New Honorific Inscriptions from Amphipolis

Pantelis Nigdelis and Pavlos Anagnostoudis

In this article we publish four honorific inscriptions found in Amphipolis that relate to important moments in the city’s history. These texts will be included in the corpus on the city that has been developing in recent years under the direction of Prof. Pantelis Nigdelis.¹

1. P. Cornelius P. f. Scipio

Despite having been commented on by eminent scholars, the oldest of the inscriptions presented here has remained only partially published since its discovery three decades ago. The inscription’s importance lies in the information it provides about both the political history of Amphipolis after the fall of the Macedonian Kingdom in 168 B.C. and the city’s institutional development during the ensuing years of transition.

Museum of Amphipolis, inv. no. E17. The stone was discovered in the summer of 1984 in the area of the northern portico of the gymnasium, close to the spot where the stele inscribed with the ephebarchic law was found.² Statue base of white, fine-grained marble, broken into rather minute fragments. A large number (over thirty) of these have been recovered, allowing Kalliopi D. Lazaridi to almost completely reconstruct the left side of the base and a large part of the (inscribed) front. The inscribed side consists of eight frag-

¹ Since 2012 this project has been part of the THALES programme “Edition of epigraphic sources and documentation of the history of Ancient Macedonia” of the Ionian University, funded by the European Union (http://excellence.minedu.gov.gr/thales/en/thalesprojects/380257).

ments. Traces of a rectangular dowel hole are preserved on the upper side, as well as a *cymatium* at the bottom of the left side. Dimensions: h. 0.635 m, w. 0.758, th. 0.347. Height of the letters 0.014–0.022, interspace 0.013–0.018.
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[Π]όπλιον Κορνήλιο[ν] Ποπλίου Σκιπίωνα

vacat

γυμν[ασιαρ]χοῦντος Νικ[... ca. 18 ...]
4 ἐπὶ πολει[τ]αρχῶ[ν ... ca. 25 ...]

Ἰάσονος τ[οῦ?] ... 

The letters in the first two lines are considerably larger than those in the following lines. 1–2: reconstructed by Hatzopoulos (Bull. épigr.), based on the photograph published by K. D. Lazaridi. 3–5: unpublished.

The inscription is carefully carved and the letters are decorated with small apices. All triangular letters form a right angle at the top. Omicron and omega are of about the same height as the rest of the letters. The alpha with a broken middle bar, epsilon with a middle horizontal stroke shorter than the ones above and below, and kappa with short diagonal strokes are the most characteristic letters. Similar forms can be found in Macedonian inscriptions dating from around the second quarter of
the second century B.C. onwards. But the most notable feature of the script is the form letter ρ, whose right vertical stroke is considerably shorter than the left one. That letter-form ceases to be used in Macedonian inscriptions in about the last quarter of the second century B.C. Taking into account the form of the letters (especially π), the inscription should be dated to the middle of the second century B.C.

The text is in two parts separated by vacant space. In the upper part, the name of the honoree is given in the accusative, preceding the authority that decided on the erection of the statue, the demos of Amphipolis, in the nominative. The second part of the text contains the names of three magistrates. The name of the gymnasiarch responsible for carrying out the demos’ decision was almost certainly followed by his patronym, but neither name can be restored with any degree of certainty. The last two lines were reserved for the politarchs, of whom there could not have been more than two, if we accept that each name would have been followed by a patronym. It is noteworthy that the name of the gymnasiarch is introduced in a slightly different way than those of the politarchs, which are introduced by a prepositional phrase (γυμνασιαρχοῦντος τοῦ δείνος … ἐπὶ πολιταρχῶν etc). The phrase ἐπὶ πολιταρχῶν strongly resembles the use of eponymous officials in the city’s inscriptions prior to the introduction of the politarchate (ἐφ’ ἱερέως τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ etc.), confirming the eponymous func-

3 IG X.2:2 347 (Derriopos, 173 B.C.); EKM I 1 (mid 2nd cent. B.C.); ILGR 246 (area of Thessalonike, ca. 130 B.C.).

4 To our knowledge EKM I 134 (dated to the end of the 2nd B.C.) is the latest in which this form of ρ is attested.

5 The variant πολιταρχῶν instead of πολιταρχῶν is of no chronological significance, since the shift from τ to ει is epigraphically attested from the end of the third century B.C. onwards. See A. Panayotou, La langue des inscriptions grecques de Macédoine (diss. Nancy 1990) 197–198 and 228.

6 Although colleges of politarchs are mentioned in numerous inscriptions from Macedonia, the phrase ἐπὶ πολιταρχῶν is attested here for the first time.
tion of the politarchs in Amphipolis.7

The name Ἰάσων is well known in Macedonia, but it is not attested in other published inscriptions from Amphipolis. An unpublished inscription, which cannot be dated with certainty, records a gymnasiasarch -άσων Τηλέφου, but to suggest that the two inscriptions commemorate the same person would be an unwarranted assumption.

The identity of the honoree is a question that previous researchers have tried to resolve. According to one view, initially advocated by K. D. Lazaridi and M. B. Hatzopoulos, the statue was erected in the aftermath of Pydna in honor of P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus, who at a later stage of his life attained remarkable prominence as a public figure in Rome (cos. 147 and 134 B.C.).8 He was the second son of L. Aemilius Paullus from his first marriage, adopted at an early age by a son of the famous Scipio Africanus without ever being alienated from his natural father. He fought at Pydna under the command of Paullus, and, despite his young age,9 managed to distinguish himself by engaging the enemy in a relentless pursuit. He participated in the small retinue that accompanied Paullus on his tour of various Greek cities before the settlement of 167 and the official end of the Third Macedonian War. It is also reported that he received the library of the former Macedonian king as spoils of war.

Although no compelling argument can be made against the view presented above, J. Ma has recently focused attention on


8 On Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus (Numantinus), the victor of the Third Carthaginian War, see A. E. Astin, Scipio Aemilianus (Oxford 1967).

