

CORINTH, ARGOS, AND THE IMPERIAL CULT

PSEUDO-JULIAN, *LETTERS* 198

THE SUBJECT of this paper¹ is a Greek literary text of disputed date and authorship preserved in the correspondence of the emperor Julian as Letter 198 (Bidez). The text is addressed to an unidentified person, to whom it recommends an Argive embassy seeking a hearing of a dispute with Corinth over Argive payments for the staging of wild-beast shows (*venationes*) in the Roman colony. In 1913, in a long and carefully argued paper, Bruno Keil sought to demonstrate that this text should be redated to the second half of the 1st century after Christ, that it is a letter of recommendation addressed to the Roman governor of Greece, and that its author was an otherwise unknown Greek notable in the governor's retinue who had undertaken, in effect, to "broker" an audience on the embassy's behalf. If correct, this view would make the text a rare surviving example of a type of letter no doubt generated in large numbers by the routines of Roman provincial administration.

Keil's views were immediately rejected by Paul Maas, who reasserted the Julianic date of the text and proposed to see its author as one of Julian's correspondents, the high priest Theodoros. Although Bidez, the editor of the Budé edition of the letters, which appeared in 1924, received Maas's arguments favorably, he went no further than to reject the idea of imperial authorship, merely classifying the text among the "*dubiae*" and leaving open a "definitive solution" of the problem. Wilmer Cave Wright, editor of the Loeb edition of the letters published the year before (where the text appears as no. 28), accepted the text as an authentic letter of Julian from his "student days at Athens" on the grounds that nothing in the text expressly excludes his authorship. More recently, Bertold Weis, editor of a German edition of Julian's letters, has firmly rejected the notion of Julianic authorship.²

Although Keil's arguments were accepted by authorities as eminent as Edmund Groag and Louis Robert, his failure to win general approval for his thesis has inhibited recognition of this text as an important source for the history of early imperial Achaia.³ In what follows I attempt to cut the Gordian knot of chronology by asking how far Keil's dating receives support from more recent developments in the study of early imperial Greece. I hope to show that such support can indeed be found: in brief, that the content relates to the cult of the emperors founded by the "younger" (post-146 B.C.) Achaean League in (as I shall suggest) A.D. 54. *Mutatis mutandis*, the text illuminates this initiative, confirming that the new cult was celebrated at Corinth and disclosing that its financing eventually provoked a bitter

¹ An earlier version of this paper was read at a one-day conference on ancient Corinth at Newcastle-upon-Tyne University in October 1992. I am grateful to participants in the ensuing discussion, as I also am to Rowland Smith, Charles Williams, and this journal's referees, for helpful comments; remaining faults, of course, are my own. The edition of Julian's letters followed here is that of Bidez 1924.

² Maas 1913, pp. 534–535; Bidez 1924, pp. 219–221; Wright 1923, p. xxiii. Weis 1973, p. 314.

³ Groag 1939, cols. 48–49; Robert 1946, p. 149; Robert 1948, pp. 139–140, where he effectively demolished the attempt by Vollgraff (1945, pp. 5–28) to find support for a 4th-century date for this text by reference to an Argive epigram for a Late Roman official.

quarrel between the Corinthians and Argives. I end by supporting a date for the text, and for this quarrel, between A.D. 80 and 120 and offer a reconstruction of its historical background.

THE TEXT

The text opens (407b–408a) with praise of Argos on historical grounds old and recent, the former emphasizing Argive leadership in the Trojan War and the sharing through ties of kinship in the achievements of Philip and Alexander (who claimed an Argive ancestry), the latter the city's record of obedience to Rome, obtained through alliance (ξυμμαχίας), not force of Roman arms. These justified the high rank (ἀξιώματος, 410a) which the Argives claimed for their city and which, they believed, entitled them to special consideration (410a). The text then reaches the nub of the matter. For the last seven years the Corinthians had claimed the right to collect contributions (συντελεῖν, 408a; συντέλειαν, 408d) from the Argives towards the cost of spectacles staged in Corinth. The Argives, claims the author, had once enjoyed the privilege (προνομίαν, 408c) of exemption from these payments in recognition of their obligation to fund their own panhellenic games (the Nemea). The author then employs four arguments in support of the renewal of this exemption. The first involved an attempt to claim for Argos the immunity (ἀτέλειαν, 408c) enjoyed by Elis and Delphi, likewise hosts to panhellenic games; moreover, the text asserts, whereas the Pythian and Olympic festivals fell only once every four years, the Argives had expanded their agonistic cycle and now had to fund no fewer than four sets of games in as many years. This argument, however, since it required the admission of an earlier Argive liability to pay, prompts the author to float the notion that at first, perhaps (τυχόν, 408c), the Argives had not even been liable for these payments. After this attempt (specious, as will be shown) to associate Argos with the privileged status of Elis and Delphi, the author argues, secondly, that the payments were being used to support spectacles which were neither Greek nor ancient, namely *venationes* (κυνηγέσια, 409a), wild-beast shows using bears and leopards (ἄρκτους καὶ παρδάλεις, 409a). Thirdly, Corinth was much richer than Argos and could support the cost herself, especially as many cities (πολλῶν πόλεων, 409b) contributed besides Argos. Fourthly, as the two cities were neighbors, the Corinthians should show a special love (ἀγαπᾶσθαι μᾶλλον, 409b) for the Argives.

We learn too that the Argives had already taken their quarrel once to a Roman court but had lost their case; they now sought to have it reopened by means of this embassy. The author then introduces its personnel, which consisted of, or at any rate was led by, two Argive notables, Diogenes and Lamprias, who are described as philosophers (φιλοσοφοῦσι, 410b), but who nevertheless, the text is at pains to emphasize, had distinguished records of civic service as “orators, magistrates, ambassadors, and generous public donors” (ῥητορεῦσι καὶ πολιτεύονται καὶ πρεσβεύουσι καὶ δαπανῶσιν ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων προθύμως, 410c).

DATE, AUTHORSHIP, AND ADDRESSEE

Two initial points should be made emphatically. Apart from the title “Julian to the Argives” (Ἰουλιανὸς Ἀργείοις) in the sole manuscript to preserve this text,⁴ nothing in the content suggests the authorship of Julian (indeed there are at least two indicators that he

⁴ Keil 1913, p. 1 (the *Codex Vossianus* in Leiden).

was not the author: see p. 215 below). On this matter at least, literary style is no guide either, to judge from the stalemate which expert authorities have reached: whereas Wright claimed that “there is nothing in [the text] which could not have been written by Julian,” Bidez on the contrary felt that “neither the vitality nor the elegance of the emperor’s manner can be recognized”; more recently, Weis has also found the style categorically “un-Julianic”. Style, then, has not so far proved a useful guide in settling the question of authorship, although the current balance of scholarly debate seems to be, if anything, *against* authenticity.⁵

Secondly, there is nothing whatsoever in the text itself to point to a date in the 4th century. More than this, there are three historical references which (and here I am heavily indebted to Keil) cumulatively situate the text most comfortably in the period between 27 B.C. and A.D. 130:

(1) The text contrasts the customs or rights (*νομίμοις*) of old Greece with those which the Corinthians “seem to have received recently from the sovereign city” (*μᾶλλον . . . ἔναγχος δοκοῦσι παρὰ τῆς βασιλευούσης προσειληφέναι πόλεως*) and goes on to ask if the Corinthians “think that they can secure advantages on the basis of the situation which the city now enjoys, since it received the Roman colony” (*εἰ δὲ τοῖς νῦν ὑπάρξασιν τῇ πόλει, ἐπειδὴ τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν ἀποικίαν ἐδέξαντο, ἰσχυριζόμενοι πλεόν ἔχειν ἄξιοῦσι*, 409c). These references present the refoundation of Corinth as a Roman colony in 44 B.C. as a relatively recent event. As Bidez remarked, “This passage is one of the most embarrassing for those who attribute the speech to Julian or one of his contemporaries.”⁶

(2) The description of Argive festivals matches the epigraphic evidence for the city’s agonistic cycle in the early principate, when Argos celebrated the “trieteric” Nemean games once every three years inclusively, along with the five-yearly Heraea and the Sebastea. Since these last two are coupled in Argive inscriptions of imperial date with celebrations of the Nemea, Axel Boëthius reconstructed a quadrennial Argive cycle in which the Heraea and Nemea fell in the first year and the Sebastea and Nemea in the third, with no celebrations in the second and fourth years; in this way, as the text says, the city hosted four agonistic celebrations in each four-year period. Soon after A.D. 130, however, this cycle was expanded by the foundation of games in honor of the deified Antinous, which are attested in a local inscription recently redated to the Severan age.⁷ Since the author’s point is to emphasize the financial burden to Argos of its own games, we would expect him to have included these Antinoea in his reckoning were they celebrated at the date of composition. On this view the text ought to fall after the foundation of the Sebastea, games instituted by Argos to honor Augustus sometime

⁵ Wright 1923, p. xxiii; Bidez 1924, p. 220. The judgment of Weis (1973, p. 314) deserves quotation: “Nach langer Beschäftigung mit den Briefen Julians, nach eingehenden Stilvergleichen und sorgfältiger Prüfung der Argumentationsweise bekenne ich mein ernststen Zweifel an der Echtheit des Briefes. Dies ist nicht, so scheint mir, der bewegliche, lebendige Geist, nicht der gewandte, elegante, flüssige und mitunter auch nachlässig-flüchtige Stil, nicht der in solchen Fällen so eindringliche, beschwörende Ton, nicht der leidenschaftliche Impuls des Kaisers Julian.”

