

Imperial Commissioners in Achaia

James H. Oliver

E GROAG's excellent studies, *Die römischen Reichsbeamten von Achaia bis auf Diokletian* (Vienna 1939) and *Die Reichsbeamten von Achaia in spätrömischer Zeit* (Diss. Pannonicae, SER. I,14 [1946]), which are cited as *Achaia I* and *II*, have made the provincial administration a much easier field for investigation. We build on that platform and bring occasionally a different point of view by consideration of new or marginal evidence. Here we shall try to look at one part of the duties of imperial commissioners¹ through the contrast afforded by an Athenian institution of the Principate, the epimelete of the city, an institution on which the writer's ideas after long confusion have only recently crystalized.

The province of Achaia was the creation of Augustus himself. There is only one delimitation of the area he assigned to it, namely Strabo 17.3.25: ἐβδόμην δ' Ἀχαιῶν μέχρι Θεσσαλίας καὶ Αἰτωλῶν καὶ Ἀκαρνανῶν καὶ τινῶν Ἑπειρωτικῶν ἐθνῶν ὅσα τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ προσώριστο. The text is corrupt, as G. W. Bowersock, *RhMus* 108 (1965) 277–89, demonstrated, who pointed out that *μέχρι* should mean 'up to but not including'. One might add that also the article before the name *Μακεδονία* (not previously mentioned) arouses suspicion. A secondary change. The text should, I think, be emended to read ἐβδόμην δ' Ἀχαιῶν μέχρι Θεσσαλίας <μετὰ> καὶ Αἰτωλῶν καὶ Ἀκαρνανῶν καὶ τινῶν Ἑπειρωτικῶν ἐθνῶν ὅσα <μ>ῆ Μακεδονίᾳ προσώριστο. Thessaly, accordingly, never belonged to the province of Achaia, which turned out to be less successful than Augustus had hoped. Thessaly remained in Macedonia, but Augustus himself did the Thessalian League the great honor of accepting the eponymous magistracy.²

A student of Achaia will be struck by the high proportion of free states in its general area. These did not fall under the imperium of

¹ The vague but convenient term "commissioners" is here used to cover *legati Augusti*, *correctores*, *curatores*, *praefecti* of various sorts who were sent to Achaia's free cities with special powers by the emperors, or to the free cities of Achaia and Macedonia. In Achaia they come at a special time, as we shall see.

² IG IX 2, 415, cited e.g. by J. A. O. Larsen, "Roman Greece," in Tenney Frank's *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome IV* (Baltimore 1938) 448.

the senatorial proconsul, fortunately for them, because the Greeks who belonged to the province felt that they were misgoverned and 'enslaved'. In fact, Tiberius, who seldom interfered with the arrangements of Augustus, eventually relieved the province of senatorial misrule by making it part of the complex called Moesia under the rule of an imperial legate. The province of Achaia was reconstituted by Claudius, who gave it back to the Senate but with certain precautions.

The epimelete of the city is one of the most important but least known officials of Athens, though Athens is the best known of the free cities of Achaia. Some of the problems that afflicted the free cities and some of the concern which Roman emperors showed for Athens and Achaia suggest themselves when the evidence on the epimelete of the city is presented all together and when the list of 'commissioners' (Groag has a record of *legati* which does not include all the commissioners and is a little outdated and not entirely separate) follows it, so that one sees more clearly a gradual change in policy. This juxtaposition of old but newly gathered evidence exhibits the transformation of a city government beside the concomitant development of the emperor's paternalism.

The Epimelete of the City

The earliest occurrence of the title *ἐπιμελητῆς τῆς πόλεως* is in the treaty of 317 B.C. between Athens and Cassander, as reported by Diodorus 18.74.3, *συνέθεντο . . . καταστήσαι δ' ἐπιμελητὴν τῆς πόλεως ἓνα ἄνδρα Ἀθηναῖον ὃν ἂν δόξῃ Κασσάνδρῳ*. Diodorus continues about Demetrius of Phalerum, *οὗτος δὲ παραλαβὼν τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς πόλεως ἤρχεν εἰρηρικῶς καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πολίτας φιλανθρώπως*. Diodorus 20.45.2 uses the title again, *Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐπιμελητῆς τῆς πόλεως γεγενημένος ὑπὸ Κασσάνδρου*, but later writers seem to have preferred to describe him as an *ἐπιστάτης*, an official quite different from the kind of official we have in mind. Demetrius of Phalerum could not without ambiguity be described in the first and second centuries after Christ as epimelete of the city. His position had been very different. Under the circumstances he cut a good figure so that no odium three centuries later attached to the title; perhaps it was remembered, if at all, as the title of a decent administrator with powerful foreign backing.

Disregarding Diodorus on Demetrius of Phalerum, we turn to the evidence which really applies, all of it on inscriptions from the first and second centuries after Christ. We may start at Athens with a fixed point in the first century.

