 starts as follows: Γαίου 'Ιουλίου, Λέοντος | ἥρωος υἱοῦ, Ὑβρέου ἥρωος, | ἀρχιερέως διὰ γένους, καθιέρωσαν οἱ κυνηγοί.

⁴⁸ The cult of Roma presumably existed in Mylasa since 188 BC, see R. Mellor, *ΘΕΑ ΡΩΜΗ. The worship of the goddess Roma in the Greek world* (Göttingen 1975), 44. It was replaced later by the new cult of Roma and Augustus, for which a temple was erected and dedicated between 12 and 2 BC (see *ibidem*, and 195). I do not agree with L. Robert, 1966, *op. cit.* (n. 50), 421 n. 7 that the *kunegoi* were a cultic group like the Juliastai at Thyateira (see below) and I consider the translation of the verb καθιέρωσαν by Blümel as "haben den heiligen Dienst vollzogen" as incorrect.

⁴⁹ Strabo 14.2.24; see Marasco 1992, *op. cit.* (n. 46), 38-42. Euthydemos had contact with Cicero, when governor of Asia, concerning a debt of the city, but it is not clear whether this was an important matter.

⁵⁰ For Hybreas, see Marasco 1992, *op. cit.* (n. 46), 37-59 with the critics of H.W. Pleket in SEG 42, 997; cf. also SEG 46, 1424.

either as a magistrate charged with the rebuilding or as *euergetes*. Marasco rejects the opinion of Ph. Gauthier that Hybreas obtained freedom for his city. Mylasa enjoyed independence since the treaty of Apameia (188 BC) and this privilege was never lost or questioned during the Republican period. It is known that Octavian, after his arrival in Asia in 31 BC, received an embassy from Mylasa, asking for help for the reconstruction of the destroyed city. Octavian probably gave help and at the same time perhaps recognized the freedom of Mylasa.⁵¹ Since Gaius Julius Hybreas probably received the Roman citizenship from Octavian, he most probably was a member or the leader of the embassy to Octavian. It is not excluded that cultic honour was awarded to Hybreas for this achievement. Perhaps Euthydemos was associated with him, as another prominent politician and benefactor.

The last inscription of the group comes from Thyateira in Lydia: the people there dedicated the Xenoneion and the grave (?) to Gaius Julius Xenon, deceased (*heros*). It is said that Xenon had conferred the greatest benefactions upon entire Asia; he is called saviour and benefactor (*euergetes*) and founder (*ktistes*) and father of his fatherland. The Juliastai, an association named after him, built the Xenoneion (a *temenos* in which his grave was also situated?) and probably performed his cult. The text is dated before 5 BC.⁵² In an earlier study I have argued that Xenon may have been head of an embassy, sent to Rome, to ask for help for reconstruction after the earthquake of 24 BC.⁵³

All benefactors of the group which I have discussed (with reservation for the case of Asklepiades from Kyzikos) were honoured with a cult in the last two thirds of the first century BC. Characteristic is that almost all intervened with the Roman authorities on behalf of their city; most of them obtained constitutional privileges, the recovery of the lost freedom. Only Xenon from Thyateira obtained material help for rebuilding his city, perhaps especially – I guess – the gymnasium. The action of Euthydemos from Mylasa remains unknown. Several of the benefactors were honoured as founder (*ktistes*). When they received a cult, some were alive, others were

⁵¹ Magie 1950, op. cit. (n. 26) I, 473.

⁵² TAM 5.2, 1098 Ll. 1-4: ὁ δῆμος | τὸ Ξενώνηον καὶ τὴν ἐντο[[μ]ήν [κα]θιέρωσεν Γαίῳ 'Ιουλίῳ 'Απο[λ]λωνίου υἱῷ Ξένωνι ἥρωι. For the date, see M.D. Campanile, *I sacerdoti del koinon d'Asia* (Pisa 1994), 31-32.

⁵³ Strubbe 1984-1986, op. cit. (n. 30), 299; Gauthier 1985, op. cit. (n. 5), 61-62, includes Xenon in his list of benefactors who obtained freedom for their city. As far as I know, Thyateira was never free.

deceased.⁵⁴ It should be noted that there are no women and no children among them.

The end

The last inscription in the series of cultic honours is the honorary decree for Lucius Vaccius Labeo from Kyme in Aiolis, which dates between 2 BC and 14 AD.⁵⁵ The inscription tells that Labeo had held the office of gymnasiarch in a glorious way, that he had built a bath for the *neoi* and had donated lands he possessed in Smarageion for its upkeep, that he had (re)built the gymnasium and that he had finished everything (of the building) splendidly. Therefore the people decided to award him the highest honour and resolved to dedicate to him a temple in the gymnasium, in which the people wanted to erect his statues, to call him founder (*ktistes*) and benefactor (*euergetes*),⁵⁶ and to confer other benefits such as golden statues, public burial after his death and interment in the gymnasium. Labeo, however, adapting his fate to what might be attained by humans, declined what was excessive and suited only to gods and god-like persons, that is the honour of the erection of a temple and of the title of *ktistes*.⁵⁷ So *boule* and *demos* decided to honour him with *proedria*, a golden crown, the erection of statues with inscription in the gymnasium, public burial after his death and interment in the gymnasium. In this text benefactions to the gymnasium, the title of *ktistes* and cultic honour are clearly interrelated.