⁶ Keil 1913, p. 15; Bidez 1924, p. 222, note 2, followed by Weis 1973, p. 315, note 10. For numismatic confirmation of the date of the colonial foundation, see now Amandry 1988, p. 13, note 90.

⁷ *IG IV*¹ 590, redated by Spawforth (1985, pp. 256–258). Boëthius 1922, p. 60; Boëthius accepted Keil’s redating of the text, modifying (*op. cit.*, p. 61, note 2) the agonistic arguments of Keil, while accepting that “*tatsächlich* die Σεβαστεία, Heraia, Nemea, während des 1. Jhd. die einzigen Agone der Stadt Argos waren.”

after his assumption of the title “Augustus” in 27 B.C. but before (since Corinth had been refounded “recently”) the establishment of the games for Antinous in or shortly after 130.

An alternative view had earlier been put forward by August Boeckh, who suggested⁸ that the text reflects a time when the Antinoea had been discontinued but when the Nemea, Heraea, and Sebastea were still celebrated. The latest evidence for the Sebastea as well as the Antinoea, an Argive inscription now redated to the Severan age (note 7 above), shows that both were still flourishing in the later 2nd or the early 3rd century. It is conceivable that at a later date one disappeared while the other survived. But this is a conjecture with no special cogency; it is just as possible that both survived until threatened equally by the general financial difficulties of the Greek cities, from which Argos cannot have been exempt, in the middle decades of the 3rd century. After this date there is no evidence for the survival of either the Sebastea, Nemea, or Heraea,⁹ although a Julianic date for the text requires us to believe in the continuity of the Argive agonistic cycle from the 1st century into the middle decades of the 4th. Given the changed religious atmosphere of late antiquity, not to mention the reduced finances of provincial cities at this time, such continuity is not easy to accept.

(3) Lamprias, one of the Argive ambassadors, bears a name used by a distinguished family of notables based on Epidauros and Argos during the principate. The family, the Statilii, seems to have come originally from Epidauros, but by the reign of Claudius at the latest it had acquired close ties with neighboring Argos, which considered itself the fatherland (πατρίς) of a much later member, T. Statilius Timocrates (II) Memmianus (*IG IV*¹ 590: note 7 above). Two Lamprias of some prominence are attested in the period between 27 B.C. and A.D. 130. The earlier, T. Statilius Lamprias (II), lived under Tiberius, Gaius, and Claudius; the later, T. Statilius Lamprias (IV) Memmianus, flourished around the turn of the first century.¹⁰

Within the period 27 B.C. to A.D. 130, Keil’s preference for a date in the second half of the 1st century after Christ drew on the periphrastic language which the text uses to describe Roman rule, referred to once as “the rulers” (οἱ κρατοῦντες, 408a), a usage well attested in Greek writers of the 1st century, notably Plutarch (*Mor.* 824c), and twice as “the mistress city” (ἡ βασιλευούση πόλις, 408a, 409c). This usage only becomes common after the reign of Hadrian, but Keil saw it as cognate with that of *basileus* (king) to describe the Roman emperor, which first appears in Greek literature in the second half of the 1st century; a more recent survey suggests that Letter 198 (on Keil’s dating) still offers the earliest instance of this usage.¹¹

In rejecting Keil’s thesis, Maas argued that a reference to the subject matter of the text could be found in a letter (Bidez 1924, no. 30) from Julian to a close friend, the polytheist Theodoros, dating from the end of 361, shortly after Julian’s accession. Here Julian praises Theodoros, firstly, for his calm in the face of an outrage (παροινίαν) committed against them both by a governor of Greece, whom Julian likens to a tyrant, and, secondly, for the help

⁸ *CIG I* 1124.

⁹ The latest reference to the Nemea and Heraea (*ca.* 253–257) that I know of comes in the Athenian inscription for the herald Valerius Eclectus: Moretti 1953, no. 90, pp. 263–264. Keil (1913, p. 13, note 1) doubted whether the Nemea were still celebrated under Julian.

¹⁰ See Spawforth 1985, pp. 250–252, 254, and 256–258.

¹¹ Keil 1913, pp. 12–13, 16–17. Survey: Wörrle (1971, pp. 329–331); he cites no instance earlier than the 2nd century.

given by Theodoros to a nameless city where he had spent time. Maas identified this city as Argos and Theodoros as the author of Letter 198; the author's intercession on behalf of Argos would then be the "help" and its failure the "outrage" referred to here by Julian, the addressee of the text being, of course, the governor.¹²

None of this quite rings true. Would Julian really have likened a provincial governor to a tyrant and considered himself as well as Theodoros the victim of an outrage, merely because in a minor administrative matter falling well within the governor's brief he had (on Maas's view) refused to hear the Argive embassy (or had found against it), thereby doing no more than uphold his predecessor's ruling? Maas ignored the fact that the text presents its addressee as well disposed towards Argos (see below). In addition (a point made by Keil), Julian considered himself a friend of Corinth, where his father was a visitor;¹³ and so an official ruling which supported Corinthian interests is hardly likely to have constituted an "outrage" for Julian (who for the same reason, if for no other, is an unlikely author of the text in the first place, as both Keil and Bidez saw¹⁴). Some cause closer to Julian's heart would better explain his outrage on this occasion: perhaps the governor in question was a Christian sympathizer who had taken some action against the province's bastions of polytheism.¹⁵

Of Maas's case we are left essentially with his observation that none of the other letters in the collection now recognized as "non-Julianic" is older than Julian's day; if the text is indeed much earlier in date, how did it come to be included with the rest of the collection in the manuscript tradition? Obviously no firm answer can be given here, although modern scholars stress the diversity and relative lateness of the surviving manuscript collections of Julian's letters.¹⁶ Perhaps this misattribution arose because an earlier copyist, just like Maas, erroneously linked the subject matter of this text with that of Julian's letter to Theodoros. The *Codex Vossianus* in Leiden, the sole manuscript to preserve the former, does not include the latter, although it places Letter 198 immediately before a second letter from Julian to Theodoros (Bidez 1924, no. 89);¹⁷ conceivably in one of the earlier collections on which the *Vossianus* drew, all three were bunched together. Given the complexity and vagaries of the manuscript tradition in general and of this one in particular, the prudent may well hesitate before erecting Maas's observation into a serious objection to the detachment of this text from the Julianic canon.

Finally, Maas objected that if the text was 1st century in date, its subject matter was too trivial for it to have survived until such a time as it could be muddled up with Julian's letters (not before the second half of the 4th century). On the contrary, it might well have been preserved among the private papers of either the author himself (on Keil's view a provincial Greek notable) or one or more of the other persons involved in the affair, notably the Argive ambassadors, and through the descendants of these men of wealth and culture have passed eventually into one of the libraries of late antiquity.

¹² Maas 1913.

¹³ Keil 1913, p. 13, citing Libanius, *Or.* 14.30 (Förster).

¹⁴ Keil 1913, p. 13; Bidez 1924, p. 220.

¹⁵ This interpretation builds on the hint of Bidez (1924, p. 56, note 3: "par 'nous', Julien entend peut-être les partisans de l'Hellénisme").

¹⁶ See Bidez 1924, pp. viii–xvi.

¹⁷ So Maas 1913; Bidez 1924, pp. 220–221.

Keil's views as to authorship and addressee, with which I am in broad agreement, are now briefly recapitulated. The text itself gives no clue as to the author's identity beyond showing that he was neither a member of the Argive embassy, which it was the text's purpose to commend, nor a native of Argos;¹⁸ and the detached tone of the references to Rome and Roman institutions suggests that his viewpoint was not that of the ruling power. The author makes no attempt to deploy his personal standing on behalf of the Argives, as we might expect were he a Roman patron of high rank (let alone an imperial prince); on the contrary, the impersonal tone is consonant with an author whose social status was no higher, and perhaps was lower, than that of the addressee. That the author was a well-schooled product of Greek high culture is shown by the rhetorical conventions that shape the text.¹⁹ Keil's hypothesis, therefore, remains attractive: the author was a provincial Greek notable well known to the Argives but also, since he agreed to "broker" an audience for his fellow provincials, to the governor, to whose retinue he perhaps belonged.

That the addressee was indeed the governor is made more or less certain by the fact that the Argives had missed an earlier chance (409d) to appeal to a higher authority "outside Greece" (either the emperor or the Roman senate, on the assumption that Achaia at the time was a senatorial province). For an appeal outside Greece to have been the next step, the case on this previous occasion must already have been heard and rejected by the highest Roman authority within the province: the governor or his delegate. Having "wrong-footed" themselves in this way (the author lays the blame on the "inaction" [ἀπραγμοσύνην, 409d] of the city's then advocate), the Argives had no right to a second hearing, and it was to have this procedural obstacle removed that the Argive embassy now sought a hearing with the addressee. This last was presumably a new governor of Greece, the only provincial official with the power to order a new hearing. The Argives had reason to see him as well disposed to their interests, since they claimed that they now had "the judges of our prayers" (νῦν ἡμῶν τὰ μὲν τῶν δικαστῶν ὑπάρχει κατ'εὐχάς, 410d); these "judges", Keil suggested, should be understood as the new governor and, as it were by anticipation, the sympathetic arbitrator (*iudex datus*) whom the Argives expected him to depute to hear the case, once successfully reopened.²⁰ The Argives would then have made an initial complaint seven years earlier when the Roman authorities removed their old exemption from these payments to Corinth; six years later, the arrival of a new governor thought to have Argive sympathies offered Argos the chance to try to reverse his predecessor's ruling.

