HADRIAN AND THE GREEK EAST:

IMPERIAL POLICY AND COMMUNICATION

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate

School of the Ohio State University

By

Demetrios Kritsotakis, B.A, M.A.

* * * * *

The Ohio State University

2008

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Fritz Graf, Adviser

Professor Tom Hawkins

Professor Anthony Kaldellis

Approved by

_____

Adviser

Greek and Latin Graduate Program

ABSTRACT

The Roman Emperor Hadrian pursued a policy of unification of the vast Empire. After his accession, he abandoned the expansionist policy of his predecessor Trajan and focused on securing the frontiers of the empire and on maintaining its stability. Of the utmost importance was the further integration and participation in his program of the peoples of the Greek East, especially of the Greek mainland and Asia Minor. Hadrian now invited them to become active members of the empire. By his lengthy travels and benefactions to the people of the region and by the creation of the Panhellenion, Hadrian attempted to create a second center of the Empire. Rome, in the West, was the first center; now a second one, in the East, would draw together the Greek people on both sides of the Aegean Sea. Thus he could accelerate the unification of the empire by focusing on its two most important elements, Romans and Greeks.

Hadrian channeled his intentions in a number of ways, including the use of specific iconographical types on the coinage of his reign and religious language and themes in his interactions with the Greeks. In both cases it becomes evident that the Greeks not only understood his messages, but they also reacted in a positive way. Thus an exchange of ideas began between emperor and the Greeks and helped him advance his program. By the medium of coinage and religion, Hadrian placed himself in the heart of the Greek world, its history and culture. At the same time, he remained loyal to Roman traditions and imperial ideology. As a result, the emperor succeeded

in his plans: the participation of the Greek people in his imperial program, the creation of two imperial centers, and, finally, the unification of the Empire.

Όσο μπορείς

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank my advisor, Fritz Graf, for his intellectual guidance and his support in all areas of this project, for his tireless efforts to improve my style and his openness in discussions. He is a treasure of knowledge to me.

I would like to thank Anthony Kaldellis for his invaluable comments, which are always sharp and insightful, on the various drafts of my dissertation.

I also thank Tom Hawkins for his comments and encouragement. Through our many conversations he helped me improve my text and taught me how to write at this level.

I also wish to thank Mrs Sophia Kremmyde of the National Hellenic Research Foundation and Mr Volker Heuchert of the Ashmolean Museum for their unconditional assistance in gathering my numismatic evidence.

My sincere thanks go to Mrs Wendy Watkins and Mr Phil Forsythe of the Center for Epigraphical and Palaeographical Studies, as well as Mrs Mary Cole, former administrative associate at the Department of Greek and Latin, for their support and willingness to listen and advise.

I would like also to thank my family in Greece, whose love, support, and understanding have made it possible for me to pursue my studies.

To my Stavroula I owe a lot. Her cheerfulness, patience, and intellectual conversation helped me succeed. Her love has made me a better person. Thank you more than I can say.

Finally, I wish to thank my father, Nikos, for giving me the strength and decisiveness I needed to write this dissertation. He lived with dignity and by his example I live.

VITA

August 25, 1971 ……. Born – Athens, Greece

1996 …… B.A Archaeology, University of Crete

2002 …… M.A Classics, The Ohio State University

2000 – present …… Graduate Teaching and Research Associate, The Ohio State University

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Greek and Latin

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AJA	American Journal of Archaeology, New York 1897-
AJP	American Journal of Philology, Baltimore 1880-
AnnEph	L'Année épigraphique; revue des publications épigraphiques relatives a l'antiquité romaine, Paris 1888-
ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, Berlin 1972-
ANSMN	Museum Notes, American Numismatic Society, New York 1945-
AnsSoc	Ancient Society, Louvain 1970-
BCH	Bulletin de correspondance hellénique, Athens, Paris 1877-
BMC	Poole R.S. et alii, Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum, volumes 1-29, London 1873-1927.
BMCRE	Mattingly H. Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, London 1923-
EA	Epigraphica Anatolica, Bonn 1983-
CID	Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes. 4 vols, Paris 1977-
CIG	Corpus inscriptionum graecarum, 4 vols, Berlin 1828-1877
CIL	Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum, Berlin 1862-
CIRB	Struve I., Corpus inscriptionum regni Bosporani, Moscow 1965
CJ	The Classical Journal, Gainesville 1905-
CP	Classical Philology, Chicago 1906-