The catalogue *IG II² 1990=III 1085* from the reign of Nero (line 1) is dated by the archon of 61/2, the herald, and the hoplite general. The reference to the general in lines 3–6 reads: *στρατηγοῦντος ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀπλείτας τὸ ὄγδοον καὶ ἀρχιερέως Νέρωνος Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Γερμανικοῦ καὶ Διὸς Ἐλευθερίου ἐκ τῶν {ἐκ τῶν} Ἑλλήνων ν καὶ ἐπι[μ]ελητοῦ τῆς πόλεως διὰ βίου ν καὶ ἱερέως Δηλίου Ἀπόλλωνος ν καὶ ἐπιμελητοῦ τῆς ἱερᾶς Δήλου νν κα[ὶ] ἀρχι[ε]ρέως τοῦ οἴκου τῶν Σεβαστῶν ν καὶ ἀρίστου τῶν Ἑλλήνων ν καὶ νομοθέτου ν Τιβερ[ίου] Κλαυδίου ν Νουίου ν ἐξ Οἴου.*

This shows that the office (rather than the mere title) of epimelete of the city could be held for life and could be held simultaneously with the *epimeleteia* of Delos, with priesthoods, and with the hoplite generalship, an annual civic office. The eighth tenure of the hoplite generalship marks Tib. Claudius Novius as the most prominent Athenian of his generation or one of the most. He was not only prominent at Athens but in all Greece, as is clearly indicated by the priesthood of the Emperor, by the title ‘best of the Hellenes’, won in the armed footrace at the Panhellenic Eleutheria at Plataea, and by the priesthood of the god of that festival.

Still another and more famous inscription records both the eighth hoplite generalship and the (lifelong) *epimeleteia* of Tib. Claudius Novius, *IG II² 3277*, *στρατηγοῦντος ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀπλίτας τὸ ὄγδοον τοῦ καὶ ἐπιμελητοῦ καὶ νομοθέτου Τι Κλαυδίου Νουίου τοῦ Φιλίνου*. It is the bronze inscription once attached to the east architrave of the Parthenon, when the Areopagus, the Council of the Six Hundred and the Demos placed the name of Nero there. Sterling Dow has completed the incomplete text of the corpus with a convincing reading, which we will not anticipate.³ The importance of the inscription to our argument lies in the proof it affords that the epimelete of the city, being the epimelete *par excellence*, could be called simply the epimelete.

Another Neronian epimelete of the city, Tib. Claudius Diotimus of Besa, has become well known as a result of A. E. Raubitschek’s splendid collocation of pieces from the Agora excavations with *IG*

³ Dow’s reading is reported so far only in the *Cornell Alumni News* 75.5 (Dec. 1972), which was drawn to my attention by Kent J. Rigsby, whom I warmly thank.

II² 3580. This fine inscription with Raubitschek's restorations in *Hesperia* 12 (1943) 66–71 and 35 (1966) 245 now reads as follows:

[-----]
 [-----] *ἰε*]ρέα [---]
 [-----] *Τι*]βέριον Κλαύ
 [διον *Τιβερίου*] *Κ*]λ[ανδίο]υ Θεοφίλο[υ]
 [υἰὸν *Δι*]ότειμο[υ *Βησα*]ιέα ἄρξαν
 5 [τα τήν] ἐπώνυμ[ον ἄρχ]ήν καὶ
 [κηρυκε]ύσαντ[α καὶ στ]ρατηγή
 [σαντα] ἐπὶ τοῦ[ς ὄπλε]ίτας τρις
 [καὶ ἀγ]ωνοθετ[ήσαντ]α δις κα[ὶ]
 [γυμνα]σιαρχή[σαντα τρ]ίς καὶ ἐ
 10 [πιμελ]ητήν γε[υ]όμ[εν]ον τῆς
 [τε πό]λεως καὶ τῆς [τοῦ *Μ*]ητρώ[ι]
 [ου κοσμ]ήσεως χρη[ματί]σαν
 [τα τὰ] ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμο[υ [[---]]
 [[-----]]
 15 [ἀρετ]ῆς τε καὶ τῆς ε[ἰς τὴν πα]
 [τρίδα] εὐνοίας καὶ φιλ[οτιμίας]
 ἔνε[κ]α ἐπιμεληθέν[των τῆς]
 κατ[ασκ]ευῆς [ἐ]κ τῶν ἰ[δίων]
Τρο[φίμου τ]οῦ Ἰ[σθμίου] καὶ
 20 *Δάφ*[νου] Ἰ[σθμίου] θωινί[ων vacat]

An epimelete of the city, Tib. Claudius Theogenes, is mentioned in an inscription which clearly belongs sometime between A.D. 48 and 79, as P. Graindor, *Athènes de Tibère à Trajan* (Cairo 1931) 50, rightly points out. Since *IG* II² 1990=III 1085 shows him already herald of the Areopagus in 61/2, it is easier to place his term as epimelete of the city in the Julio-Claudian than in the Flavian period, and again easier to place him under Nero than under Claudius, but whether he served as epimelete before or after he served as herald of the Areopagus cannot be stated confidently in the absence of a fixed *cursus honorum* at Athens. The inscription, *IG* II² 3449=III 556, reads:

Ἡ βουλή ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου καὶ
 ἡ βουλή τῶν *Χ* καὶ ὁ δῆμος Ἰου-
 λίαν Βερενείκην βασιλεύσαν

μεγάλην Ἰουλίου Ἀγρίππα βασι-
 5 λέως θυγατέρα καὶ μεγάλων
 βασιλέων εὐεργετῶν τῆς πό-
 λεως ἔκγονον διὰ τῆς προνοί-
 ας τοῦ ἐπιμελητοῦ τῆς πόλε-
 ως Τιβ. Κλαυδίου Θεογένους
 10 Παιανιέως

On Queen Berenice PIR² Iulia 651 will provide references.