As to the moment in this offensive for which this text was composed, it must have preceded the hearing which it requests (at which speeches would certainly have been the order of the day but by the ambassadors themselves, who, we learn, were old hands in public oratory): presumably the embassy had arrived and was waiting on the governor, but the favor of an audience had yet to be secured. Although our text poses rhetorically as a "speech" (λόγος) and ranges its author among the "orators" (411b), it was probably composed for written delivery, serving in effect as a petition on behalf of the embassy.²¹

¹⁸ Keil 1913, pp. 22–23.

¹⁹ On these, see Keil 1913, pp. 24–35.

²⁰ Identity of addressee: Keil 1913, pp. 20–24.

²¹ So Keil 1913, pp. 22, 24.

CORINTHIAN *VENATIONES*

Now I attempt to elaborate further, from the point to which Keil developed it, the historical context of the reattributed text, beginning with the nature of the Argive payments to Corinth. Although the author refers rhetorically to Argive “enslavement” (ἐπιδουλεύειν, 409b) and “attachment” to the Corinthians (Κορίνθιοι δὲ νῦν αὐτήν [*sc.* τὴν Ἀργείων πόλιν] προσγενόμενην [*Wright:* προσνευόμενην] αὐτοῖς, 408a), the text as a whole makes perfectly clear that, far from being reduced to administrative dependence on the Roman colony, Argos at the time enjoyed the normal civic autonomy of a Roman subject city (*civitas stipendiaria*). Following Mommsen, therefore, Keil explained the administrative basis of these payments in terms of a Roman “financial attribution” (“finanzielle Attribuirung”) of Argos to Corinth. There are parallels in the Roman east for such arrangements, as in the case of Rhodes and Kaunos or, evidently, Athens and all or part of Kephallenia; but it would come as a surprise to find Rome treating in this way (in peacetime to boot) a famous city like Argos, host to one of the ancient festivals of the Greek “period”, and it would certainly be surprising, as Keil realized, to find “many” cities in Greece identically treated.²² At this point, therefore, I reluctantly part company with Keil, in the belief that the true nature of these payments is revealed by the purpose for which they were used: the funding of wild-beast shows (a point on which Keil made no comment).

I note, first, that we have plenty of other evidence for the staging of such a typically Roman entertainment in the Roman colony. Writing in the mid-2nd century, Apuleius in his *Golden Ass* depicts a senior Corinthian magistrate, a duovir, sending to Thessaly for wild animals for his planned gladiatorial show.²³ Corinth is one of only two cities in Achaia (the other, Patrai, was also a Roman colony) known to have equipped themselves with an amphitheater, the Roman setting *par excellence* for gladiatorial shows and *venationes*.²⁴ Not content with this facility, the Corinthians converted both their theaters into arenas at one time or another. The refurbished theater of the Greek city has yielded fragments of frescoed scenes of *venationes* painted on the barrier built to protect the spectators; they feature lions, a bull, and a spotted cat, which the Greeks would have described as a πάνθηρ or a πάρδαλις (as in this text), as well as a mysterious human participant whose purple-edged garment and high red boots proclaim him as an official (probably local). Some two generations after its refurbishment by Herodes Atticus, the city’s odeion underwent a similar conversion; here the American excavators found traces of what may have been animal cages. In spite of this archaeological evidence, identification of the “theaters” to which the text refers is problematic, since its reattribution to the 1st century places it before the conversions just described, and the Corinthian amphitheater is unexcavated and undated. But temporary theaters could just as well be meant, like (perhaps) the “gully outside the city” where, as Dio of Prusa says sniffily, the Corinthians of his day watched gladiatorial shows.²⁵

²² Keil 1913, pp. 7–9. Kaunos: Dio Chrysostom 31.125. Kephallenia: Cassius Dio 69.16.2 with Day 1942, p. 185. Bertrand 1985 stresses that “attribution” in the Roman east is best attested in the context of postwar settlements.

²³ *Met.* 10.18. For the value of this work to the historian, see Millar 1981.

²⁴ For the recent discovery of Patrai’s amphitheater, see Rizakis 1989, p. 185.

²⁵ Theater: *Corinth* II, chap. 5. Odeion: *Corinth* X, pp. 146–147. Amphitheater: *Corinth* I, pp. 89–91. Dio Chrysostom 31.121, dated by Jones (1978, p. 133) to about A.D. 70–75 (?).

I now suggest that the Corinthian shows that the Argives were liable to support were celebrations of the imperial cult. To anticipate the argument, we know that Argos was a member city of the “younger” (post-146 B.C.) Achaean League, which, as we shall see, founded a collective imperial cult at Corinth in the mid-1st century. We know too that *venationes*, shows pitting beasts against beasts or beasts against human combatants (*venatores, bestiarii*), were a widespread feature of provincial Greek festivals celebrating the imperial cult, when they were usually combined with gladiatorial shows, also well documented at Corinth.²⁶ Finally, Letter 198 states that Argos was one of “many cities” which helped to pay for these shows, as we would expect in the case of a collective cult organized around a provincial *koinon* or league of cities.

A COLLECTIVE IMPERIAL CULT AT CORINTH

The chief item of evidence on this point is a Latin inscription from Corinth set up by one of the colony’s tribes in honor of its patron, the Spartan magnate C. Iulius Spartiaticus:

C. Iulio Laconis f.
 Euryclis n. Fab. Spartiati[*co*],
 [p]rocuratori Caesaris et Augustae
 Agrippinae, trib. mil., equo p[*ublic*.]
 5 [e~~x~~]ornato a divo Claudio, flam.
 divi Iuli, pontif., Ilvir. quinq. iter.,
 agonothete Isthmion et Caesa.
 [S]ebasteon, archieri domus Aug.
 [i~~n~~] perpetuum, primo Achaeon,
 10 ob v[*ir*]tutem eius et animosam
 f[*usi*]ss[i~~m~~]amque erga domum
 divinam et erga coloniam nostr.
 munific{i}entiam tribules
 tribu[s] Calpurnia[e]
 15 [p]atrono.

The tribesmen of the Calpurnian tribe (set up this statue), on account of his excellence and unsparing and most lavish generosity both to the divine family and to our colony, for their patron Gaius Iulius Spartiaticus, son of Laco, grandson of Eurycles, of the Fabian tribe, procurator of Caesar and the Augusta Agrippina, military tribune, decorated with the public horse by the deified Claudius, flamen of the deified Julius, twice quinquennial duovir, president of the Isthmian and Caesarean Sebasteon games, high priest for life of the Augustan house, the first of the Achaeans to hold this office.²⁷

The date of this inscription is controversial, depending on whether one accepts the view of its first editors that the striking reference to Nero’s mother can only belong to the brief period of her political ascendancy in 54–55; but the reference does not *require* this dating, and it seems safer to place the text in the longer period between Nero’s accession (54) and

²⁶ See Robert 1940, no. 60, pp. 117–118; pp. 309–331 (chap. 5: “Les chasses et les combats de bêtes à l’amphithéâtre”).

²⁷ Taylor and West 1926, pp. 393–400; *Corinth VIII*, ii, no. 68; Smallwood 1967, no. 264, p. 75.

Agrippina's murder (59).²⁸ The *cursus honorum* of Spartiaticus provides as a *terminus post quem* for his assumption of the high priesthood his term as agonothete of the Isthmian games, which in turn is listed after his second term as quinquennial duovir at Corinth.²⁹ It is a reasonable assumption that Spartiaticus had held both these posts fairly recently, within, say, the ten years prior to the inscription. At any rate, his father, the Spartan dynast Laco, who also held the colony's quinquennial duovirate, was disgraced by Tiberius in 33 and rehabilitated only under Claudius or conceivably Gaius (that is, in 37 at the earliest and, more probably, after 41), and in my view the tenure of high office by father and son in a Roman colony is unlikely to belong to this period of political limbo for the family.³⁰ Accordingly, the years available for their duovirates are the three quinquennial years under Claudius, which, following the new dating proposed by Michel Amandry, are 41/42, 46/47, and 51/52, along with 56/57 (51/52 now being assigned by Amandry to the *quinquennales* Tib. Claudius Dinippus and Tib. Claudius Anaxilaus).³¹ On the assumption that the father preceded the son, the second duovirate, therefore, belongs to either 46/47 or 56/57. Conceivably Spartiaticus could have served as agonothete, and become high priest, in the very same year; so 46/47 becomes the earliest possible date for his assumption of his Achaean post, with 48/49 a more likely *terminus post quem* and 58 or, conceivably, 59 the latest. I suggest below that in fact the occasion for the institution of the new cult was the accession of Nero in 54 (on which view the second duovirate must be assigned to 46/47).

The high priesthood of the Achaean League, a post well attested until the 3rd century, makes its first appearance in this text. The usual interpretation of the formulation "first of the Achaeans" is that Spartiaticus was its first incumbent. A minority view, which has found no supporters, is that of the first editors of the text, who claimed that Spartiaticus was only the first to hold for life an office which previously had been annual, evidently on the view that a date in the mid-1st century for the establishment *ab initio* of an Achaean federal cult of the emperors was too late, a view, of course, which begs the question.³² The ambiguity of the Latin, as of the Greek version of Spartiaticus's priestly title in an Athenian inscription, permits this interpretation, which introduces, however, an otherwise unattested complication into the history of a priesthood that, throughout its long later history, was always a post for life. To my mind the most economical explanation remains the usual one: Spartiaticus was the first incumbent of a post which, from the outset, was held for life, and it was the honor to be gained from being the first to serve which helps to explain its attraction for the most distinguished available candidate of the day; one might compare a Trajanic inscription from Syrian Apamea in honor of a local notable, L. Iulius Agrippa, which saw

²⁸ Taylor and West 1926, *loc. cit.*, followed by Amandry 1988, p. 74, note 563 ("opinion qui semble parfaitement fondée"); *contra* Pflaum 1960, no. 24 *bis* (dated to A.D. 54–59), pp. 63–65; Bagdikian 1953, no. 34, p. 39; Puech 1983, p. 26, note 42; Halfmann 1979, no. 299 (A.D. 54–59), pp. 126–127.