9 According to Livy 44.44.3 he was seventeen years old, but the issue is more complicated. See Astin, Scipio Aemilianus 245 ff.
another important statesman, who also participated in the Third Macedonian War and was a prominent figure of his time: Publius Cornelius Scipio Nasica Corculum (cos. 162 and 155), son of Publius Cornelius Scipio Nasica.10 The younger Nasica had married Aemilius Paullus’ niece Cornelia, the oldest daughter of Scipio Africanus, thus becoming the adoptive uncle of the aforementioned Scipio Aemilianus. He also distinguished himself during the last phase of the war against Perseus as a senior military officer under Paullus’ command, managing to defeat the Macedonian garrison stationed at Pythium. What is of utmost importance for the subsequent history of Amphipolis is that Nasica was sent with a small contingent to the city right after the battle of Pydna, in order to “lay waste to Sintice” and to inhibit Perseus from making counterattacks on the Romans.

Of these two Cornelii, both had some involvement in Macedonian affairs and reportedly visited Amphipolis, and either could be identified with the honoree attested in the statue base. No other namesake need be taken into consideration.11 Despite the attractiveness of Lazaridi’s proposal, it is difficult to ascertain what led to the bestowal of such a prestigious honor upon the young Aemilianus. Ma conjectures that some kind of reconciliation could have taken place between Paullus and Amphipolis through the intercession of Aemilianus, but the latter lacked any sort of military authority to play such a role and so there is no evidence to support that view.12 He rightly rejects the possibility that Aemilianus was honored on the oc-

10 J. Ma, in Imperialism 234–237, where both possibilities are considered equally probable. In a brief re-examination of the issue in 2013 (Statues and Cities 90), he seems to favour the second solution.

11 For the least likely possibilities see Ma, in Imperialism 235; in n.13 he mentions the consul of 16 B.C., formerly identified with the quaestor pro praetore of Achaea attested in IG II² 4120 and 4121 (see PIR² C 1438). This governor of Achaea can no longer be identified with the consul of 16 because of the evidence now provided by AE 1967, 458.

12 Ma, in Imperialism 235.
casion of his embassy in the East in 144/3 on the grounds that no official title held by the honoree is mentioned in the inscription.\textsuperscript{13} It is also possible that Aemilianus participated in the games organized by his father in Amphipolis, but even for a winning athlete, the erection of a statue in the gymnasium would seem a rather extravagant prize.

On the other hand, literary sources provide more tangible evidence about the relationship between Scipio Nasica and Amphipolis, which was less ephemeral than is generally assumed. According to Livy, Nasica was sent to Amphipolis when Paullus was still at his camp in Pydna and before it became known that Perseus had fled the city.\textsuperscript{14} At that point, all that Paullus could have known was that Perseus had fled the battlefield, heading in the direction of Amphipolis. Unlike the citizens of Beroea and Thessalonike, who immediately after the battle surrendered to the Romans, the citizens of Amphipolis had opened their gates to the fleeing monarch, putting themselves in a potentially dangerous position. The specific orders that Nasica received from the consul, notably to lay waste to Sintice, suggest that at the time the land around the Strymon was still beyond Roman control and capable of providing the Macedonian king with enough resources to afford him a last stand. After Nasica was sent in pursuit of Perseus, Paullus moved his camp from Pydna to Pella and stayed there for an unspecified number of days (\textit{aliquot dies}, Liv. 44.46.4). While in Pella, he was informed that Perseus had fled to Samothrace, so he moved his army and reached Amphipolis in four days. Although it is not explicitly stated, it is reasonable to assume that the message informing the consul about the whereabouts of the fleeing king was sent by Nasica himself. That was precisely when Paullus should have been informed that the citizens

\textsuperscript{13} As we shall see, any date after 149 for the erection of the statue is unlikely.

\textsuperscript{14} Liv. 44.46.2: \textit{P. Nasicam, ignarus fugae regis, Amphipolim misit cum modica peditum equitumque manu, simul ut Sinticen evastaret et ad omnes conatus regi impedimento esset.}
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of Amphipolis had refused to provide assistance to their former king, leaving him no other option but to flee the city. The undeniable fact is that Amphipolis was not subjected to reprisal, even if Nasica had received direct orders by Paullus to ravage the region; it would therefore not be inappropriate at all if the citizens of Amphipolis, reasonably at its pro-Roman party’s suggestion, decided to honor the Roman officer out of gratitude for the role he had played in effecting the peaceful surrender of the city to Roman rule in 168. In any case, the identification of the honoree with Nasica seems less problematic.15

If the find-spot of the remnants of the honorific monument is the place where the statue was originally erected (the northern portico), then it was situated in a prominent part of the gymnasium, close to where the ephebarchic law was displayed. The dowel hole still visible on the upper side was probably used to secure the base to a nearby wall. In contrast to other material that belongs to the early (Hellenistic) phase of the gymnasium and was reused in its later phase, Cornelius Scipio’s statue base was shattered into pieces never to be used again. Only a small fraction of the original base survives, and one cannot help but wonder what caused the apparently violent mutilation of the monument. If the mutilation is to be connected with the Andriskos uprising (149 B.C.),16 then it is noteworthy that it was Scipio Nasica who was dispatched to Macedonia as a legate to deal with the situation.17

15 After Paullus reached Amphipolis, he did not change his strategy towards Sintice and moved his army northwards to Siris. Unfortunately, Livy does not inform us who was head of the garrison stationed in Amphipolis.

16 For the self-proclaimed king of Macedon and the events of 149–148 see J. M. Heliesen, Andricus and the Revolt of Macedonians (Madison 1968); P. A. MacKay, Studies in the History of the Republican Macedonia (Berkeley 1964), with a detailed study of the numismatic evidence.

17 Zonaras 9.28: οἱ δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι κατεφρόνουν μὲν πρῶτον τοῦ Ἀνδρίσκου, εἶτα τὸν Σκιπίωνα τὸν Νασίκαν ἐπέμψαν εἰρηνικῶς ποιῶς τὰ ἑκεῖ διοικήσοντα. ὡς εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἔλθον καὶ μαθὼν τὰ γενόμενα, τοῖς μὲν
As stated above, the chief importance of the inscription lies in the fact that it offers rare new evidence about the institutional history of Amphipolis in the period after the fall of the Macedonian kingdom in 168 B.C. and before the establishment of the Roman province of Macedonia in 148. Of the seventy-two references to the institution of the politarchs conveniently gathered by G. Horsley, three are in inscriptions of Amphipolis: the honorific inscription for Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, the two independent dedications of Perseus and the *demos* of Amphipolis to Artemis Tauropolos, and a fragmentary honorific or dedicatory inscription. To these attestations can now be added the two that are published here for the first time: the honorific inscription for M. Licinius Crassus (below) and, of course, that for P. Cornelius Scipio.