Thus we have three Claudian-Neronian epimeletes of which one, the epimelete of A.D. 61, Tib. Claudius Novius, was epimelete for life. Tib. Claudius Theogenes may easily but need not be the earliest of the three, except that he is closely tied to the man whom we now consider. That Tiberius Claudius Hierophantes, before he became hierophant, had had a distinguished Roman and Athenian career including the post of epimelete of the city appears from an inscription at Eleusis, erected apparently by the granddaughter of the aristocratic hierophantid who also appears in the inscription.⁴ The hierophantid need not have been the hierophant's wife; at least her granddaughter was not his granddaughter. Kirchner in IG II² 3546 treated both columns as parts of the same inscription because the date at the end of each column is the same and the lettering too is apparently the same. But why repeat the name of the priestess of Demeter and Kore below each column? Perhaps to attest permission for the statue in each case. We reproduce only column II.

Τιβέριον Κλαύδιον Ἱεροφάντην Καλλικρατίδου Τρικορύσιον,
 ἔπαρχον ἀρχιτεκτόνων δήμου Ῥωμαίων γενόμενον,
 ἔπαρχον σπείρης Ἰσπανῶν δευτέρας, ἄρξαντα τὴν
 ἐπώνυμον ἀρχὴν ἐπὶ μεδίμνω καὶ δε[κ]απέντε δραχμαῖς,
 15 κηρυκεύσαντα τῆς ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγο[υ β]ουλῆς, κήρυκα
 βουλλῆς καὶ δήμου γενόμενον ἐπὶ δ[η]ναρίοις δυοί,
 ἐπιμελητεύσαντα τῆς πόλεως, ἀγνοθητέσαντα,
 γυμνασιάρχῆσαντα, στρατηγῆσαντα, πρεσβεύσαντα
 πολλάκις, Ἐλευσεινίαις θεαῖς εὐσεβείας ἔνεκεν
 vacat

20 ἐπὶ ἱερείας Φλαουίας Λαοδαμείας τῆς Κλείτου Φλυέως θυγατρός.

⁴ On the hierophant and the hierophantid see Kevin Clinton's study, *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, forthcoming).

The hierophant's personal name is replaced by his title. On the other hand, an inscription from the Athenian Agora, erected after his death, contributes his personal name (Oenophilus) and an insight into the powerful connections he had in Roman society. We reproduce the text with the restorations of A. Wilhelm, *Wiener Anzeiger* 72 (1935) 83–90.

Τιβ[έρι]ον Κλα[ύδι]ον [Καλλι]
 κρα[τί]δου υἱὸ[ν] Κυρξ[ίνα]
 Οἰνόφιλον Τ[ρι]κορύσι[ον]
 ἱεροφαντήσαντα Ἀρ[ρία]
 5 Τορκ[ο]υάτου θ[υ]γάτηρ
 Καλπ[ουρνία, Βελ]λείκου
 Τηβα[νι]α[νοῦ] γυ[νή], τὸν
 [ποιητ]ὸν π[ατέρ]α.

As I argued in *AJA* 55 (1951) 347–49, his adopted daughter, Calpurnia Arria, was the daughter of the one-time imperial legate of Galatia, Asprenas Calpurnius Torquatus (*RE* Nonius 29), and the wife of C. Bellicus Tebanianus, *cos.* 87.

A hierophant always belonged to the *seniores*, and some hierophants were very old. Claudius Oenophilus may have been epimelete of the city in his fifties.

Tricorythus was not a large deme, and it is not likely that more than one Tricorysian became epimelete of the city. The name of Tib. Claudius Oenophilus exactly fits the space available for the name of the Tricorysian who appears in *IG* II² 3185=III 68 from Athens:

Ἐστία καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ θεοῖς Σεβαστοῖς καὶ τῇ βουλῇ
 τῆι ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου καὶ τῆι βουλῇ τῶν ἑξακοσίων καὶ
 τῶι δήμῳ Φιλόξενος Ἀγαθοκλέους Φλυεὺς
 ἀνέθηκεν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ποιήσαντος τοῦ πατρὸς
 5 Ἀγαθοκλέους τοῦ Φιλοξένου Φλυέως,
 στρατηγούντος ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀπλείτας Τι Κλ[αυδίου]
 Θεογένους Παιανιέως καὶ ἐπι
 μελητοῦ τῆς πόλε[ως] Τι Κλαυδίου Οἰνοφίλου]
 Τρικору[σίου]]

Thus Claudius Oenophilus, whose name was restored in line 8 by A. E. Raubitschek, *Hesperia* 12 (1943) 71 n.161, and Claudius Theogenes

were roughly contemporaries. The *epimeleteia* of Oenophilus belongs in the Neronian or Flavian Period.