CR	The Classical Review, London 1887-
EA	Epigraphica Anatolica, Bonn 1983-
FD III	Fouilles de Delphes. Tome III, Epigraphie, Paris 1909-
GRBS	Greek Roman and Byzantine studies, Cambridge, Mass. 1959-
HSCPh	Harvard studies of classical philology, Cambridge, Mass. 1890-
IDidyma	Wiegand T., Didyma 2: Die Inschriften, Berlin 1958
IEphesos	Wankel H., Die Inschriften von Ephesos, Bonn 1979-
IErythrai	Engelmann H. and Merkelbach R., Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai**,** Bonn 1972
IG	Inscriptiones Graecae, Berlin 1873-
IGR	Cagnat R. et alii (edd.) Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes, Paris 1901-1927
IKourion	Mitford T.B.. The Inscriptions of Kourion. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 83, Philadelphia 1971
IKSestos	Krauss J., Die Inschriften von Sestos und der thrakischen Chersones. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 19, Bonn 1980
IGUR	Moretti L., Inscriptiones graecae urbis Romae. 4 vols. in 5 parts. Rome 1968-1990
ILS	Dessau H., Inscriptiones latinae selectae, Berlin 1892-1916
IMagnesia	Kern O., Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander, Berlin 1900
IosPE	Latyshev V., Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini graecae et latinae, 3 vols. St. Petersburg 1885-1901. Vol. 1, 2nd edn., Inscriptiones Tyriae, Olbiae, Chersonesi Tauricae, St. Petersburg 1916

IScM II	Stoian I., Inscriptiones Daciae et Scythiae Minoris antiquae. Series altera: Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris graecae et latinae. Vol. 2. Tomis et territorium, Bucharest 1987.
ISmyrna	Petzl G., Die Inschriften von Smyrna**,** Bonn 1982-
ITralleis	Poljakov F.B., Die Inschriften von Tralleis und Nysa. Teil I: Die Inschriften von Tralleis, Bonn 1989
IvP	Fränkel M., Die Inschriften von Pergamon 2 vols, Berlin 1890-1895
IvP III	Habicht C., Die Inschriften des Asklepieions. Mit einem Beitrag von Michael Wörrle. "Altertümer von Pergamon" 8.3, Berlin 1969
JHS	The Journal of Hellenic studies, London 1880-
JNG	Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte, Munich 1949-
JRA	Journal of Roman archaeology, Ann Arbor 1988-
JRS	The Journal of Roman studies, London 1911-
MAMA 6	Buckler W. H. and Calder W.M., Monuments and Documents from Phrygia and Caria. «Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua» [MAMA] 6, Manchester 1939
MDAI(A)	Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung, Athens 1921-
MonAnt	Monumenti antichi, Milan 1889-
NumChr	The Numismatic Chronicle, 7th ser., London 1961-
PCPhS	Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, London 1882-
REG	Revue des études grecques, Paris 1888-
RPC	Burnett A.M., Amandry M., Ripollès P.P., Roman provincial coinage, London 1998-
SEG	Supplementum epigraphicum graecum, Amsterdam 1923-
SNG	Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, 1931-

TAM II	Kallinka E., Tituli Lyciae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti, Vienna 1920-1944
TAM IV,1	Dörner F.K., Tituli Asiae Minoris, IV. Tituli Bithyniae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti, 1. Paeninsula Bithynica praeter Chalcedonem. Nicomedia et ager Nicomedensis cum septentrionali meridianoque litore sinus Astaceni et cum lacu Sumonensi, Vienna 1978
TAM V	Hermann P., Tituli Asiae Minoris, V. Tituli Lydiae, linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti, 2 vols. Vienna 1981 and 1989
TAPhA	Transactions of the American Philological Association, Chico 1974-
ZPE	Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Bonn 1967-

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The subject of this dissertation is the imperial program of the Roman emperor Hadrian for the Greek East with particular focus on the regions of Asia Minor and the Greek mainland. I will discuss what the emperor's program was, to whom did he address it, and how he advertised it, by examining evidence from coinage and the sphere of religion.

Varius multiplex multiformis[1], Hadrian attracted by his actions and personality the attention of contemporary and later authors. Publius Aelius Hadrianus succeeded his adoptive father, Emperor Trajan, in A.D 117[2] and reigned until his death on 10 July 138. He was notorious for his many interests and inquisitiveness. The emperor was interested in oratory, philosophy, literature, and aspired to possess knowledge of almost every art. He showed particular interest in architecture and adorned the cities of the empire with all kinds of buildings, from harbors to aqueducts, from libraries and baths to temples and gymnasia.

In the 21 years of his reign, Hadrian tirelessly engaged in the administration of the vast empire and, in his frequent and lengthy journeys, surveyed all of its provinces. Hadrian followed a non-expansion policy and his reign was marked by a general lack of major military conflicts, apart from the Second Roman-Jewish War.