²⁹ J. H. Kent (*Corinth* VIII, iii, no. 10, p. 31) dates his *agonothesia* to 47, but this date is conjectural, the more so since some doubt exists as to whether Spartiaticus presided over the "Greater" or "Lesser" Isthmia (note 34 below).

³⁰ Cartledge and Spawforth 1989, pp. 102 and 104.

³¹ Amandry 1988, pp. 22 and 74, note 563.

³² Taylor and West 1926, p. 395.

his great-grandfather's term as the first-ever high priest of provincial Syria's imperial cult (ὁ πρῶτος τῆς ἑπαρ|[χείας ἐ]ρασάμενος) as an ancestral distinction worth recalling.³³

Bernadette Puech has argued that the new cult of which Spartiaticus was high priest was celebrated at Corinth,³⁴ a view with which I am in agreement and in support of which, I believe, more can be made of the inscription for Spartiaticus. Its hyperbolic praise for the honorand's "unsparing and most lavish generosity both to the divine family and to our colony" presumably refers *inter alia* to his generosity in defraying the expenses of his high priesthood, and the gratitude of the Calpurnian tribesmen makes best sense if they were among the audience for this generosity as participants in celebrations at Corinth over which the high priest Spartiaticus presided.

Puech based her argument, however, on the evidence linking four Achaean high priests (Spartiaticus included) with the Isthmian sanctuary under colonial Corinth's control. Thus Spartiaticus was an Isthmian agonothete; the high priest "Lucanius", a friend of Plutarch, gave a banquet at Corinth during an Isthmian celebration; the Trajanic high priest Cn. Cornelius Pulcher served as agonothete of the joint Isthmian and "imperial" games; and the high priest P. Licinius Priscus Iuventianus, whose dates are a matter of continuing controversy, during his term completed an extensive program of works at the Isthmian sanctuary.³⁵ In the light of these ties, Puech proposed to see the quadrennial "imperial" games for the ruling emperor at Isthmia, which the colony instituted under Tiberius, as the "temps fort" for the celebration of the Achaean cult.³⁶ In fact, the case for linking this cult with Isthmia seems to me to be a weak one, once it is accepted that any citizen of Corinth prominent enough to hold the Achaean high priesthood was, by definition, likely at some point in his career to have held office at, or in other ways taken an interest in, Corinth's most prestigious sanctuary. Both Spartiaticus and Pulcher, although their families originated from Sparta and Epidauros respectively, pursued Corinthian careers and no doubt held the colony's citizenship; "Lucanius", whose rare Italian *nomen* yields Caesarian connections, was surely a Corinthian by birth, and Priscus came from a prominent Corinthian family.³⁷ Once this weak link with Isthmia has been called into question, we are left in the dark as to the details of the cult, although the inscription for Spartiaticus makes fairly certain that he performed his priestly duties at Corinth. But if the dispute over Argive payments to Corinth is placed in the context of this Achaean cult, we would have confirmation that Corinth was indeed its home and would be able to identify what Puech called its "modalités": an annual festival in the "theaters" of the colony itself featuring *venationes* (and no doubt gladiatorial

³³ *SIG*³ 790 (Athenian inscription). Apamean text: Balty 1981, no. 20, pp. 205–206. G. W. Bowersock kindly drew this reference to my attention.

³⁴ Puech 1983, pp. 40–41. The Corinthian *cursus* of Spartiaticus describes him as *agonothete Isthmion et Caesar. [S]ebasteon*, taken by Puech as a reference to the "imperial" games, by Geagan (1968, p. 71) as a reference to the Isthmia and Caesarea.

³⁵ Geagan 1989, pp. 349–360, challenging on archaeological grounds the attempt of Puech (1983, pp. 35–41) to make Priscus pre-Hadrianic.

³⁶ Puech 1983, pp. 41–42. Imperial games: *Corinth* VIII, iii, p. 28; Geagan 1968.

³⁷ Priscus: Geagan 1989, p. 357. Lucanius: Plutarch, *Quaest. Conviv.* 5.3.1; Schulze 1904, p. 532, noting Caesar's centurion, Q. Lucanius (Caesar, *BG* 5.35.7). The ingenious suggestion of West (*Corinth* VIII, ii, p. 55) that the name be read as "Licinius" must be rejected.

shows too), funded by the “many cities” of the League, Argos among them. It is to explore further this outside funding of Corinthian entertainments that I turn next.

COLLECTIVE FUNDING OF *VENATIONES* AT CORINTH

Returning to Letter 198, no commentator has reflected on the implications of its claim that the *venationes* at Corinth were funded by “many cities”. If correct, this claim, coupled with the fact that such shows are so closely linked in neighboring provinces of the Roman east with the imperial cult, in itself is enough to suggest strongly that Argive liability to these contributions stemmed from arrangements for the collective funding of a federal or provincial imperial cult such as is found in Roman Asia, where the provincial *koinon* appointed special officials to administer the contributions from member cities for this purpose.³⁸ Unfortunately, the text gives no further clue to the identity of this cultic grouping, to which, it goes without saying, not only Argos but also Corinth would have belonged, although one red herring introduced by the author needs to be set aside, namely, his claim that Argos was entitled to the same financial immunity as Elis and Delphi. This claim, if justified, might be used to show that these two cities were theoretically liable to the same payments. On such a view, the collectivity in question would have been a large one, embracing cities as far afield as the western Peloponnese and central Greece. As Keil saw,³⁹ however, on the matter of Delphi and Elis the author descends into “humbug” (“Spiegelfechtere”), setting up a false parallel between the broad exemption which these two cities enjoyed, to judge from this text, as “free and immune cities” (*civitates liberae et immunes*) and the specific privilege of exemption from payments to Corinth which had “formerly” (πάλαι, 408b) been granted to Argos on the grounds that she, like Delphi and Elis, also bore the burden of a panhellenic festival.⁴⁰ We are left, then, with the text’s shadowy reference to “many” other contributing cities.

WAS THE ACHAEAN HIGH PRIEST A *SACERDOS PROVINCIAE*?

This section seeks to define more closely the identity of these “many” cities, working from the assumption that they were member cities of the post-146 B.C. Achaean League, which by the 2nd century seems once more to have covered the whole Peloponnese, with the possible exception of the Eleutherolaconian League.⁴¹ Since the membership of colonial Corinth continues to be questioned,⁴² I stress here that it is clearly attested, first, by the high priesthoods of Priscus Iuventianus and “Lucanius” (above) and, second, by federal prescriptions for the setting up of statues at Corinth’s Isthmian sanctuary, the earliest of

³⁸ Deininger 1965, pp. 70, 96, and 155–157; Price 1984, p. 54.

³⁹ Keil 1913, pp. 7–9.

⁴⁰ For Delphi’s freedom, see Accame 1946, p. 204 and the imperial letters in *FdD* III, iv, nos. 301 and 313. Delphi’s immunity is attested to my knowledge in Letter 198 only, as is that of Elis: Accame, *op. cit.*, p. 147, followed by Schwertfeger 1974, pp. 54–55. Accame (*ibid.*) erroneously supposed that this text proves the Roman immunity of Argos and Corinth as well; *Corinth* VIII, i, no. 80 shows that Corinth only obtained this privilege (line 5: τὴν ἀτέ[λειαν] τῇ πόλει παρασχόντα, of Cn. Cornelius Pulcher) under Hadrian.

⁴¹ Kahrstedt 1950, pp. 70–75. For the membership of the League at the time of the First Mithradatic War, see now Boehringer 1991, pp. 163–170.

⁴² Oliver 1978, p. 191. Wiseman 1979, pp. 500–501.

which dates to A.D. 37.⁴³ As for the membership of Argos, previously attested from 37 only, it can now be pushed back to 88/87 B.C.⁴⁴

Puech argued that the high priests of the Achaean League were the province of Achaia's equivalent to the provincial high priests of other provinces (*sacerdos provinciae*), in that the cult over which they presided, although instituted by the Achaean League, represented the province as a whole. Her case⁴⁵ rests on an inscription from Messene (*IG V i 1451*), dating from 139–161, in honor of the future emperor Marcus Aurelius:

M. Αἴλιον Αὐρήλιον
 ὁ Οὐῆρον Καίσαρα
 ὁ οἱ Ἑλληγες εὐχαρι-)
 στοῦντες τοῖς θεοῖς
 5 καὶ λιπούμενοι τὰ ἀγαθὰ
 τῷ οἴκῳ, εἰσηγησαμένου
 καὶ τὰ ἀναλώματα παρασχόν-
 τος Τιβ. Κλ. Σαιθίδα Καιλια-
 νοῦ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως αὐ-
 10 τῶν διὰ βίου καὶ Ἑλλαδάρ-
 χου ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν
 Ἀχαιῶν, ἀνέστησαν.

The Hellenes set up (the statue of) M. Aelius Aurelius Verus Caesar in thanks to the gods and beseeching good for his house, Tib. Claudius Saethida Caelianus, their high priest for life and helladarch by appointment of the Achaean League, having introduced the motion and provided the funds.