We now come to a complicated problem of identification in connection with a man or two men named T. Coponius Maximus. The first inscription, *Hesperia* 11 (1942) 39, is a stele erected apparently in the Agora by the prytaneis of Attalis in the year of an undatable archon Ann[ius - -]. The prytaneis cite in crowns those officials particularly entitled to appreciation for help and service during the prytany. These were arranged in two or more rows of three crowns each with the title above and the name inside the crown. In the first row were the citations of the agonothete of the Great Eleusinia, the epimelete of the city, and another official whose name and title are lost; in the second row were citations of the hoplite general, the treasurer of the Council, and another title now lost. We reproduce only the first row as follows:

<p>οἱ πρυτάνεις τὸν ἀγωνοθέτην τῶν 10 μεγάλων Ἐλευσεινίων</p>	<p>15 οἱ π[ρυ]τάν[εις τὸν] [- - -] ἐπιμ[ε]λητ[ήν τῆς] πόλεω[ς]</p>
<p>IN WREATH</p> <p>Τι Κλαύδι ον Δημό στρατον Σουνιέα</p>	<p>IN WREATH</p> <p>Τι Κωπώ μιον Μά 20 ξιμον Ἄγνούς ιον</p>

This inscription not only shows the importance of the epimelete of the city to the prytaneis who were serving at the time of the Great Eleusinia but attests the *epimeleteia* of a man named T. Coponius Maximus. The same man or a homonym was epimelete [of the city] when the Sarapion Monument was erected in the Asclepieum, a great triangular base supporting a tripod. The text (*Hesperia* 5 [1936] 95 and *Hesperia* Suppl. 8 [1949] 243-46) was originally engraved on the front alone, but a century later the two other sides bore interesting inscriptions too. The original inscription, however, was a dedication by Q. Staius *Pyrphorus ex Acropoleos* of Chollidae, priest of Asclepius, in honor of his grandfather Q. Staius Sarapion, poet and Stoic philosopher, the man to whom Plutarch dedicated the essay *De E apud Delphos* and who is one of the main speakers in Plutarch's *De Pythiae*

oraculis. The dedication mentions permission granted by the Areopagus and the name of an unknown archon. After references to a contest there comes Sarapion's *Carmen de officiis medici* in twenty dactylic hexameters and then well below the inscription the following notation in large letters:

Ἐπιμελη[τεύοντος τῆς πόλεως Κωπω]γί
ο[υ] Μαξίμ[ου]

We infer from this that permission from the epimelete of the city⁵ was desirable before the erection of a monument in the sanctuary of Asclepius even when the Areopagus had granted a statue. Whether or not it was he who designated the location of the monument, he had to approve its erection and appearance. We might infer further that the Coponius Maximus who was epimelete at the time the Sarapion monument was erected belonged roughly to the generation after Sarapion's.

Another monument in the Asclepieum, *IG II² 4481*, has two inscriptions, of which the earlier reads as follows:

[Ἡ δεῖνα Εἰ]ρηναίου ἐκ Φυλακίων
[ἀνέθηκε]ν Ἀσκληπιῶ καὶ Ὑγίᾳ εὐχὴν ὑ
[πὲρ τῶν παι]δίων ἐπὶ εἰρέως διὰ βίου ·Γ· Κασίου
[..... Κ]ολλυτέως καὶ [ἐ]πιμελητοῦ Τί
5 [του Κωπων]ίου Μαξίμου Ἀγνουκίου, ζα
[κόρου δὲ] Ἀλεξάνδρου το[ῦ] Δ' Ὀῆθεν, ἐπὶ ἄρ
[χοντος Κοίν]του Τρεβελλίου Ῥούφου Λαμ
[πτρέως]

Q. Trebellius Rufus of Toulouse in Narbonnese Gaul is well known as a personality of the reign of Domitian and archon at Athens sometime between A.D. 85 and 95. This enables us to say that T. Coponius Maximus, or one of the men named T. Coponius Maximus, was epimelete of the city in the reign of Domitian.

Still another monument in the Asclepieum, *IG II² 3187*, quite undated, was erected in the time of the epimelete of the city, T. Coponius Maximus:

⁵ The restoration τῆς πόλεως is certain, because the lacuna can be measured. Whether or not *ἱεροκέρυκος* follows Μαξίμ[ου] is uncertain.

Ἴσκληπιῶι καὶ Ὑγείαι
 Δημήτριος Ἀντιόχου
 Σφήττιος
 ζακορεύσας τὸ ἔδα
 φος τοῦ προπυλαίου
 στρώσας ἀνέθηκεν
 vacat
 ἐπιμελητεύοντος
 Κωπωνίου Μαξίμου,
 ζακορεύοντ[ος --]
 τοῦ Διο[----]
 νέως.