Labeo declined the cultic honour and the title of *ktistes* because these were suited only to the gods (θεοί) and god-like men (ἰσοθέοι). The last word no doubt refers to the Emperor (Augustus).⁵⁸ Labeo put into words the

⁵⁴ Strubbe 1984-1986, op. cit. (n. 30), 290-291 with bibliographical references. Their grave was often located within the city. I am not certain that the statement of Price 1984, op. cit. (n. 1), 50 that from the reign of Augustus onwards at most heroic honours (to deceased people) were awarded, is correct (cf. the grant to Labeo, who was alive).

⁵⁵ H. Engelmann, *I. Kyme* 19; partly republished by G.G. Fagan, *Bathing in public in the Roman world* (Ann Arbor 1999), 330 no. 292 (Ll. 37-41 with translation) and 347 no. 339 (Ll. 39-40).

⁵⁶ Ll. 5-8: καὶ ναυ[ὸ]ν ἐν τῷ γυμ<ν>ασίῳ κατείρων προαγρημένω, ἐν ᾧ ταῖς τεῖμαις αὐτῷ κατιδρύσει, κτίσταν τε καὶ εὐεργέταν προσονυμιάσδεσθαι.

⁵⁷ Ll. 13-17: καὶ προσμετρεῖς τὰν ἐαυτῷ τύχαν τοῖς ἐφικτοῖσιν ἀνθρώπῳ, τὰν | μὲν ὑπερβαρέα καὶ θεοῖσι καὶ τοῖς ἰσοθέοισι ἀρμόζουσιν τὰς τε τῷ ναυῷ κατειρώσιος τὰς τε τῷ κτίσῃ | προσονυμασίας τεμᾶν παρητήσατο.

⁵⁸ Price 1984, op. cit. (n. 1), 51 with note 129; J.-L. Ferrary, in: *Actes du congrès international d' épigraphie grecque et latine, Nîmes 1992* (Paris 1997), 207 (imitation of the

idea which was no doubt generally diffused among the Greeks, that cultic honours had to be reserved for the deified Emperor because of his supreme position.⁵⁹ Moreover, as an Italian – Labeo no doubt belonged to a family of Roman *negotiatores* established in Kyme – he may have been especially sensitive to the official policy of Augustus, who declined divine honour during his lifetime, and whose words are echoed by Labeo. Parallel to Labeo's case, the last new cult of a Roman governor was established in the last decade BC.⁶⁰

After Labeo not a single benefactor was honoured with cultic honours, publicly celebrated, but the practice of conferring the title of *ktistes* went on, without cultic aspect, however. We must infer that the practice of conferring cultic honours on citizen-benefactors, which existed in Asia Minor since the beginning of the second century BC, came to an end under the influence of the cult of the Emperor and the political situation. We clearly detect here the impact of Empire.⁶¹

Labeo was offered cultic honour for his reconstruction of the gymnasium, just like Lyson, the first benefactor I have discussed. So far, we seem to have two different groups of benefactors, on the one hand those who financed (re)construction works in their city, especially on the gymnasium, on the other hand those who succeeded in winning privileges or constitutional changes for the better from Roman authorities.⁶² Both benefactions, however, were equal. They were considered as the refoundation of the city;

moderation of Augustus). Price 1984, op. cit. (n. 1), 49 note 116 is astonished that Labeo received such high honours, while he “is known only to have repaired the gymnasium”.

⁵⁹ Price 1984, op. cit. (n. 1), 50–51.

⁶⁰ For cultic honours for Roman magistrates, see Ferrary 1997, op. cit. (n. 57), 199–225; cf. the list on 216–218. According to this list the last one was C. Marcius Censorinus, proconsul of Asia between 8/7 and 3/2 BC (attested at Mylasa). G. Thériault, *Cahiers des Études Anciennes* 37 (2001) II, 92 with note 60, however, argues that it was C. Vibius Postumus, proconsul of Asia between 6–9 or 12–15 AD (attested at Samos). Thériault attributes the disappearance of cultic honour for Roman magistrates to the ‘monopolisation’ of that honour by the Emperor and his family and to Augustus' restrictive legislation on the honouring of magistrates in the provinces (p. 92).

⁶¹ Outside Asia Minor the practice ended around the same time. The last award of cultic honours to a civic benefactor took place at Kyrene in 16/15 BC for Barkaios, who was deceased (SEG 9, 4; cf. L. Robert, *Revue de Philologie* (1939), 158–163 (= *OMS* II, 1311–1316)). The gymnasiarch had to bring sacrifices for him every year on his birthday.

⁶² Thériault 2001, op. cit. (n. 60), 91 argues that the civic benefactors, honoured with cultic honours, acted in critical and dramatic circumstances, in which vital interests of their city were at stake (liberty, taxes, financial or other support). He does not point to benefactions to the gymnasium.

both types of benefactors were honoured with the title of *ktistes* (founder). The link between the two benefactions is the fact that in the second and first centuries BC the gymnasium had become the most important place in the city and the symbol of the city itself.⁶³ As *ktistai*, and overpowering all their fellow-citizens, these benefactors deserved the highest cultic honours.⁶⁴

Leiden, September 2003

⁶³ L. Robert has pointed out in many studies that the gymnasium had become a second *agora*; Ph. Gauthier, in: M. Wörle & P. Zanker, eds., *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus* (München 1995), 1-11. L. Robert had announced a work on the *euergetai* and their cult, i.a. in *OMS* II, 814 n. 3; Thériault 2001, op. cit. (n. 60), 85 n. 1 announces a book on "Les bienfaiteurs grecs et romains et les honneurs cultuels dans la cité grecque".

⁶⁴ Strubbe 1984-1986, op. cit. (n. 30), 290-296.