Puech argued that the text makes a significant distinction between the “Greeks” in whose name the honorand exercised his high priesthood and the “Achaean” on whose behalf he held the helladarchy (an Achaean post established under Hadrian). On her view, the text shows that the “constituency” served by the Achaean high priest was different from, and broader than, the one served by the Achaean helladarch. The difficulty with this argument is that honorific inscriptions set up by the Achaean League for other helladarchs give the post, and the league, similar pan-provincial pretensions by describing them as “ruling the Hellenes” or “ruling Hellas”.⁴⁶ Can we be sure that the distinction made by the Messenian text is a meaningful one and that “Hellenes” and “Achaean” here are not merely synonyms?

For a brief period under Nero, however, a case can indeed be made for seeing the Achaean high priest as a truly provincial dignitary. It rests on the evidence (neglected by Puech) for a union of the Achaean League with the province's smaller regional leagues (Boeotian, Euboean, Phocian, Locrian, and Dorian) in the period between 37 and the late 60's.⁴⁷ Could this cooperation have extended to collective participation in emperor worship

⁴³ *IG VII 2711* = Oliver 1989, no. 18, lines 31–32 (ἀρκεσθῆτε τοῖς Ὀλυμπίασι καὶ Νεμέῃ καὶ Πυθοῖ καὶ Ἰ[σθμοῦ] τεθησομένοις); *IG V 2 517* (late 2nd or early 3rd century), lines 15–16 (ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς τῆς Ἑλλάδος πανηγυριστηρίοις, Ὀλυμπίασι καὶ Ἰσθμοῖ καὶ Νεμέῃ).

⁴⁴ Boehringer 1991, pp. 165–167.

⁴⁵ Puech 1983, p. 24.

⁴⁶ *Inscriptionen von Olympia*, nos. 448 ([ἄρξ]αντα τοῖς Ἑλλησι), 458 (ἄρξαντα τῆς Ἑλλάδος).

⁴⁷ Deininger 1965, pp. 88–91; Oliver 1978.

at Corinth? It is true that this union has an *ad hoc* look about it: membership fluctuated (the Dorians took part in 67 but not in 37), and the collective officials whom we encounter, the “general” (*strategos*) and the “secretary”, look like Achaean League functionaries acting on behalf of the union as a whole.⁴⁸ On the other hand, we find this organization of “Panachaeans” or “Panhellenes”, as its members liked to style themselves, celebrating a form of emperor worship in the period immediately before the institution of the federal cult at Corinth. Thus in 37, on the accession of Gaius, the Panachaeian “assembly” (σύνοδος) “celebrated a common festival” (κοινῆ ἑορτάσαντες) in the new emperor’s honor at Argos, where the Roman governor and his *consilium* were also present to witness the taking of the oath of loyalty to Gaius by the representatives of the province’s cities.⁴⁹ Although J. A. O. Larsen curiously denied any “reference to divine honors or cults” on this occasion, the generally close link between emperor worship and ceremonies of provincial oath taking leaves in no doubt that this “common festival” of the Panachaeians in 37 included cultic acts on behalf of Gaius, such as sacrifices on the imperial altar(s) at Argos.⁵⁰ Given the governor’s involvement, a degree of initiative from above, at the very least, probably lay behind this Argive episode: as Oliver saw,⁵¹ the Panachaeian union looks like a Roman administrative convenience, on this occasion providing a governor with a provincial forum for the staging of loyalist ceremonies. Since the same governor, P. Memmius Regulus, was still in office in 41,⁵² when Claudius succeeded Gaius, it is likely that a similar oath-taking ceremony was staged in Greece (at Argos once more?) four years later, again accompanied by acts of emperor worship. It does not seem unreasonable to see the eventual institution of an Achaean cult as growing out of the earlier, more sporadic, celebrations by the “Panachaeans”. It may well be that Nero’s accession in 54 prompted this new initiative, behind which we can discern, as well as any encouragement from above, the energetic self-promotion of the provincial magnate chosen to be the first high priest in the name of the Achaean League but who was also thought of, perhaps, as representing the smaller member leagues of the Panachaeian union.

The Panachaeian union, however, does not seem to have survived Nero’s short-lived liberation of Greece, when it makes its final appearance in the evidence as an administrative stopgap on which the withdrawal of the governor and his staff placed great strain, so that the then secretary, T. Statilius Timocrates (I), had his work cut out in “establishing firmly the still unsettled conditions of our freedom.”⁵³ At any rate, following Vespasian’s recreation of the province of Achaia by, at the latest, 74, no more is heard of the Panachaeian union. If it did not survive this change, this may have been because Rome now placed more reliance for the regional administration of Greece on the assize system, which in Achaia’s case has

⁴⁸ “General”: *IG VII* 2711 = Oliver 1989, no. 18, lines 1–2. “Secretary”: *IG IV*² 80–81 = Peek 1969, no. 34, pp. 28–29.

⁴⁹ Oliver 1989, no. 18, lines 5–7: ὄρ|[κον ᾧμοσε]ν ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν, παρόντος καὶ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, [[ἐναντίον] τοῦ συνεδρίου. Holleaux 1938, pp. 161–163 (*consilium*).

⁵⁰ Larsen 1955, p. 122. Herrmann 1968, pp. 96–98, 106 with note 53 (where συνέδριον in *IG VII* 2711, line 7 is misunderstood: for the correct interpretation, see Holleaux 1938, pp. 161–163). For the debris of an Argive inscription for a local imperial high priest ([ἀρχιερεὺς τοῦ] οἴκου τῶν Σε[βαστῶν]), see Piérart 1974, no. 3, pp. 776–777.

⁵¹ Oliver 1978, p. 188.

⁵² Groag 1939, cols. 25–30.

⁵³ Peek 1969, pp. 28–29, no. 34, lines 9–13. Date of this text: Spawforth 1988, pp. 253–254.

yet to be reconstructed, although Nero's tour of Greece's "assizes and markets" (*conventus mercatusque*), along with anecdotes attached to traveling governors and other evidence, points firmly enough to its existence.⁵⁴ Imposed (as I believe) from above, the Panachaeian union had always been fissiparous, as the near secession of Boiotia in 37 underlines;⁵⁵ with a decline in Roman interest, member leagues which were the products of a long tradition of regional particularism in Greece may not have had the will to stay together. The disappearance of this larger entity may well have paved the way for the emergence of other regional cults of the emperors as well as the Achaean cult, to judge from the appearance of a "high priest of Boiotia" under the Antonines (M. Ulpius Damasippus of Amphiklia) and of a "high priestess for life" (early 3rd century?) of both a federal Boeotian cult of Athena Itonia and, so it seems, an unspecified federal cult of the Phocians (Flavia Lanice of Chaironeia, ἀρχιέρειαν διὰ βίου τοῦ τε κοινοῦ Βοιωτῶν τῆς Ἰτωνίας Ἀθῆνας καὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ Φωκέων ἔθνους). Neither Damasippus nor Lanice is said specifically to have celebrated the imperial cult, and Lanice's Boeotian priesthood is a reminder that the high-priestly title in this period was associated with other cults too; on the other hand, the possibility can hardly be ruled out that these Boeotian and Phocian federal cults included at least an element of emperor worship (for what it is worth, Lanice's son *was* an imperial high priest, of the local, Chaironeian, cult).⁵⁶ In sum, it is hard to discern the institutional basis for a *sacerdos provinciae* in the period after Nero, once we question Puech's strong interpretation of the Messenian text discussed earlier.

PROVINCIAL LISTS OF CITIES FROM CORINTH AND ARGOS

As will be seen below, Letter 198 is best dated to the period between 80 and 120. In this post-Neronian period, when the Achaean League no longer collaborated with its central Greek counterparts, is there any reason for thinking that the "many cities" of the text could refer to provincial communities other than Achaean member cities? In this section I consider two neglected inscriptions, one Corinthian, the other Argive, which conceivably relate to the Achaean cult, although if they do, they pose two problems to which I do not see a clear solution (p. 226 below).

While the Corinthian text is preserved, the Argive inscription was copied by Ludwig Ross from a stone which, to my knowledge, is now lost.⁵⁷ The two clearly duplicate the same list of cities, which in the Corinthian version are followed by rubrics:

Argive version:

[-----]

Λα[χ]εδ[αίμων

Μοθώνη

Corinthian version:

[-----]

Λεῦκτρον [--]

Κορώνη [--]

⁵⁴ Suetonius, *Ner.* 28.2; Burton 1975, pp. 97 and 99 ("at least from the Flavian period onward a similar system of annual assizes across a fixed circuit operated in all the proconsular provinces"). I attempt to reconstruct Achaia's assize circuit in my book on Roman Greece (in preparation).

⁵⁵ Deininger 1965, pp. 88–89. Note the near secession of Boiotia in 37: *IG VII* 2711 = Oliver 1989, no. 18, lines 7–13, 61–64.

⁵⁶ Damasippus: Oliver 1970, no. 32, p. 117. Lanice and her son: *IG VII* 3426, commented on, *RE II*, i, 1895, col. 477, *s.v.* Ἀρχιερεύς (Brandis); Fossey 1986, no. 9, pp. 258–259 (with photograph and a suggested date in the middle or second half of the 3rd century); Schachter 1981, pp. 117–127 (Athena Itonia).

⁵⁷ Corinthian: *IG IV*¹ 1605; *Corinth VIII*, i, no. 13. Argive: *IG IV*¹ 619.