Both of the last two monuments call Coponius Maximus epimelete, but neither of the two accords his name and office the prominence that the first two monuments (*Hesperia* 11 and *Hesperia* Suppl. 8) accord them. This may or may not be significant. A title epimelete of the Asclepieum is not attested, but a title epimelete of the Lyceum is known earlier from *IG* II² 2875=III 89, and *IG* II² 2877=III 90 may record an epimelete of the Prytaneum at an earlier date. If one did not have Claudius Novius in mind, it would be possible to suppose that Coponius Maximus served as epimelete of the Asclepieum before becoming epimelete of the city, and that the title epimelete without the words *τῆς πόλεως* meant epimelete of the Asclepieum. The Parthenon inscription, however, shows that Coponius Maximus was in each case mentioned as epimelete of the city.

The complication continues with still another monument in the Asclepieum, *IG* II² 3798, allowed by an epimelete named T. Coponius Maximus, but the name is here distinguished by the title 'sacred herald':

Ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου β[ου]
 λή{ι} καὶ ἡ βουλή{ι} τῶν X
 καὶ ὁ δῆμος Σώζοντα
 Λαδίκου Σουνιέα ἰα
 5 τρόν, ζακορεύσαντα
 Ἴσκληπιοῦ καὶ Ὑγεία[ς]
 ἐν τῶι ἐπὶ Στρατολάου
 ἄρχοντος ἑνιαυτῶ' κλειδουχοῦν
 τος Σώζοντος Ὡ Σουνιέως

vacat

10 ἐπιμελητεύοντος Κω
πωνίου Μαξίμου ἱερο
κήρυκος.

This time we have a date, the archonship of Stratolaos. If Stratolaos is the same as the archon Flavius Stratolaos, a known succession of five archons gives a valuable clue to the date. Though Graindor placed him in 118/9, Simone Follet⁶ argues persuasively that he belongs sometime between 94/5 and 99/100. Perhaps there is no real complication if we infer that the epimelete (of the city) became sacred herald⁷ during his *epimeleteria* so that only one man named Coponius Maximus served as epimelete (of the city). The confusion arose through the wrong dating of that panel of five archons, whom Simone Follet has at last located properly, and through IG II² 1072=III 2, which showed a Coponius Maximus sacred herald, naturally presumed to be identical with the Coponius Maximus, sacred herald and epimelete in IG II² 3798—where, incidentally, his name and office, though without the words τῆς πόλεως, are given the old prominence. In IG II² 1072=III 2, the consolation decree for the death of the young man of Elis, Antonius Oxylus, it is the prescript in lines 1–6 which concerns us: Ἐπὶ Τίτου Κωπωνίου, Ἱεροκήρυκος υἱοῦ, Μαξίμου Ἀγνουσίου ἄρχοντος, Βοηδρ[ομιῶνος] ὀγδόῃ μετ' εἰκάδα, ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχίδος τρίτης πρυτανείας, πεντεκαίδεκάτῃ τῆς πρυτανείας, ἧ Νεικίας Δωρίωνος Φλυεὺς ἐγραμμάτευεν, βουλή ἱερά ἐν Ἐλευσεινί[ω]. τῶν προέδρων ἐπεισήφιζεν Ἡράκλειτος Πειριεὺς καὶ συνπρόεδροι ὁ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄπλα στρατηγὸς τὸ δεύτερον καὶ γυμνασίαρχος τὸ δεύτερον καὶ ἱερεὺς Ἄρεως Ἐνναλίου καὶ Ἐννοῦς καὶ Διὸς Γελέοντος, ἱεροκήρυξ Τίτος Κωπώνιος Μάξιμος Ἀγνούσιος εἶπεν.

The prescript shows us the existence of two men named T. Coponius Maximus, the elder of whom two years later is attested as epimelete (of the city) by IG II² 3798 but whose titles, as recorded in IG II² 1072, do not include that of epimelete (of the city), though the accumulation of priesthoods and other offices is very striking. The situation then is that we have one Coponius Maximus attested as epimelete of the city, one Coponius Maximus attested simply as

⁶ S. Follet, "Flavius Euphanès d'Athènes, ami de Plutarque," *Mélanges . . . Pierre Chantraine* (Études et Commentaires 79 [Paris 1972]) 35–50.

⁷ See Clinton, *op.cit.* (n.4 *supra*) on the office of sacred herald.

epimelete, one extraordinarily prominent Coponius Maximus sacred herald but not described as epimelete, and two years later Coponius Maximus sacred herald and epimelete. Since they are now closely enough dated to be identical, it is tempting to see in these four cases the same man and to explain the absence of the title 'epimelete' in IG II² 1072=III 2 on the supposition that in this decree of the Council of the Six Hundred only those titles of the proposer were mentioned which were felt to be old and genuine Athenian titles.

Before we leave Coponius Maximus sacred herald, we must say something about the monument erected in the Asclepieum in honor of his son, Coponius Maximus jr, director of the Stoic School, for his services as priest of the Demos and Graces and as agonothete of the Great Caesarea. This monument, IG II² 3571=III 661, on which no mention of an epimelete of the city occurs (*ἐπιμεληθέντος* is very different from *ἐπιμελητεύοντος*), threatens to obscure the question because of the way it is dated.