The first three documents, mentioning five, two, and three politarchs respectively, present rather perplexing information on how many of these magistrates were in power in Amphipolis, giving the impression that over a brief period of time their number fluctuated wildly. Ch. Koukouli-Chrysanthaki once postulated that there were two politarchs in pre-Roman times, as attested in the dedication to Tauropolos, which she dated to 179–171, but that their number was increased to five after the Romans became involved in Macedonian affairs, as reflected in the inscription for Ahenobarbus, which is usually dated to

---

21 *SEG* XXVII 248; fig. 3 below.
22 Their perplexing nature is stressed by Horsley, *MedArch* 7 (1994) 118.
E. Voutyras, following earlier scholars, maintained that when the institution of the politarchs was introduced in Amphipolis after the settlement of 167, they were initially two in number but were later increased to five. It is beyond the scope of the present study to reopen the question concerning the time when the institution was introduced in Macedonia and the development it underwent later, but it must be stressed that the new inscription seems to confirm Voutyras’ conclusion, as it lists only two politarchs and can safely be dated immediately after the battle of Pydna in 168.

The apparent ambiguity of the sources concerning the number of politarchs in Amphipolis cannot be clarified until two other issues have been addressed. First, there is one fragmentary inscription from Amphipolis that seems to attest three politarchs instead of two or five. Second, the inscription for Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus mentions five politarchs, even though it is usually dated ca. 167. As regards the first inscription, the argument that it attests a board of three magistrates cannot be sustained, since the stele has not been preserved intact and the original text could easily have commemorated up to five magistrates (see fig. 3). The identification of Domitius Ahenobarbus, however, poses greater difficulties that cannot be dealt with in the present article. For now, it suffices to recall that P. Perdrizet, the only person who actually examined the stone, deemed the chronology now accepted by most scholars


as too early on palaeographical grounds.\textsuperscript{26}

To sum up, the inscription from 168 B.C. constitutes the earliest attestation of the politarchs in Macedonia to date and, taken together with older and more recent finds, sheds light on the development this institution underwent in Amphipolis from the second century B.C. onwards. Even the reference to the \textit{demos} is something that should not be overlooked, since it clearly demonstrates that—during the period in which Macedonia was becoming a Roman protectorate—the citizen body remained active in Amphipolis.

\textit{Figure 3: SEG XXVII 248}

2. Marcus Licinius Crassus

The inscription is on the revetment of the pedestal of a statue that was set up, probably in the gymnasium,\textsuperscript{27} in honor of Marcus Licinius Crassus (cos. 30 B.C.), the last governor of the

\textsuperscript{26} Perdrizet, \textit{BCH} 18 (1894) 419–429, no. 2 [\textit{SEG XXIV} 580]. Neither we nor the scholars who came before us (Edson, Lazaridis, Voutyras) were able to find it.

\textsuperscript{27} According to verbal testimony (from Alexandros Kochliaridis, former Chief Warder of Amphipolis Museum and a close colleague of D. Lazaridis), the stone comes from the place known as ‘Koundoura ormi’ (the bed of the Koundoura stream), located in front of the ancient gymnasium.
province of Macedonia in the form it took in the Republican period. The stone is broken on the upper left side, and was cut down on the other three sides when it was reused. In the reconstruction we suggest, the number of letters missing from the left edge of the inscription has been calculated on the basis of the first four lines, which can be completed with certainty.

Fragment of a marble inscription, given to the Amphipolis Museum (inv. A 529) on 7 Nov. 1990 by Mr. Antonios Tsalis, a resident of the village of Palaiokomi, Serres. The inscription had been built into the oven of the Leptokarydis house in the same village, as was evident from the fact that the greater part of it was covered with a thick layer of soot. A small quadrilateral hole in the obverse (the inscribed side) of the slab and an irregular indentation on the reverse were also made when it was reused. Dimensions: h. 0.57 m.; w. max. 0.84, min. w. 0.74; th. 0.12. The letters have apices; their height varies: in the first line 0.035 m., in the last three bigger, from 0.043 to 0.050. Interspace 0.015–0.020. Figure 4.
[... ] ΣΟΑΜ[- - - - - - - - - -]
[... ]ΤΟΙΚΟΥΝ[- - - - - - - - - -]
[Mάρ]κον Λικίννιον Κρά[σσον]
4 [... ]οκράτορα, σωτήρα καὶ εὐ[- -]
[... ]ζ πόλεως πολιταρχου[- - - - - - - - - -]
[... ]υσιμάχου τοῦ Αποστολοφο[- - - - - - - - - -]
[... ]χεπόλεως τοῦ Φιλίπ[- - - - - - - - - -]
8 [... ]μματοῦ τοῦ [. ]ομιμην[- - - - - - - - - -]
[----------------------------------------]

In 2 the right half of a tau can be made out. Of the final extant letter the vertical stroke and the cross-bar of a nu have survived.

1: The remains of the extant letters allow us to restore: [ὁ δήμος ζ ἄμφιπολ(ε)τῶν], “the demos of the Amphipolitans.” This phrase appears in a dedicatory inscription made by the demos to Artemis Tauropolos,28 in the honorific inscription (found in Thessalonike) for Iulius C. f. Optatus, probably a procurator Augusti for the province of Macedonia in the time of Claudius,29 and in the similarly honorific inscription for Cn. Domitius Cn. f. Ahenobarbus.30

2: The participle, which can be restored with certainty, shows that the ecclesia of the demos of Amphipolis and the Romans living there, [οῖ καὶ τοικοῦν[τες Ῥωμαίοι], erected this monument after a vote. The phrase refers to the Roman community of Amphipolis (conventus civium Romanorum). Its use for the first time in Macedonia, rather than the more usual συμπραγματευόμενοι Ῥωμαίοι that describes these communities in