	Ἐπίδαυρα ΠΕΝ [---]		Κεφαλληνία [---]
	Τρυζήν		Βοιαί ET [---]
5	Ἑρμιόνη	5	Κλίτωρ ET Σ'
	Ἥλις		Μεσσήνη ET Ϛ'
	Πάτραι		<i>vacat</i>
	Μαντίνια		
	[Λ]εὔκτρ[ρ]ον		
10	Κορώνη ΑΡΚ[---]		
	[Κεφά]λλην[ια]		

Combining these two we arrive at the following:

	[-----]		[-----]
	Λα[χ]εδ[αίμων--]		La[c]ed[aimon--]
	Μοθώνη [---]		Mothone [---]
	Ἐπίδαυρα πεν(ταπόλεως) [---]		Epidaurus (?) of the Pen(tapolis) [-]
	Τρυζήν [---]		Troizen [---]
5	Ἑρμιόνη [---]		Hermione [---]
	Ἥλις [---]		Elis [---]
	Πάτραι [---]		Patrai [---]
	Μαντίνια [---]		Mantineia [---]
	Λεὔκτρον [---]		Leuktron [---]
10	Κορώνη ΑΡΚ[---]		Korone ARC[---]
	Κεφάλλην[ια] [---]		Kephalenia [---]
	Βοιαί ET [---]		Boiai (?) paid [---]
	Κλίτωρ ET Σ'		Kleitōr (?) paid 6
	Μεσσήνη ET Ϛ'		Messene (?) paid 90
	<i>vacat</i>		

The letters ΑΡΚ in the Argive fragment are problematic. Fraenkel (to *IG IV*¹ 619) suggested their restoration as Ἄρκ[αδικόν], supposing, since we know of no Arcadian Korone, that they had been mistakenly transposed, either by the original letter cutter or by Ross, from the line above, where they would have served to distinguish Arcadian from Eleutherolaconian Leuktron or Leuktra, as it was known to Pausanias (3.26.4). The difficulty with this view, however, is that Arcadian Leuktron, one of the communities which contributed to the synoecism of Megalopolis, is not known to have possessed city status in the imperial age, or even to have still existed then as a settlement. Without these letters, the natural interpretation in the context of Roman Greece would be that we have here Messenian Korone and Eleutherolaconian Leuktron (or Leuktra). As for the letters ΠΕΝ in line 3, I have tentatively restored πεν(ταπόλεως) on the basis of 3rd-century inscriptions from Aigina alluding to a “sacred pentapolis” (ἱερὰ πεντάπολις) which celebrated its joint festival on that island; nearby Epidaurus, on the east coast of the Saronic gulf, is a likely candidate for membership.⁵⁸

As indicated already, this list belongs to the imperial age, to judge from the lunate letter forms of the Corinthian text. A more precise dating is provided by the fact that Mantinea only

⁵⁸ *SEG XXX* 340. Leuktron: *RE XII*, ii, 1925, cols. 2307–2308, s.v. Leuktron (Wrede).

recovered its old name (dropping that of Antigonea) under Hadrian (Pausanias 8.8.12). On the assumption that the list has an administrative significance, the inclusion of Kephallenia seems to narrow down the possible date to the second quarter of the 2nd century, since by the mid-century at the latest the island had been transferred from the province of Achaia to that of Epeiros.⁵⁹ All the other communities listed were Peloponnesian, although the geographical ordering looks random.

The rubrics provide a clue to the significance of this list, if Fraenkel was right to interpret them as records of payments, suggesting the expansion of ET to ἐτ(έλεσε) (“paid”): the two recorded amounts would then resolve themselves as 6 (Kleitor) and 90 (Messene). One problem with this (otherwise attractive) view is that, if the computation was in any denomination of Roman coinage, the two preserved amounts look impossibly small, unless they were multiples of some pre-agreed financial unit. I have no better solution to offer, however, and merely add the observation that, if payments *are* in question, the striking gap between these two amounts (roughly 1:15) may not be an unrealistic reflection of the difference in resources between a small Arcadian city (Kleitor) and one of provincial Greece’s regional centers (Messene).⁶⁰

Given the overwhelming preponderance of Peloponnesian cities among the preserved names, could we have here a list of payments by cities celebrating the joint cult of the emperors at Corinth? In support of this view, apart from the findspots of the two stones, is the fact that the “younger” Achaean League at its greatest extent, before the creation of the Arcadian and Argive leagues known to Pausanias (8.22.1; 23.1), embraced the entire Peloponnese (Sparta included, it now seems), with the possible exception only of the Eleutherolaconian League.⁶¹ If Elis, in spite of its exemption (above), appears here as a contributor, the explanation may be that we are dealing with an honorific record of voluntary payments by member cities for a particular purpose (building works, for instance, in the sanctuary of the cult).

Against this view is the inclusion of Kephallenia, the three cities of which are not known to have had any connection with the “younger” league, and one (or probably two) Eleutherolaconian cities, Boiai and (?) Leuktra. One possibility raised by the inclusion of these cities is that provincial communities which were not members of the Achaean League may from time to time have wanted, and been allowed, to associate themselves with the federal cult at Corinth; in that case, the “many cities” of our text may not have denoted Achaean member cities exclusively. But on this point we are moving on to extremely speculative ground, and the fact is that these inscribed lists in the present state of knowledge raise more questions than they answer.

A HISTORICAL RECONSTRUCTION

I end by offering a reconstruction of the possible background to Letter 198. In 54, to mark the accession of the emperor Nero, a cult of the emperors was instituted at Corinth by the member cities of the Achaean League, its focus an annual imperial festival which included *venationes* (and, no doubt, gladiatorial shows); the first high priest for life was C. Iulius Spartiacus, whose native Taygetos was well stocked at this date with wild animals, bears

⁵⁹ Ptolemy, *Geog.* 3.18.9 (Müller). Epeiros: Thomasson 1984, p. 204.

⁶⁰ Fraenkel to *IG IV*¹ 619. For a corrective view of Roman Messene, see now Habicht 1985, pp. 36–63.

⁶¹ Kahrstedt 1950, p. 73. Sparta: Boehringer 1991, p. 166; Souris and Spyropoulos 1991, pp. 127–132.

included, and may well have provided the less exotic fauna for his shows (Pausanias 4.20.4). A forerunner, perhaps the chief one, to this cult was the celebration of imperial festivals by the Panachaean assembly on the accessions of Gaius and Claudius; and so the central Greek leagues which took part in these assemblies may also have been involved in the financing of the Achaean cult. The involvement of the governor in 37 raises the question of how far this Achaean initiative came from below, how far from above; in fact, the larger background warns us against making too much of the degree of provincial spontaneity. Whereas the provincial league of Asia was paying homage to Augustus as a god as early as 29 B.C.,⁶² the absence in Greece before the mid-1st century after Christ of any collective imperial cult is striking.⁶³ A well-known inscription from Messene, dating from A.D. 2, portrays a Roman official, the quaestor P. Cornelius Scipio, engaged in the energetic promotion of the imperial cult at Messene and in “most of the cities of the province”; such official zeal, in part, maybe, a labor of self-promotion, could have been encouraged by provincial sluggishness over cultic honors for Augustus and his house.⁶⁴ This view of the Messenian inscription is encouraged by other evidence that Greece was something of a reluctant province under Augustus and his dynasty. As well as disturbances in the free city of Athens, culminating in outright rebellion in 13 B.C.,⁶⁵ Greece’s subject cities did not take kindly to the senatorial regime imposed by Augustus in 27 B.C. To judge from a Mantineian decree describing, with heavy irony, a local notable’s embassy to Rome, where he was “pleasant to the divine Senate, since he brought praise of the proconsuls, not an accusation,” it was fairly common for the Augustan province’s notables to complain about the proconsular government,⁶⁶ and in A.D. 15 these complaints made Tiberius transfer Achaia from senatorial to his own direct control.⁶⁷ In 37, political indifference, not financial embarrassment, seems the best explanation for the reluctance of Boiotia’s notables to undertake to represent the Boeotian League on a congratulatory embassy to the new emperor Gaius.⁶⁸ That the new Achaean cult of 54 was encouraged by the Roman authorities is suggested by the choice of Corinth as its venue. At first the Greeks had little love for Julius Caesar’s colony, as we see from a well-known epigram by the Augustan poet Krinagoras of Mytilene, whose description of the colonists as “shop-soiled slaves” (παλιμπρήτοισι) expressed a sense of Greek outrage at the servile origins of

⁶² Price 1984, p. 54.

⁶³ On the imperial cult at Plataia organized by the “common council of the Hellenes”, which first appears in 61/2, see Spawforth forthcoming 1994.

⁶⁴ *SEG* XXIII 206.

⁶⁵ See now Hoff 1989, pp. 267–276.

⁶⁶ *SIG*³ 783, lines 29–30. See Ehrenberg 1953, p. 943.

⁶⁷ Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.76.

⁶⁸ See note 55 above. The implication of the remarks of Oliver (1971, p. 224), that Boiotia’s notables were too poor in 37 to undertake the embassy, is not borne out by the Epaminondas “dossier”, which states that it was the “respectable and the first men from the (Boeotian) cities” who declined it (*JG* VII 2712 = Oliver 1971, p. 227, lines 40–41: πο[λλ]ῶν τε συνεληλυθότων εὐσχημόνων καὶ πρώτων ἐκ τῶν πόλεων καὶ πάντων ἀρνούμενων καὶ ἐπι[κα]λουμένων). Such men will have included earlier generations of the wealthy Boeotian families (e.g., the Flavii of Thebes and the Flavii of Thespiāi) found in the circle of Plutarch of Chaironeia, himself a man of means; and it is hard to believe that in 37 the fortune of Epaminondas, the Acraephian magnate whose benefactions form the subject of *JG* VII 2711–2712, was not matched or exceeded by those of his peers in the larger Boeotian cities.