The old date, "ante a. 117/8," depends on the correct assumption that the Coponius Maximus here honored was identical with the homonymous archon whom Graindor dated in 116/7, Kirchner in 117/8. He would not have been described as the priest of the Demos and Graces, it was incorrectly assumed further, if he could have been described as an ex-archon. But if he was being honored for a donation or liturgy which he undertook in connection with his appointment as priest of the Demos and Graces, it would be understandable that only this priesthood and his permanent professorship or directorship of the Stoic School at Athens should be mentioned. This is not a *cursus honorum* or even an Athenian approximation of one. So the argument has but little weight. In our opinion the monument was erected long after the archonship of Coponius Maximus jr, which is now dated in 91/2 at the earliest and in 97/8 at the latest.⁸

The only epimelete of the city currently known to have held office after Coponius Maximus is Tib. Julius Herodianus, whose name stands, in a line apart, below an epistle of an emperor (Hadrian) erected at the Piraeus in front of the Deigma.⁹ The Deigma, where merchants displayed their samples and took orders, was a public, not sacred, locality. The epistle is conveniently accessible in IG II² 1103 or

⁸ S. Follet, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6) 43.

⁹ D. Ch. Gofas, *Δείγμα: Ιστορική έρευνα επί του Έλληνικού δικαίου τών συναλλαγών* (Athens 1970) 26-68.

better in P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrien* (Cairo 1934) 127–29. The last line reads ἐπιμελητεύοντος τῆς πόλεως Ἰουλίου Ἡρωδιαν[οῦ] Κολλυτέως. Herodianus is known also from IG II² 3316=III 489, but he does not seem to have been a man of the same standing as Claudius Novius, Claudius Diotimus, Claudius Theogenes, Claudius Oenophilus and Coponius Maximus.

The epimelete of the city may have been cited below this epistle either because the inscription was erected in front of the Deigma or because the epistle concerned the sale of fish at a festival where the epimelete had some special responsibility.

There remains Hermaeus son of Hermaeus, of Colonus, mentioned as epimelete of the city in IG II² 3548. It was he who earlier supervised the monument for Coponius Maximus jr which on p.399 we dated in the Trajanic period. He lacked Roman citizenship.

We may summarize the little we know about the epimelete of the city at Athens. The epigraphical evidence cannot be pushed back beyond the reign of Claudius at the earliest. An epimelete of the city is surely attested from the reign of Nero on. In all cases at Athens the epimelete of the city is himself an Athenian, with Roman citizenship in most cases. Except for the two last (Hermaeus and Julius Herodianus, from whom less was expected) the epimelete of the city was a local magnate with important connections in the outer world. This suggests that the epimelete of the city helped to protect the public and sacred property of the city (and Delos?) from the encroachment of powerful individuals. He was no longer so necessary when the emperor began appointing from the Roman Senate *correctores* of the free cities. No epimelete of the city is attested after the Hadrianic reform of the Athenian constitution.

At Athens, where there are many inscriptions, the argument from silence does have weight. If the call for special protection first went out from the consuls of 27 or 28 B.C.,¹⁰ we must ask who performed the task before the *epimeleteia* of the city was created in the reign of Claudius. Nero had no interest in Athens, and neither did Seneca; so the new office, which was either for life or for a long term, and which required the cooperation of the Roman government, can reasonably be credited to Claudius, since we are unwilling to predi-

¹⁰ J. H. Oliver, "On the Hellenic Policy of Augustus and Agrippa in 27 B.C.," *AJP* 93 (1972) 190–97, with reference to the Cyme inscription of H. W. Pleket's excellent dissertation.

cate its existence in the time of Augustus. The epistle of Claudius to the Alexandrians, *P.Lond.* 1912 lines 62–66, shows the emperor acceding to a request to reduce to three years the term of some officials in that city. His importance in the history of procuratorships, which were held for terms of several years each, is well known. There is no difficulty in recognizing the accord with administrative ideas of Claudius in the creation of the *epimeleteia* of the city at Athens.

In *IG II² 1035*, which reflects the ruling of the consuls of 27 or 28 B.C. on the protection of the public and sacred domain of cities, the Athenian officials who are mentioned as having certain responsibilities are the hoplite general, the basileus and the treasurer of the sacred *diataxis*. Before the creation of the post of epimelete of the city these three officials performed the supervision and protected the city's interest, perhaps the hoplite general over the public domain, the basileus and the treasurer of the sacred *diataxis* over the sacred domain. They were usually without Roman citizenship themselves, and this may gradually have weakened their position as protectors. But in the Claudian-Neronian period we meet with hoplite generals¹¹ who were Roman citizens and who held the generalship for many terms unlike the archons, who held office for one year each. These generals were themselves magnates and were surely in a better position than mere *peregrini* to protect the public domain from encroachment. The iteration of office in the case of hoplite generals was nothing new, but their Roman citizenship and nomen had significance. The hoplite generals of the Julio-Claudian and Flavian periods could be expected to meet any challenge to the public domain from private encroachment.

The archonship of the basileus, however, could not be so prologued because of its history and its relation to other archonships. So for the sacred domain the post of epimelete of the city was created. The parity is best expressed by the last four lines of the above cited *IG II² 3185=III 68*, "when Ti. Claudius Theogenes of Paeania was hoplite general and [Ti. Claudius Oenophilus] of Tricorythus was epimelete of the city."