[1] *Epitome de Caesaribus* 14.6.
[2] Unless otherwise stated, all dates are A.D.

The peace policy was further strengthened by the erection of permanent fortifications along the empire's borders, such as the British Wall and the fortifications along the Rhine frontier. To maintain morale and keep the troops from getting restive, Hadrian established intensive drill routines and personally inspected the armies.

Among the most important aspects of his program was the cancellation of some 900,000,000 sesterces of debt to the public treasury which gained him public favor. He continued and expanded Trajan's practice of the *alimenta*, which supported the local economy and helped maintain orphans in Italy. He also ensured that the grain supply upon which Rome depended became more secure with his great building program in Ostia. His most significant legal achievement was the codification of the praetorian and aedilician edicts. This task was assigned to Salvius Julianus, who put together these edicts. This work has been lost, but many excerpts made by commentators upon it have survived in Justinian's *Digesta*.

Of particular significance were the relations that he established with the people of the Greek East. The *Graeculus*, as he was ironically called[3], became an ardent friend of the Greek people and displayed his interest in a number of benefactions to cities and individuals alike. Before his accession to the throne Hadrian had visited Greece and during his residence at Athens he served as the eponymous archon of the city in 112. From 123, when he first visited the Greek provinces as emperor, to 134, when he returned to Rome from his last tour, Hadrian contributed to the renaissance of mainland Greece and Asia Minor more than any of his predecessors had. His benefactions included, among others, public works for the betterment of life in the cities, such as aqueducts, roads, baths; restoration and construction of temples; monetary gifts to sanctuaries and associations; and revision of local laws. The

[3] *HA Hadrian* I.5.

inscriptions, dedications and public documents such as decrees set up in the Greek cities in unparallel number, reveal the gratitude of the people to a Roman emperor who not only respected and promoted their rich culture, but also showed by his actions that he intended for them to be active members of the empire.

A serious difficulty for the student of Hadrian is the insufficient literary evidence. Our major sources are Dio Cassius' *Roman History* and the *Historia Augusta*. Each presents its own problems.

Dio Cassius was born between ca. 155 and 163/164 at Nicaea. He was the son of Cassius Apronianus, a Roman senator. He too became senator under Commodus and governor of Smyrna after the death of Septimius Severus and afterwards suffect consul around 222. He was also proconsul in Africa and Pannonia. Alexander Severus made him his consul again in 229 as consul *ordinarius*. He died sometime after 229.

Dio composed his *History* in 80 books in Rome probably during the 210-220s to cover events from Rome's foundation to his own day. His narration of Hadrian's reign survives mainly in the discontinuous and selected epitome of Xiphilinus, a scholar at Constantinople in the eleventh century. Whether there were any formal histories of the reign or biographies which Dio consulted remains a mystery. A number of possible influences have been suggested, such as Dio's contemporary Marius Maximus or Asinius Quadratus, who wrote a Roman History, but nothing is certain[4]. Fergus Millar has also suggested that Dio compiled much of his information from stories circulating among Rome's elite, perhaps augmenting his narrative with copies of Hadrian's reports to the Senate[5]. Dio refers twice to Hadrian as a source (66.17.1, 69.11.2), once to a letter written by Hadrian (69.17.3; see also 69.2.4 and

[4] See discussion in Millar (1964) 61ff.
[5] Millar (1964) 61-72.

69.2.6), once he refers to Plotina's rather than Trajan's letter to the senate on Hadrian's adoption (69.1.4) and once to the "truthful" account of the death of Trajan, which Dio's father had heard as governor of Cilicia (69.1.3).

The text that has survived is a brief account of Hadrian's life focusing on certain events (such as Hadrian's inspection of the army, inauguration of the Olympeion, the Jewish War), his interactions with Roman aristocrats and intellectuals and his character and moral values. Dio's treatment of Hadrian is difficult to evaluate from this epitome. However, a general trait that has been observed is a general hostility to the emperor which must be attributed to the fact that Dio as a member of the Senate expresses senatorial feelings in his work. In fact, it has been noted that Dio makes the relations of the emperors with the senate a central idea in his history of the empire[6]. Regarding his account of Hadrian, we know that the Senate was alarmed by various events. Not only the killings that occurred in Hadrian's early reign, but also the idiosyncrasies of the emperor, the abandonment of provinces conquered by his predecessor, his Philhellenic stance, and the affair with Antinoos could have damaged Hadrian's image at Rome and generated hostility among the senators. Although limited in the amount of information it offers (names, numbers, and exact dates are often omitted and geographical details are scanty) and despite Dio's senatorial bias, his account of Hadrian's reign remains in general trustworthy when we check it against other sources.