28 SEG XXXI 614 = Hatzopoulos, Macedonian Institutions II no. 29: ὁ δήμος ὁ ἄμφιπολῖτῶν Ἀρτέμιδι Ταυροπόλῳ πολιταρχοῦντον Τιμονίδου τοῦ Ἀσκληπιιάδου, Μεστὶολου] τοῦ Μητροδόρου.
29 IG X 2 1 136: [ὁ δήμος ἄμφιπολ[τῶν] [ - -] Ἰούλιον Γ. νίκαιν Βρικτῶν etc. Edson in his commentary suggested that it might refer to a procurator of the imperial estates.
30 Perdrizet, BCH 18 (1894) 419, published the first line of the inscription as δήμος ἄμφιπολειτῶν; SEG XXIV 580 gives [ὁ δήμος ἄμφιπολειτῶν].
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is not surprising. Similar epigraphic examples, dated from the first century A.D. onwards, are known from many Greek cities. A typical example is from Achaea, where ca. A.D. 31 the city of the Pellenians and its Roman inhabitants ἡ πόλις τῶν Πελληνέων καὶ Ἦμοιοι οἱ κ[α]τοικοῦντες honor the procurator provinciae Publius Caninius Agrippa as their ancestral benefactor (ἐκ προγόνων εὐεργέτην: SEG XI 1269). The same expression is found in cities in Asia Minor, e.g. Pergamum, where ὁ δῆμος καὶ οἱ κ[α]τοικοῦντες Ἦμοιοι set up a statue of Augustus (I.Perg. VIII.2 383); Apamea (Phrygia), where between 66 and 69 the council and the demos and the Roman inhabitants ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι set up a statue of Vespasian (MAMA VI 177); and Tralles, where sometime after 129 [the council and the people and] the Romans living in Tralles (ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος καὶ οἱ ἐν Τράλλεσι) honored an eminent official (I.Tralleis 80).

3: The honoree is named using an onomastic formula without filiation, as in a similar inscription for Crassus from Thespiae, ὁ δῆμος Μάρκον Λικίνιον Κράσσον αὐτοκράτορα τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πάτρωνα ἀρετῆς ἐνεκεν καὶ εὐνοίας θεοῖς.32

4: Here as in the inscription from Thespiae and one on the Athenian Acropolis33 for Crassus, the honoree is called αὐτοκράτωρ. Here and at Thespiae there is no mention of his office; but the title αὐτόκρατωρ confirms that the statue was erected in his honor during his proconsulship, i.e. in 29 or 28, when he was

31 See the citations in nn.46–51 below. The honorific inscription Ekm I 59 that οἱ Βεροιαῖοι καὶ οἱ ἐνκεκτηκόντες Ῥωμαῖοι set up between 57 and 55 is an exception.


33 IG II 4118: ὁ δῆμος Μάρκου Λικίνιον Μάρκου ὡς Κράσσον ἐνθύπατον καὶ αὐτοκράτορα ἀρετῆς ἐνεκεν κ[α]ὶ εὐνοίας. Kirchner gives the date as ca. 27; M. J. Payne, APETAS ENEKEN: Honors to Romans and Italians in Greece from 260 to 27 B.C. (diss. U. Michigan 1984) 333, dates this inscription and the one from Thespiae to between 30 and 28.
proclaimed *imperator* by his legions. Accepting a similar honor after his period of office as *proconsul*, when he seems to have fallen into disfavor, would be strange. The question remains open whether or not the Senate finally awarded him the title of *αὐτοκράτωρ*, since Augustus was granted the powers of *imperium maius proconsulare*.34

What is especially interesting is that the Amphipolitans gave him the title *σωτήρ*, which, as far as we had known, was only once ever given to a Roman Republican official in Macedonia, Quintus Caecilius Metellus.35 Granting it to Licinius Crassus most probably reflects that the inhabitants of Amphipolis, Greeks and Romans, believed that, thanks to his military successes against the Bastarnae and neighboring Thracian tribes (on which see below), he had saved them from the devastating consequences that an invasion of Macedonia through the Strymon valley would have had on their lives. The title *εὐεργέτης* (benefactor) is more common and was granted in other honorific inscriptions in cities of the province to its Roman officials, e.g. M. Minucius Rufus (cos. 110 B.C.), or C. Caecilius Rufus, *legatus* ca. 52.36 The three titles (*αὐτοκράτωρ*, *σωτήρ*,


36 *SEG* XLI 570: [Μάαρκον Μινύκιον Κοίντου Κοίντου] ὑ[ιὸν Ἡρωίαν] στρατηγὸν ἀ[νθύπατον Ῥωμαίων νικήσαντα τόν] πρὸς Γαλατίας Σκορδῆς καὶ Βέσους καὶ τοὺς λυπότοις Θράκης πόλεον τῶν αὐτῶν εὐεργετὴν ἄρετὴς ἐνεκεν καὶ εὐνοίας Εὐρωπαίων ἡ πόλις; *Polemon* 1 (1929) 201, 424a: Ἀμπετριεῖς Γάιον Καίλὼν Γεαύν ὑ[ιὸν Ῥοῦφον, πρεσβευτὴν καὶ ἀντιστράτηγον, ἐποδεδειγμένον δὲ καὶ δήμαρχον τῶν ἑατῶν εὐεργετήν ἄρετὴς ἐνεκεν τῆς εἰς ἑατοὺς.

---

*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 57 (2017) 295–324
εὐεργέτης] were used in combination in Greek inscriptions to honor important Roman generals of the Republican period, such as Sulla and Caesar. 37

6–9: Of the names of the politarchs in the year in which the statue was erected only three can be filled in with certainty. The name of a fourth has been preserved in a very fragmentary condition; on the basis of what we know about the number of politarchs in the city from other inscriptions of this period and the fact that the stone has also been cut off at the bottom, a fifth name must also have been mentioned. 38 The names and patronyms of the first three, who are otherwise unknown, can be completed: [Ἀ]υσίμαχος, Μητροφώ[v], [Ἀχάρ]έπολις, Φιλαίπ[νος], [...][μ]μάτως, and [Ν]ομίμην[ιος]. Of these the names, Lysimachus, Numenius, and Philippus are already attested in inscriptions from Amphipolis. Archepolis is mentioned for the first time, though known in Macedonia from Thessalonike and Styberra, likewise Metrophon, associated with Thracian cities (e.g. Maroneia, Pistoros, and perhaps Stryme). Completing the name of the third politarch, of which the letters -ματω have been preserved, is impossible. In the onomastics not just of the city but also of Macedonia, there is no trace of a name with this