The list of hoplite generals shows no iteration of office in the first half of the second century and not much thereafter. The silence of the first half may be accidental, but notables with six or seven tenures

¹¹ Th. Chr. Sarikakis, *The Hoplite General in Athens* (Diss. Princeton 1951) 28–30, where allowance must be made for S. Follet's new chronology.

would presumably be recorded in the inscriptions if there had been any in the second century. Surely the need for hoplite generals with repeated tenure had passed. The change in atmosphere took place about the time of the trial and condemnation of Claudius Hipparchus, when the imperial government seemed to be assuming a more active rôle.

The theory here presented is that the hoplite general and the epimelete of the city were responsible for the protection of the public and sacred domain in the Claudian-Neronian and Flavian periods, but their rôle as protectors of the domain declined thereafter, with a less important or less prominent epimelete appearing in the early years of Hadrian but disappearing entirely in the Hadrianic reform of the Athenian constitution.

We have tried to show that as late as the Domitianic period very important men served as epimelete of the city. In the time of Domitian something happened at Athens to lessen the need for this kind of epimelete as for the kind of men who were recently serving as hoplite general. We have suggested as a cause the intervention of Domitian into the internal affairs of Athens.¹² Not intervention to quell disorder but intervention to prevent 'tyranny'. The trial and condemnation of Tib. Claudius Hipparchus (*PIR*² C 889) was the turning point in the history of the institution. It occurred under the friendliest of all emperors so far friendly to Athens, Domitian, who as first emperor to do so accepted the archonship. Estates of Claudius Hipparchus, who aimed presumably at economic control of Athens, were confiscated by the *fiscus*. The trial was absolutely sensational and formed a precedent for the trial of his grandson at Sirmium in 174.

While the *basileus* and the hoplite general are well known officials with many duties,¹³ the treasurer of the sacred *diataxis* appears elsewhere only in *IG* II² 3503, which apparently is still dated around 40 B.C.¹⁴ The *diataxis* itself continues to be attested in the Antonine Period but not the treasurer(s). In or near the reign of Severus Alex-

¹² One may compare the situation in another free city: J. Jannoray, *BCH* 68–69 (1944–45) 79, spoke of a different but equally significant "intervention du pouvoir central dans les affaires de Delphes, une première fois sous Domitien et une seconde sous Hadrien." In *Hesperia* 40 (1971) 239, a re-edition of the imperial letter *FD* III (4) 286, line 7 should have been restored ἐπικελεύομαι ὑμᾶς, because ἐπτέλλομαι ὑμῖν was too strong for Claudius.

¹³ D. J. Geagan, *The Athenian Constitution after Sulla* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 12 [1967]) *passim*.

¹⁴ S. Dow, *Prytaneis* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 1 [1937]) 176: *cf. Hesperia* 35 (1966) 244.

ander the honorary decree for Ulpianus Eubiotus Leurus reveals a plural board in charge of the sacred *diataxis* instead of a single treasurer. It is tempting to connect the change with the reforms of the Hadrianic period, but the board was not sufficiently prominent to be mentioned often in the monuments, and we should be merely guessing. Still we may raise the question whether the substitution of the plural board for the single treasurer of the *diataxis* was not one of the changes brought about by the abolition of the post of epimelete of the city. They helped to supervise perhaps, but the main defense against the encroachment of powerful individuals would now rest, I think, with the hoplite general if he could cope with the situation, otherwise with senatorial commissioners appointed by the emperor or with the Attic Panhellenion when there was no commissioner.

List of Imperial Commissioners

Augustan emissaries like Cn. Pullius Pollio and C. Marius Marcellus of Groag's *Achaia* I 20–22 and the legate of Augustus and Tiberius recorded in Ehrenberg-Jones 81a do not concern us, because they need to be no more than influential ambassadors.¹⁵ The real list begins later.

MAXIMUS UNDER TRAJAN

Pliny (*Ep.* 8.24) describes him as *missum ad ordinandum statum liberarum civitatum*, and Arrian (*Diss. Epicteti* 3.7) seems to describe the same Maximus at Nicopolis as *διορθωτῆς τῶν ἐλευθέρων πόλεων*.

C. AVIDIUS NIGRINUS IN A.D. 114

Attested at Delphi as *leg. Aug. pro pr.* in *FD* III 4, nos. 290–296, at Athens in *Hesperia* 32 (1963) 24 no.25.

P. PACTUMEIUS CLEMENS UNDER HADRIAN

Attested as *legatus divi Hadriani Athenis Thespiis Plataeis* by *CIL* VIII 7059=*ILS* 1067 at Cirta.

L. AEMILIUS JUNCUS NEAR A.D. 134

Attested at Athens as *leg. Aug. pro pr.*, at Sparta as *δικαιοδότης*, at Delphi as *διορθωτῆς τῶν ἐλευθέρων δ[ήμων]* (see *Hesperia* 36 [1967] 42–56).