Corinth's new population, which is likely to have been most keenly felt among the colony's immediate neighbors;⁶⁹ the disdainful attitude of Letter 198 to Corinthian *Romanitas* reveals the persistence of such hostility at Argos into the later 1st century. In this context, Corinth may well have owed its choice as a venue for the new cult more to the Roman authorities than to the wishes of the League's membership, which no doubt included rival "Greek" candidates for the prestigious and economically beneficial job of host, not least Argos itself, scene of the Panachaeon celebration in 37. Effective lobbying by colonial notables could have played its part here: Corinthian inscriptions show that the colonial elite took full advantage of the fact that Corinth was the seat of the provincial procurator and closely associated with the proconsuls to cultivate personal ties with Roman officialdom.⁷⁰ Finally, the first high priest, a man of great standing in the province with a distinguished colonial career behind him, was surely a Corinthian partisan; given the whiff of Spartan irredentism exuded by "Argolicus", the name of one of his brothers, it may not be farfetched to suggest that this member of Sparta's client dynasty would have relished supporting Corinthian interests at the expense of Argive ones.⁷¹

The new cult required financing. As the case of Spartiacus confirms, the "euergetism" of the high priests played its part here, although we should not exaggerate its importance: our text shows that the cities involved were obliged to pay annually towards the cost of the yearly festival at Corinth. This cost is likely to have been considerable, since exotic beasts such as the leopards or cheetahs (παρδάλεις) and lions known to have been used in Corinthian *venationes* did not come cheaply: Diocletian's edict gives prices of between 75,000 and 150,000 denarii for Libyan lions and leopards.⁷² At first the Argives successfully claimed exemption from these contributions on the grounds that they were already burdened with the cost of panhellenic games; this Argive claim (and there could have been others) hints at the unenthusiastic reception which some quarters of the province gave to the prospect of financing the new cult, if not to the cult as such. Ultimately they may have owed this concession to their standing in League affairs at the time: in 37 the "general" presiding over the Panachaeon union was an (otherwise unknown) Argive,⁷³ and it is hard not to see his influence at work in the choice of his own city as a venue for the Panachaeon meeting of the same year. In this period the Statilii of Epidauros and Argos were also prominent in League politics: between 35 and 44 T. Statilius Lamprias (II) and his son Timocrates arranged for the erection of statues of the Roman governor and his son at the Asklepieion "on behalf of the Achaeans",⁷⁴ and it was this same Timocrates who, in his mature years, went on to serve the Panachaeon union with such distinction as secretary after Nero's liberation of Greece (p. 223 above).

⁶⁹ Gow and Page 1968, no. 37, pp. 220–221.

⁷⁰ See *Corinth* VIII, iii, p. 58 on the Gellii of Corinth, who "seem to have made a hobby of setting up monuments to their friends of high rank."

⁷¹ Argolicus: *PIR*² I 174.

⁷² Giaccherio 1974, pp. 210–211, no. 32, lines 1–6.

⁷³ *IG* VII 2711 = Oliver 1989, no. 18, line 2: [. . . .] εὐς Διοδότου Ἄ[ρ]γεῖος, perhaps a kinsman of Tib. Claudius Diodotus (*IG* IV¹ 606) or Diodotus, son of Onesiphorus (*IG* IV¹ 597).

⁷⁴ Spawforth 1985, pp. 250–251, citing *IG* IV² 665 = Peek 1969, no. 289, pp. 125–126.

As Keil saw,⁷⁵ this exemption was not a recent event at the time of the composition of Letter 198: it had been conferred “formerly”, a formulation sufficiently vague to permit the author disingenuously to float the possibility that “in the beginning” (τὴν ἀρχήν, 408c) Argos had never even been asked to pay. Quite what “beginning” the author had in mind is unclear. The reference could be to 54, when (I suggest) the new cult was founded and its finances first set up; but the author might have been thinking of some earlier date, if we assume that member cities of the Panachaeian union were obliged to contribute towards the cost of federal celebrations of imperial accessions in the pre-Neronian period. Quite when the foundation of the cult might have come to seem an event of the past is also unclear; but a generation later is perhaps not too soon. Other considerations come into play. The text gives us no idea why, seven years previously, Argos had lost her exemption, beyond the ambiguous statement that it resulted from her “attachment” to Corinth “by the sovereign city” (ὕπὸ τῆς βασιλευούσης πόλεως, 408a); whether the reference is to a Roman administrative decision of recent date or to the one behind the city’s initial liability to the payments, back in (as I believe) 54, is unclear. If the latter, then there appears to be proof that the Roman authorities were closely involved in the original arrangements for financing the Achaean cult and that (as would be expected) they sanctioned the system of annual contributions by member cities. If the former, we should perhaps imagine the governor getting drawn into a local attempt (successful as it turned out) to challenge Argive exemption. To hypothesize further is probably unwise; but it may be worth suggesting that the reimposition of Argive liability coincided with a waning (if only temporary) in the city’s prominence in League affairs, such as might have followed the retirement or death of T. Statilius Timocrates (I), the secretary of the Panachaeian union in the late 60’s. A further chronological indicator is the strong possibility, as was seen earlier (p. 214 above), that the second Argive ambassador, Lamprias, belonged to this same family of Statilii. The text presents him and his colleague as men of considerable experience in public affairs; if we are to identify him with T. Statilius Lamprias (IV) Memmianus, who was probably the grandson of Timocrates and born between 40 and 60,⁷⁶ his mature years, and the date of this text, would fall roughly in the period from 80 to 120.

A few observations are now offered about the relations between Argos and Corinth in the early empire in the light of this text. Above all, the Argive “quarrel” (φιλονεικίας, 411b) with Corinth was about money: on this point the text leaves us in no doubt. This quarrel can now be seen as an unusually well documented example from provincial Achaia of the petty struggles which characterized Greek inter-city relations under Roman rule.⁷⁷ As such, however, it may have sprung from more than financial causes: that the Argives were “forced to slave for a foreign spectacle celebrated by others” (ξενικῇ θεᾷ καὶ παρ’ ἄλλοις ἐπιδουλεύειν ἀναγκαζόμενοι, 409a) constituted a loss of civic face, one made all the more bitter by the fact that these “others” were the jumped-up Roman colonists at Corinth. Asia Minor provides other examples of the way in which the organization of provincial sacrifices could wound civic pride by “the subordination implied by taking part in the sacrifices of a superior city.”⁷⁸ In this case, moreover, Argos was probably smarting already from a loss of regional standing as

⁷⁵ Keil 1913, p. 9.

⁷⁶ Spawforth 1985, p. 255.

⁷⁷ Jones 1978, chap. 10, with references.

⁷⁸ Price 1984, p. 130.

Caesar's colony went from strength to strength: on their own admission the Argives were now less prosperous than the Corinthians (χρημάτων τε ἔχοντες ἐνδεέστερον, 409a); and the choice of Corinth in 54 as home to the Achaean imperial cult put paid to any Argive aspirations to play host once again to Panachaean celebrations, as the city had done in 37 (and 41?).

The author ends his letter by making dire predictions of “eternal discord” (ἄθάνατον . . . τὴν δύσνοιαν) and “hatred strengthening with time” (τὸ μῖσος ἰσχυρὸν τῷ χρόνῳ κρατυνόμενον, 411b) between the two cities if the Argives fail to get their way. Unfortunately, the outcome of the dispute is not known. One possible pointer is the evidence for close ties with Corinth among the Argive elite in the 2nd century. Thus there are, in a list of Isthmian victors from the Antonine age, the names of two Argive notables, Pompeius Cleosthenes and Cn. Cornelius Pulcher, among the winners of the equestrian events.⁷⁹ Late in the same period, or perhaps under Septimius Severus, the Argive T. Statilius Timocrates (II) Memmianus held office in the colony as Achaean high priest.⁸⁰ But these persons, it may be objected, are increasingly remote in date from the dispute in question here. More germane is the combined Argive and Corinthian career under Trajan of M. Antonius Achaicus, who held office as agonothete in his native city but also served as agonothete of the Isthmian games at Corinth, where he was honored posthumously with the colony's curial insignia.⁸¹ How likely is it that an Argive would have pursued such a career if Argos and Corinth at the time were at loggerheads? This is not an easy question to answer, since loyalties to more than one city were not unusual at this level of provincial Greek society. But the career of Achaicus would certainly fit well with a period of reconciliation between Argos and Corinth following a satisfactory resolution of the quarrel over payments.

It remains to draw attention to a surprising feature of this text: its outspokenness. Although, understandably, the author stops short of referring explicitly to the imperial cult, he makes no bones about Argive disdain for the purpose to which the disputed payments were put. On this point, of course, the text finds its place in a contemporary Greek polemic against violent Roman-style shows;⁸² nevertheless, given that this disdain could have run the risk of being mistaken for criticism of emperor worship itself, it seems surprising to find it in a letter addressed to, and seeking a favor from, a Roman governor (even one who was thought to be well disposed towards the Argives). This text may tell us something more generally about Achaian perceptions of how far a senatorial official could be pushed without offence being given, as of the benevolent senatorial attitudes to old Greece which Pliny (a contemporary of the author) articulates in his famous letter to Maximus (*Ep.* 8.24). When dealing with the prestigious cities of what Pliny called “the true and genuine Greece” (*veram et meram Graeciam*), were senatorial administrators more resigned than usual to tolerating Greek “impudence”?⁸³

⁷⁹ *Corinth* VIII, i, no. 15, lines 44–48. For the family of Cleosthenes, see now *SEG* XVI 258–259.