38 As in the (now lost) inscription in honor of Cn. Domitius Cn. F. Hesperobarbus, Perdrizet, BCH 18 (1894) 419, no. 2 [SEG XXIV 580]; ὁ δήμος Λιμησσολιτῶν Γαύανον Δωμήτειον Γναίῳ νομοὶν Αἰνόβαρβον τὸν εὐεργήτην, πολεπαλειτῶν [Φιλ]ακράτως τοῦ [Πυ]λράκτους, [Ε]πικράτους τοῦ Σερ[,] οὺ, [Θ]εότητα τοῦ [δείνος], Ἐρμοῖτον τοῦ Ἀρπάλῳ, Σαρπαῖονος τοῦ Σαρα[–]. On the various dates suggested for this inscription see Horsley, Melanchthia 7 (1994) 102 and 114–115. Given that the earliest mention of politarchs at Amphipolis (no. 1 above) and the combined dedication to Tauropolos from Perseus and the demos mention only two politarchs, the appearance of five in the Licinius Crassus inscription makes the date 167, suggested by a number of scholars, problematic.
ending and the same number of letters.\textsuperscript{39}

On the basis of the foregoing the inscription must be completed as follows:

29 or 28 B.C.

\[
\begin{align*}
[\omega \delta \eta m\omega \varsigma \omega \Lambda \mu [\varphi i \pi o \lambda (\epsilon) \iota \tau \omicron \nu kai]\nonumber\noindent
& [o\iota \varsigma \tau o i k\omega \nu\varsigma [\tau e\varsigma \Psi o m\alpha \iota i o i]\nonumber\noindent
& [M\nu \rho \kappa o\nu \Lambda i k\iota \nu n i o i K\rho [\varsigma \nu \sigma \nu o n]\nonumber\noindent
& [\alpha u\tau \omega k\rho \alpha \tau \alpha \omicron, \sigma o t\eta \rho \varsigma kai\nu e\varsigma \varepsilon \varphi y \gamma \varepsilon \tau \eta \nu n]\nonumber\noindent
& [\tau \eta \varsigma \pi \omega \lambda e o\varsigma, \pi \omega \lambda e i \tau \alpha r \chi o\nu [\nu t e\nu o n]\nonumber\noindent
& [\Lambda \mu \sigma i m\alpha \chi o\nu \tau o\nu \M\mu r \tau o \rho \sigma \nu o\nu [\nu t e\nu o n]\nonumber\noindent
& [\Lambda \rho i \chi e \pi \omega \lambda e o\nu \tau o\nu \Phi i \lambda \iota \pi [\pi o n]\nonumber\noindent
& [. . . ]\mu m\alpha t o\nu \tau o\nu [N]\nu m\mu e n\{\nu o n]\nonumber\noindent
& [- - - - - - - - t o]\nu [M\{ - - - - -\}]
\end{align*}
\]

As the titles \textit{συντοκράτωρ} and \textit{σωτήρ} allow us to deduce, the inscription is associated with the military successes of Marcus Licinius Crassus during his campaigns as governor of Macedonia in the Balkans in 29–28 B.C.\textsuperscript{40} We owe the most comprehensive description to Cassius Dio Book 51, in which he informs us that, early in 29,\textsuperscript{41} Crassus drove the Bastarnae from the territory of the (Thracian) Denthelitae, who lived on the borders of the province of Macedonia (along the upper part of the Strymon). The Bastarnae, a German tribe from the Dan-

\textsuperscript{39} Research based on \textit{LGPN IV}.


\textsuperscript{41} On the starting point of the hostilities in 29 see the discussion in Groag, \textit{RE} 13 (1926) 272–273; cf. Charlesworth, \textit{CAH} X 117–118; Papazoglou, \textit{The Central Balkan Tribes} 417.
ube region, had occupied the area. Crassus subsequently vanquished them in a battle near what is now Cibrica, in the vicinity of the Kedros River, a tributary of the Danube, and in fact killed their king, Deldo. According to the same account hostilities against the Bastarnae were resumed in 28: Crassus extended the range of his campaigns, subduing Thracian tribes such as the Maedi, the Serdi, and the Bessi. That same year after provocation by some of his allies he turned on the Getae in the Danube region, where he defeated the kings, Dapyx and Zyraxes, and his legates subdued the rebellious Moesi once and for all. It was these successes of his over the Thracians and the Getae, as stated in the Fasti Triumphales (exs Traecia et [Get]is, July of 27), that laid the foundations of Roman rule north of the province of Macedonia and opened the way for creating the provinces of Moesia and Thrace. Consequently the new inscription must be dated to 29 or 28.

This new testimony offers no significant information on the hostilities in those years. At best it strengthens the likely hypothesis that the four or five legions Crassus led invaded Thrace through the Strymon valley. It is also possible that some of them were permanently garrisoned there. Contributory factors in the choice of route must have been the location of the enemy and the fact that the river was at least partly navigable.

What is more important is the information that the decision

---

42 I. Ital. XIII.1 p.345. On the interpretation of this—at first sight—strange phrase, because neither the Bastarnae nor the Moesi against whom Crassus had been battling are mentioned, see Papazoglou, The Central Balkan Tribes 324, and Šašel Kos, in Limes 284–285.

43 See Šašel Kos, in Limes 282, and most recently B. Kreiler, “Zur Datierung eines Volkesbeschlusses von Thasos und zum makedonischen Statthaltersitz im 2. Jh. v.Chr.,” ZPE 174 (2010) 109–112. Kreiler theorized that Amphipolis was the most suitable place for garrisoning the Roman legions of the province in the second half of the second century B.C., because of the repeated attacks on Macedonia by the Skordiski and Gauls.

to erect a statue of Crassus was made by the ecclesia of the demos and the Roman community of the city following a process which is not clear from the wording of the inscription. Though we suspected the existence of this community from the well-known passage of Caesar describing the flight of Pompey after his defeat at Pharsalus in 48,\(^\text{45}\) hitherto we have had no epigraphic evidence to confirm it. This testimony can be added to the others we have on Romans organizing themselves in similar ways in other cities of Macedonia, e.g. Thessalonike,\(^\text{46}\) Beroea,\(^\text{47}\) Edessa,\(^\text{48}\) Acanthus,\(^\text{49}\) Idomene,\(^\text{50}\) and Styberra.\(^\text{51}\)

The fact that this community made the decision to award honors to the provincial governor together with the city’s demos shows not only that it had influence over the local community but also that the number of its members was such as to make it a significant factor in the public life of Amphipolis.