¹⁵ Special agents perhaps but in a different sense from the later group. Imperial legates in Achaia are not discussed by H.-G. Pflaum, "Légats impériaux à l'intérieur de provinces sénatoriales," *Hommages à Albert Grenier* III (*Latomus* 58 [1962]) 1232–42.

SEVERUS ABOUT A.D. 139

Attested at Eleusis as ἑπαρχ[ος] (*Hesperia* 21 [1952] 382).

QUINTILII FRATRES, 'RULERS OF GREECE', UNDER MARCUS AURELIUS

Literary and epigraphical evidence is discussed in *Marcus Aurelius* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 13 [1970]) 66–72. A board of two equal colleagues.

CLAUDIUS DEMETRIUS UNDER SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS

Groag interprets *Inscr. v. Olympia* 941 to mean that Demetrius was simultaneously proconsul and *leg. Aug. pro pr.* and corrector of the free cities. His rank (consular or praetorian) is not clear, but since that combination of powers was what the *Quintilii fratres* had, he was probably like them of consular rank. See also G. Barbieri, *L'albo senatorio da Severo a Carino* (Rome 1952) 40 no.150.

TI. CLAUDIUS CALLIPPIANUS ITALICUS UNDER SEVERUS AND CARACALLA

Attested at Athens in *IG II²* 4215=III 631 and *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 265 no.22 as *leg. Augg. pro pr.*, curator and corrector of the free cities, with consular rank (ὑπατον means *consularis* or else, as Groag, *Achaia* II 10–11 argues, with consular fasces). Barbieri no.1996. See Leonticus (*infra*).

EGNATIUS PROCULUS UNDER SEVERUS AND CARACALLA

Attested at Sparta as the consular corrector by *IG V* 1, 541. Barbieri no.205.

C. LICINIUS TELEMACHUS IN A.D. 209

Attested at Athens as the *clarissimus leg. Aug.* and curator of Athens by *IG II²* 1077 (= Oliver, *Marcus Aurelius* no.23), and at the Piraeus as the *clarissimus* curator of the city of the Athenians by *IG II²* 2963= III 1177. In the latter the paeonistae of Asclepius petition Telemachus on the god's order (see J. H. Oliver, "Paeonistae," *TAPA* 71 [1940] 302–14). In the former Telemachus is said to have issued a *διάταγμα* with a proclamation concerning the elevation of Geta to corulership, and this proclamation of good tidings has called forth a public celebration at Athens. The Athenians have voted to sacrifice *πανγενεῖ* (cf. *GRBS* 13 [1972] 102).

CN. CLAUDIUS LEONTICUS UNDER SEVERUS OR CARACALLA

Attested at Epidaurus, Megara and Delphi (*SIG³* 877) as ὑπατικός καὶ ἐπανορθωτῆς τῆς Ἀχαιίας (or Ἑλλάδος), and at Athens after his death as one-time proconsul. The Delphian inscriptions are now to be consulted in *FD III* 4, 269–271 and 331 A and B. In *FD III* 4, 269 Leonticus is said to have surpassed [πάντας τοὺς] πρὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἡγε[μονεύσαν]τας καὶ ἐπανορθώσαντας, which implies

that often the proconsulship of Achaia and the correctorship of the free cities were combined in the person of a *consularis*. This seems to have occurred in the case of Claudius Callippianus Italicus (*supra*).

TI. CLAUDIUS SUBATIANUS PROCULUS *ca.* 200–206

Attested at Cuicul as *curator Atheniensium et Patrensi* by ILS 9488. Barbieri no.173.

PAULINUS IN THE SEVERAN PERIOD

Attested at Sparta as ἡ[γ]ε[μόνα] καὶ διορθωτὴν τῆς Ἑλλάδος by IG V 1, 538. Barbieri no.2071.

L. EGNATIUS VICTOR LOLLIANUS UNDER SEVERUS ALEXANDER

Attested at Thebes by IG VII 2510, in which the Plataeans call him τὸν λαμπρότατον ὑπατικὸν, ἐπανορθωτὴν Ἀχαιίας. PIR² E 36; Barbieri no.1023.

In summary, the practice of sending an imperial commissioner to the free cities of Greece is first attested in the case of Maximus under Trajan and was developed further by Hadrian. Under Antoninus Pius the practice seems to have lapsed; only one commissioner, the prefect Severus, not a legate to all or several free cities, is so far attested, and only very early in the reign. Under Marcus Aurelius and the Severi, however, appears a new kind of interim governor, a *consularis* who combined the authority of the old proconsul of Achaia, who was a *praetorius*, with that of the Trajanic-Hadrianic corrector of the free cities. The combined post, first attested for the Quintilii, was later called that of the ὑπατικὸς καὶ ἐπανορθωτὴς τῆς Ἑλλάδος or ἡγεμῶν καὶ διορθωτὴς τῆς Ἑλλάδος, so that Philostratus could speak of a time when the Quintilii ἦρχον τῆς Ἑλλάδος.

The combination of the two posts first and perhaps always occurred in preparation for war. Its purpose was to concentrate power in able hands and to avoid the disruption of an annual change and of a conflict of authority.

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

June, 1973