⁸⁰ *IG* IV¹ 590. Date: Spawforth 1985, pp. 256–258.

⁸¹ Achaicus: *ILS* 8863; *Corinth* VIII, iii, nos. 124 (name restored) and 224 (text improved by Geagan 1968, pp. 79–80); Kent (*Corinth* VIII, iii, p. 31) tentatively assigned his Corinthian *agonothesia* to Domitian, which strikes me as a little early; *SEG* XVI 258. An Antonius Achaicus, presumably the same man or a kinsman, turns up at Messenian Asine (*IG* V i 1408).

⁸² Robert 1940, pp. 248–253.

⁸³ For *impudentia* as a Greek failing in Roman eyes, see Petrochilos 1974, pp. 39–40.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Accame, S. 1946. *Il Dominio Romano in Grecia dalla Guerra Acaica ad Augusto*, Rome
- Amandry, M. 1988. *Le monnayage des duovirs corinthiens* (BCH Supplement 15), Paris
- Bagdikian, A. 1953. "The Civic Officials of Roman Corinth" (diss. University of Vermont 1953)
- Balty, J. C. 1981. *Guide d'Apamée*, Brussels
- Bertrand, J.-M. 1985. "Le statut du territoire attribué dans le monde grec des Romains," in *Sociétés rurales dans l'Asie Mineure et la Syrie hellénistiques et romaines: actes du colloque organisé à Strasbourg* (Contributions et travaux de l'Institut d'Histoire Romaine, Strasbourg 4), E. Frézouls, ed., Strasbourg, pp. 95–106
- Bidez, J. 1924. *L'empereur Julien. Oeuvres complètes*, I, ii, *Lettres et fragments* (Collections des Universités de France), Paris
- Boëthius, A. 1922. *Der argivische Kalender*, Uppsala
- Boehringer, C. 1991, "Zur Geschichte der Achaïschen Liga im 2. und 1. Jh. v. Chr.," in *Achaia und Elis in der Antike* (Meletemata 13), A. D. Rizakis, ed., Athens, pp. 163–170
- Brandis, C. G. *RE* II, i, 1895, cols. 471–483 (Ἀρχιερεὺς)
- Burton, G. 1975. "Proconsuls, Assizes and the Administration of Justice," *JRS* 65, pp. 92–106
- Cartledge, P. A., and A. J. S. Spawforth. 1989. *Hellenistic and Roman Sparta. A Tale of Two Cities*, London/New York
- Corinth I = H. N. Fowler and R. Stillwell, *Introduction: Topography, Architecture* (Corinth I), Cambridge, Mass. 1932
- Corinth II = R. Stillwell, *The Theatre* (Corinth II), Princeton 1952
- Corinth VIII, i = B. D. Meritt, *Greek Inscriptions 1896–1927* (Corinth VIII, i), Cambridge, Mass. 1931
- Corinth VIII, ii = A. B. West, *Latin Inscriptions 1896–1926* (Corinth VIII, ii), Cambridge, Mass. 1931
- Corinth VIII, iii = J. H. Kent, *The Inscriptions 1926–1950* (Corinth VIII, iii), Princeton 1966
- Corinth X = O. Broneer, *The Odeum* (Corinth X), Cambridge, Mass. 1932
- Day, J. 1942. *An Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination*, repr. New York 1973
- Deininger, J. 1965. *Das Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Munich
- Ehrenberg, V. 1953. "Legatus Augusti et Tiberii?" in *Studies Presented to D. M. Robinson* II, G. E. Mylonas and D. Raymond, eds., Saint Louis, pp. 938–944
- FdD III, iv = A. Plassart, *Épigraphie*, iv, *Inscriptions de la terrasse du temple et de la région nord du sanctuaire* (FdD III, iv), Paris 1970
- Fossey, J. M. 1986. "Some Imperial Statue Bases from the South West Kopais," in *Studien zur alten Geschichte* I, H. Kalcyk, B. Gullath, and A. Graeber, eds., Rome, pp. 247–259
- Geagan, D. J. 1968. "Notes on the Agonistic Institutions of Roman Corinth," *GRBS* 9, pp. 70–80
- . 1989. "The Isthmian Dossier of P. Licinius Priscus Iuventianus," *Hesperia* 58, pp. 349–360
- Giacchero, M. 1974. *Edictum Diocletiani et collegarum de pretiis rerum venalium*, Genoa
- Gow, A. S. F., and D. L. Page. 1968. *The Greek Anthology* I, Cambridge
- Groag, E. 1939. *Die römischen Reichsbeamten von Achaia bis auf Diokletian* (Schriften der Balkankommission. Antiquarische Abteilung 9), Vienna
- Habicht, C. 1985. *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece*, Berkeley
- Halfmann, H. 1979. *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jh. n. Chr.* (Hypomnemata 58), Göttingen
- Herrmann, P. 1968. *Der römische Kaisereid* (Hypomnemata 29), Göttingen
- Hoff, M. C. 1989. "Civil Disobedience and Unrest in Augustan Athens," *Hesperia* 58, pp. 267–276
- Holleaux, M. 1938. *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques* I, Paris
- Jones, C. P. 1978. *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kahrstedt, U. 1950. "Zwei Probleme im kaiserzeitlichen Griechenland," *SymbOslo* 28, pp. 66–75
- Keil, B. 1913. "Ein Λόγος συστατικός," *NAkG* (Philologisch-historische Klasse), pp. 1–41
- Larsen, J. A. O. 1955. *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History*, Berkeley
- Maas, P. 1913. Review of B. Keil, "Ein Λόγος συστατικός," in *BZ* 22, pp. 534–535
- Millar, F. 1981. "The World of the Golden Ass," *JRS* 71, pp. 63–75
- Moretti, L. 1953. *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche*, Rome

- Oliver, J. H. 1970. *Marcus Aurelius. Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East* (*Hesperia* Supplement 13), Princeton
- . 1971. "Epaminondas of Acraephia." *GRBS* 19, pp. 221–237
- . 1978. "Panachaeans and Panhellenes," *Hesperia* 47, pp. 185–191
- . 1989. *Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors from Inscriptions and Papyri* (*Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society* 178), Philadelphia
- Peek, W. 1969. *Inschriften aus dem Asklepieion von Epidauros*, Berlin
- Petrochilos, N. K. 1974. *Roman Attitudes to the Greeks*, Athens
- Pflaum, H.-G. 1960. *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire Romain* I, Paris
- Piérart, M. 1974. "Rapports sur les travaux de l'École Française en 1973. Argos II, B. Les inscriptions," *BCH* 98, pp. 774–782
- Price, S. R. F. 1984. *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge
- Puech, B. 1983. "Grands-prêtres et helladarques d'Achaïe," *REA* 85, pp. 15–31
- Rizakis, A. D. 1989. "La colonie romaine de Patras en Achaïe: le témoignage épigraphique," in *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire* (*BICS* Supplement 55), S. Walker and A. Cameron, eds., London, pp. 180–186
- Robert, L. 1940. *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec*, Paris
- . 1946. *Hellenica* III, Paris
- . 1948. *Hellenica* IV, Paris
- Schachter, A. 1981. *Cults of Boeotia, I, Acheloos to Hera* (*BICS* Supplement 38.1), London
- Schulze, W. 1904. *Zur Geschichte lateinische Eigennamen*, Berlin
- Schwertfeger, T. 1974. *Der Achaïische Bund von 146 bis 27 v. Chr.* (*Vestigia* 19), Munich
- Smallwood, E. M. 1967. *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Gaius, Claudius and Nero*, Cambridge
- Souris, G., and T. Spyropoulos. 1991. «'Ενας στρατηγός και αρχιερέυς του Κοινού των Αχαιών σε μία νέα επιγραφή από την Τεγέα», in *Achaia und Elis in der Antike* (*Meletemata* 13), A. D. Rizakis, ed., Athens, pp. 127–132
- Spawforth, A. J. S. 1985. "Families at Roman Sparta and Epidauros: Some Prosopographical Notes," *BSA* 80, pp. 191–258
- . Forthcoming 1994. "Symbol of Unity? The Persian Wars Tradition in the Roman Empire," in *Greek Historiography*, S. Hornblower, ed., Oxford
- Taylor, L. R., and A. B. West. 1926. "The Euryclids in Latin Inscriptions from Corinth," *AJA* 30, pp. 389–400
- Thomasson, B. E. 1984. *Laterculi Praesidum* I, Göteborg
- Vollgraff, W. 1945. "Argos dans la dépendance de Corinthe au IV^e siècle," *AntCl* 14, pp. 5–28
- Weis, B. K. 1973. *Julian. Briefe*, Munich
- Wiseman, J. 1979. "Corinth and Rome I," *ANRW* II, vii, 1, pp. 438–548
- Wörle, M. 1971. "Ägyptisches Getreide für Ephesos," *Chiron* 1, pp. 325–340
- Wrede, W. *RE* XII, ii, 1925, cols. 2307–2308 (Leuktron)
- Wright, W. C. 1923. *The Works of the Emperor Julian* III (Loeb Classical Library), London/New York

ANTONY J. S. SPAWFORTH

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE UNIVERSITY
 Department of Classics
 Newcastle-upon-Tyne NE1 7RU
 United Kingdom