This new witness is also interesting for the history of the city itself: it shows that, whatever the economic and social consequences of the two great Roman civil wars of the second half of the first century B.C. on Macedonian soil, it would be wrong to describe Amphipolis at the end of the thirties as “an uninhabited site,” as is sometimes said or implied in the literature.\(^\text{52}\)

\(^{45}\) BC 3.102.2–4: evat editum Pompei nomine Amphiropoli propositum uti omnes eius provinciae iuniores, Graeci civesque Romani, iurandi causa convenirent … ipse ad an- coram una nocte constitit, et vocatis ad se Amphiropoli hospitibus et pecunia ad necessarios sumptus corrogata cognito Caesari adventu ex eo loco discessit.

\(^{46}\) IG X.2.1 32 and 33 (1st cent. A.D.); SEG XLVI 812 (Augustan).

\(^{47}\) EKM I 59 (57–55 B.C.).

\(^{48}\) EKM II 180 (1st cent. A.D.).

\(^{49}\) SEG I 282 (Augustan).

\(^{50}\) SEG XIX 438 (41–44).

\(^{51}\) IG X.2.2 330 (1st cent. A.D.).
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3. Augustus and Lucius Calpurnius Piso Pontifex

In 1979 D. Lazaridis discovered one of Amphipolis’ gates, known as Gate Δ and thought to be the main gate of the city. This gate, at the southernmost point of the walls and about 1 km. in a direct line from the current site of the Lion Monument, has been preserved in excellent condition. It measures 10 m. × 10.5, has an external fortified courtyard 6.80 m. long and 4.70 wide and an inner, paved space that belonged to the bed of the road that passed through it. The walls of the courtyard have survived to a height of 3.70 m. at one point and 4.40 at another. The width of the entry is 3.38 m. Outside, in front of the south wall of the courtyard, on either side of the entrance and at a height of ca. 2 m. above the original level of the courtyard, two inscribed bases for bronze statues were discovered in situ. The one on the left has been preserved intact with a few abrasions, while from the one on the right the impost block is missing. The two pedestals are placed symmetrically in relation to the entrance to the gate (fig. 5).

Brill’s Companion to Ancient Macedon (Leiden 2011) 428–429.

Lazaridis, Λατινική Διεθνείς Σύνεδρος (M.A. thesis Thessalonike 1993) 29–30, holds that the road skirted round the eastern wall and followed a route to the north of Pangaeon. G. Lolos, Συνεδρίου Ελληνικής Εφαρμογής (Athens 2008), does not discuss this.
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Both pedestals are of white coarse-grained marble with greyish veining. Their orthostats taper slightly towards the top on all sides, and consist of two upright cornerstones laid widthwise, well fitted together and set on a system of moldings (concave below and convex above), standing on a stylobate. However, there are some small differences between them, mainly in the fashioning of the moldings on the base but also in the upper part of the front, which curves noticeably outwards only on the pedestal on the viewer’s right.

Left pedestal: It has survived together with its monolithic, tripartite dosseret. The lower and upper parts of the dosseret, which are undecorated and are almost rectangular in section and taper slightly towards the bottom, are separated by a cornice-style group of moldings—bead and reel, convex, and cyma recta (from bottom to top). On the upper surface of the dosseret are two mortices (left 0.16 × 0.10 m., right 0.08 × 0.08) for attaching an over-life-size bronze statue. The inscription attests that it was an imperial statue. As can
be deduced from the location and the shape of the mortices, the statue was installed leaning to the left. The left leg was the engaged (weight-bearing) leg, with the sole of the foot firmly rooted on the base, as the large trapezoidal mortice under the sole and the ellipsoid one under the heel show. The figure had its free, right, leg distinctly out to the right and slightly back, touching the surface only with the front part of the foot and slightly lifting the heel. Thus the torso was turning noticeably to the left. Dimensions: dosseret h. 0.32 m., w. 0.73, th. 0.69. Orthostat: h. 0.785, w. 0.72 (above)–0.73 (below); th. 0.69 (above)–0.715 (below). Upper part of the base: h. 0.13, w. 0.81, th. 0.77. Figure 6.

Right pedestal. On the top of the orthostat there are Π-shaped mortices for attaching the two cornerstones placed widthwise. The left-hand one (0.20 × 0.065 m., th. 0.035) was placed on a rectangular indentation, while the right-hand one (0.25 × 0.065, th. 0.035) was set in an axe-shaped indentation. Another four rectangular mortices can be identified with the corresponding pour channels for molten lead close to the corners of the orthostat. These were intended to take the tenons that attached the orthostat to the dosseret, which is now lost. For reasons of stability, however, these four mortices were set with two in one direction and two in another: the one located at the front left corner and the one diagonally opposite were made parallel to the narrow side of the cornerstones while the other two, which are more elongated, follow the diagonal that crosses the ortho-
stat from back left to front right. In the mortice at back left and part of the corresponding pour channel a significant chunk of lead has been preserved. Dimensions of the pedestal: orthostat h. 0.94 m., w. 0.73 (above)–0.79 m. (below), th. 0.67 (above)–0.72 (below). Upper part of the base: h. 0.13, w. 0.92, th. 0.90. Figure 7.

As is seen from the above description, the statue on the left, which was of Augustus as its inscription shows, was clearly turned towards the opening in the propylon and the statue on the other side of that opening. As to the statue on the right we can reasonably posit that it also would have been set at an angle on its pedestal, and was also turning its torso towards the propylon, i.e. to its right and towards the emperor, with the right leg engaged and the left free, given the symmetrical placement of the two pedestals on either side of the gateway. Consequently, the two statues would have formed a group, thus emphasizing the relationship between them.55

Figure 8

55 We are most grateful to our friend Dr. Chrysoula Ioakeimidou for the description of the pedestals and the suggested interpretation of their poses.
The inscription on the left pedestal (line h. 0.04 m., interlinear space 0.01–0.015; fig. 8):

Αὐτοκράτορι Καίσαρι
θεῷ θεοῦ υἱῷ
Σεβαστῷ σωτῆρι και
κτίστῃ τῆς πόλεως.

The inscription on the right pedestal (line h. 0.03–0.04 m., interlinear space 0.02–0.025; fig. 9):

Λευκίῳ Κολπορνίῳ
Πείσωνι πάτρωνι
και εὗεργέτη τῆς πόλεως.

Not only are the two pedestals constructed and worked in the same way: some of the characteristics of the lettering and the general impression of the script are identical,\textsuperscript{56} so there is no

\textsuperscript{56} Typical letters with the same form are: \textit{alpha} (with broken middle bar), \textit{epsilon} (with the three horizontal strokes of equal length and the middle one not touching the upright hasta), \textit{eta} (with middle bar not touching the two hastas), \textit{kappa} (with short side strokes), \textit{pi} (with horizontal stroke projecting slightly beyond the two hastas), \textit{rho} (with a small bowl), \textit{sigma} (with horizontal strokes parallel), and open \textit{omega} (with the strokes at the bottom sometimes
doubt that the two monuments were constructed at the same
time and were part of a single program. Thus the statue on the
right pedestal belonged to L. Calpurnius Piso, known as Ponti-
fex (PIR² C 289), and not to his father L. Calpurnius Piso Ca-
sonianus who was governor of Macedonia in 57–55, as has been
suggested on the basis of the initial mention of this discovery.⁵⁷
L. Calpurnius Piso Pontifex’s activities in the Balkans are well
known from the literary sources, above all Dio. According to
these Piso was sent by Augustus from Pamphylia to Thrace,
because a general revolt of the Thracian tribes had been
reported, in which the Bessi played a leading role under
Vologases, a priest of Dionysos. In the meantime the king of
the Odrysians, Rhescuporis, had been murdered and Rhoe-
metalces I, king of the Sappaeans, had fled to the Thracian
Chersonese (Dio 54.34.5–7). This uprising also affected Mac-
donia when the Sialetae, a tribe in western Thrace or at its
north-eastern edge between the Haemos and the coastal
region,⁵⁸ invaded the province and laid it waste.⁵⁹ Piso’s mis-
slanting and sometimes almost touching the engraver’s guideline). The let-
tering is carefully executed apart from the last two letters in the Calpurnius
inscription, which the stone carver has made smaller and closer together on
account of misjudging the space available. The letters are squared off and
have small apices. Having no photos of the two inscriptions at his disposal,
F. Daubner, “Macedonian Small Towns and their Use of Augustus,” Re-
ligion in the Roman Empire 2 (2016) 391–414, erroneously argues that “they
cannot have been erected together, as a group, because the letter forms are
very different from each other” (399).

⁵⁷ Lazaridis, in Πρακτικά του Η’ Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου 21, and Prakt 1979,
75, followed by Payne, APETAS ENEKEN 292; Ferrary, Actes du Xe congrès
225; Canali de Rossi, Il violo 12 and 141; Xydopoulos, Ancient Macedonia VI
1374–1375; Eilers, Roman Patrons 150 and 206, who nevertheless does not
exclude the possibility that it might be Piso the Pontifex. By contrast
Koukouli-Chrysanthaki, in Brill’s Companion 429–430, recognizes that it is
Pontifex, but still accepts him as governor of Macedonia.

⁵⁸ On the area inhabited by the Sialetae see C. Partsch, Beiträge zur Völker-
kunde von Südosteuropa (SitzWien 1933.1) 89 and n.1, and E. Oberhumer,
“Selleteike,” RE 2A (1923) 1320, and “Sialetae” 2067.

⁵⁹ Dio 54.34.6: ὡς ὀὖν αὐτὸς (sc. Οὐαλαγαίσης) τε ταύτ’ ἐποίει καὶ οἱ

---
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sion lasted three years.60 Various dates have been proposed for the year he spent in Thrace and Macedonia, where he recruited troops. In our opinion the most convincing is the one that would have the mission lasting from 11 to 9 B.C.61 The two monuments must be dated to this period.

The new witness is the first known inscription in which a Macedonian city honors Piso, and so it raises once again the question to what extent he was directing military campaigns not only as Augustus’ legate but also as governor of Macedonia, as some scholars assert.62 The new inscription cannot answer this question once and for all, but the fact that the Amphipolitans did not honor him as proconsul reinforces the view, previously expressed,63 that he was operating in Thrace as Augustus’ legate in Macedonia (legatus Augusti pro praetore provinciae Macedoniae), just as a few years before him L. Tarius Rufus had done when he subjugated the Sauromatians/Sarmatians who had invaded Thrace.64 Evidently Augustus, wishing to control Thrace militarily himself and not through

Σιαλέται τὴν Μακεδονίαν ἐκακούργουν.


61 For a critical appraisal of all opinions see G. Alföldy, “Un celebre frammento epigrafico tiburtino anonimo (P. Sulpicius Quirinius?),” in I. di Stefano Manzella (ed.), Le iscrizioni dei cristiani in Vaticano (Vatican City 1997) 199–208, here 204–205. The alternative dates that have been proposed are 13–11 and 12–10.

62 See Alföldy, in Le iscrizioni 206. To the bibliography cited there add Sarikakis, Πολιτείαι Ἀρχοντεῖς II 34–37.

63 See A. Aichinger, “Die Reichsbeamten der römischen Macedonia der Prinzipatpoche,” AArchSlov 30 (1979) 609, and Alföldy, in Le iscrizioni 206. According to Alföldy we must exclude the possibility that Piso was governor of Macedonia in these years, because immediately thereafter he took on the province of Asia, and two consecutive periods of office by a senator is inconceivable in the Augustan period.

64 AE 1936, 18: Imperatore Caesare Divi filio Augusto L(uicio) Tario Ruf(o) pro praetore legionis X fret(ensis) pontem fecit.
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the governors of Macedonia appointed by the Senate, sent people he could trust on special military missions, whenever Thrace, part of the province, revolted. This close relationship between Augustus and Piso is made clear in Amphipolis by the fact that their statues formed a single statuary group, erected at the main entrance of a city in a senatorial province.65

As in many other Greek cities Augustus is honored in the new inscription with the title “saviour” (σωτήρ) which confirms the “soteriological” character of the honors bestowed on him by the Greeks.66 Beyond the general idea that he saved them from the effects of civil wars, it is reasonable to assume that Amphipolitans honor Augustus as “saviour” at this very moment for the further reason that he and his legate had saved them from the actions of the Sialetae and the damage that future attacks by the rebellious Thracian tribes could have inflicted on their city. As to the title of patronus (πάτρων) given to Piso, this confirms the tendency among Greek cities in the first century B.C. to award it to Roman officials more often than had been the case in the past,67 though we do not know what led the Amphipolitans to choose to do so.

The most interesting honorific title in the two inscriptions is undoubtedly κτίστης τῆς πόλεως (lit. “builder” or “founder” of the city) given to Augustus, found for the first time in Macedonia in this period. It is difficult to say exactly what the Amphipolitans meant by this title. Judging by its usual meaning in relation to the building activity of both local benefactors and emperors,68 one might propose that Augustus, probably on ac-
count of his particular ties to the city (see below), funded the restoration or construction of one or several buildings there, as he did in other Greek cities where he is honored with the title, and sometimes in combination with the title σωτήρ. Indeed it has recently been argued that there was an Augustan building program in Amphipolis related to the gymnasium and the sanctuary of the Egyptian gods. Nevertheless, the archaeological evidence proposed to back up the hypothesis about the destruction of these buildings in Amphipolis is problematic as regards dating. Another version of events would be that Augustus funded the restoration or reconstruction of the temple of Artemis Tauropoulos, the emblematic temple of the


69 E.g. IG XII.6 1205 (from the island of Korassiai), I.Tralles 35, IGR IV 314 (Amisos). On the financial support Augustus gave to Greek cities so that they could repair or construct public buildings see the survey by D. Kienast, Augustus Prinzeps und Monarch (Darmstadt 1982) 353–360.

70 See Koukouli-Chrysanthaki, in Brill’s Companion 433, who—following Lazaridi and Samartzidou (see next note)—accepts that these buildings had been destroyed and speaks of the “rebuilding program of Augustus.”

71 The excavator of the gymnasium, Lazaridi, in Μνήμη Δημητρίου Λαζαρίδη 257–258, and Prakt 139 (1984) 316, believes that the gymnasium was destroyed in the mid-1st cent. B.C. in the attacks on Macedonia by Thracian tribes. In this she follows G. Bakalakis, “Θρακικά χαράγματα εκ του παρά την Αμφίπολιν φράγματος του Στρυμόνος,” Θρακικά 13 (1940) 5–32, i.e. that Thracians at that time destroyed buildings in the city. This is attested, according to Bakalakis, by some Thracian names carved on architectural members of these buildings. Despite referring to levels of destruction in the gymnasium, Lazaridi does not date them. The argument is repeated in S. Samartzidou, “Στοιχεία από τη λοταρία των αυτοκρατορίων θεών στην Αμφίπολη,” Νάμυτα, Τιμητικός έμπορος για το ναό της Δημήτριο Παντεραλή (Thessalonike 2011) 58. But the dating of these graffiti has been challenged by G. Mikhailov, “Epigraphica Thracica I. Noms thraces d’Amphipolis,” Epigraphica 17 (1975) 25–35, who rightly dates them to the 3rd-4th cent. A.D. on palaeographical grounds.
city, in which Alexander the Great had shown an interest (Diod. 18.4.5), based on the statement of Antipater of Thessalonike that in his day the temple had been completely destroyed. However, in that case there is always a risk that we are dealing with poetic hyperbole or a literary topos.

Yet building activity is not the only possible interpretation. The title κτίστης, as happens elsewhere, could be used metaphorically in the sense of “founder,”74 referring to the new privileged status of “free city” (civitas libera) that Augustus and Antony had granted Amphipolis probably soon after 42.75

73 For the topos of the destruction of once-powerful cities, including Amphipolis, see A. Harder, “Epigram and the Heritage of Epic,” in P. Bing and J. Steffen Bruss (eds.), Brill’s Companion to Hellenistic Epigram (Leiden/Boston 2007) 419 and n.31.
74 On the metaphorical meaning of the title, given to emperors and Roman officials as well as to citizens who had intervened to ensure that the cities of their birth were awarded privileges, such as that of civitas libera, or had them confirmed, see Strubbe, AncSoc 15–17 (1984–1986) 292–298, who speaks of its “konstitutionelle Sinn.” Recently R. Veymiers, “Le basileion, les reines et Actium,” in L. Bricault and M. J. Versluys (eds.), Power, Politics and the Cults of Isis (Leiden 2014) 195–236, here 222, recognizes in giving both titles to Augustus a local tradition followed by Amphipolitans in the cases of Brasidas and Philip II, while Daubner, Religion in the Roman Empire 2 (2016) 399, seems to believe that “it is not the beneficence of the Augustus that is commemorated in Amphipolis’ monuments but the assessment of him by the community.”
75 See Plin HN 4.38: Amphipolis liberum (oppidum). His description relates to the Augustan period; see O. Cuntz, “Agrippa und Augustus als Quellschreiber des Plinius,” Jahrbücher für classische Philologie Suppl. 17 (1890) 511–512, 522–523; R. Bernhardt, Imperium und Eleutheria. Die römische Politik gegenüber den freien Städten des griechischen Ostens (Hamburg 1971) 89 n.6; Kreiler, ZPE 174 (2010) 112. The exact date of the conferral of this status has not come down to us. J. Touratsoglou, Die Münzstätte von Thessalonike in der römischen Kaiserzeit (Berlin 1988) 7 n.10, dates it soon after the battle of Philippi on the basis of Amphipolitan coins which he believes commemorate the event, because they display the same iconography as similar commemorative mintings from Thessalonike relating to being awarded the status of a free city; see also F. Papazoglou, Les villes de Macédoine à l’époque romaine (BCH 57 (2017) 295–324
because before the battle of Philippi the city was the supply station for their army and the base of one of their auxiliary legions (App. BC 4.107). This interpretation would also fit the bill if this status had been conferred on the city by Augustus alone or had been confirmed by him after Actium.
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