The biography of the emperor in the *Historia Augusta* is more problematic. *The Historia Augusta* is the conventional title given to a number of biographies of Roman emperors, their heirs, and usurpers from Hadrian to Carinus (A.D. 283-285). The *Histori*a *Augusta* raises a number of questions: who the author(s) was, when was

[6] See E. Cary's introduction to Loeb's edition, p. XVIff.

it written, did the original text undergo later changes, what was its purpose, what its sources were and what is the veracity of the many literary references and documentary quotations in the text? These are questions that puzzle scholars and a number of possible, though not definite answers have been given[7]. In what concerns us here, the overall picture of the *Historia Augusta* created reliability problems which are seen in Hadrian's biography as well. It is unknown what the sources of Hadrian's *Vita* were. Two sources mentioned in the text are Hadrian's autobiography and Marius Maximus. We know that the emperor wrote his autobiography probably towards the end of his life[8]. Dio Cassius and the *Historia Augusta* quote from it[9]. The *Historia Augusta* claims that the autobiography was published under a freedman's name[10].

Marius Maximus has been identified with Lucius Marius Maximus Perpetuus Aurelianus, born in ca. 155. He became senator under Commodus and held a number of offices, among them governor of Gallia Belgica in 197, suffect consul probably in 199, governor of Coele-Syria in 208 and a few years later he became the first ex-consul ever to hold both the proconsulship of Asia and that of Africa in succession. He also served as City Prefect in 217 and held a second consulship in 223 as colleague of Alexander Severus. He wrote a series of biographies of twelve Roman emperors, of which none survives. He is quoted as direct authority for four statements in the Life of Hadrian (2.10;14.2;20.3;25.4) and for two in Aelius' life (3.9; 5.4-5). However, his authority is contested and scholars treat his quotations with skepticism.

[7] With regard to its authorship, it has been suggested that the biographies were written by a single person toward the end of the fourth century. The idea was first expressed by Hermann Dessau in his article "Über Zeit und Persönlichkeit der Scriptor Historiae Augustae", *Hermes* 24 (1889) 337-392. The idea has found support among scholars such as Ronald Syme in his *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford, 1968) and *Emperors and Biography* (Oxford, 1973), but the issue is not entirely resolved yet.
[8] See the interesting study on imperial autobiography by Lewis (1993).
[9] Dio Cassius: 66.17.1; 69.11.2. *HA*: I.1; III.2-3; III.5; VII.2.
[10] *HA* XVI.1

As in every person's biography in the *Historia Augusta*, Hadrian's life is presented in the following form: ancestry, life previous to his accession to the throne, policy and events of his reign, personal traits, death, personal appearance, honors after death. The author follows a chronological narration in general and pays special attention to Hadrian's personal characteristics, habits, manner of administration and program, and relations with individuals. In this respect the work is invaluable, as it provides a wealth of detailed information, which must always be compared against other sources for verification. In my opinion, this wealth of information, far larger than what Dio provides, is the merit of the work. On the other hand, although Mary Boatwright argues that Hadrian's biography is one of the most veracious in the *Historia Augusta*[11], the scholar must always be aware of important flaws in the text. Inaccuracies, contradictions and events that seem to be the author's invention or popular imagination are frequent in the text[12].

Such is the state of the two main literary sources for Hadrian's reign. I must underline here the fact that the problems in these sources will not affect my argument because this study will not rely on those aspects of these sources that are most problematic, only on their general outline of the history of the reign, which is not controversial.

Apart from these two works a little may be gleaned from the fourth-century chroniclers Aurelius Victor, Eutropius, Festus and the unknown author of the *Epitome de Caesaribus.* The work *De Physiognomonia* by the sophist Polemon of Smyrna provides some insight into Hadrian's travels in the East and his personal appearance. Other sources, such as Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*, Athenaeus'

[11] Boatwright (2000) 21.
[12] For example the confusion over the names of Pius' two adopted sons in XXIV.1, or the contradictions regarding Hadrian's treatment of Heliodorus in XV.5 and XVI.10.

Deipnosophistae, or Pausanias' *Periegesis* report events related to the emperor, but the material they provide can only be used to supplement the two biographies.

The scholar needs to look elsewhere to confirm the scanty literary evidence of Hadrian's reign. Such information can be obtained from the vast number of epigraphic texts from all over the empire, Hadrian's rescripts preserved in legal texts, and the numerous building activities. The emperor spent most of his reign traveling throughout the empire, and his interactions with locals are attested by the variety of inscriptions set up. Imperial proclamations and edicts; his correspondence with cities; responses to petitions; general orders to governors or legates; speeches before the armies; building inscriptions; dedications on his behalf and to him, all are reflected in the rich epigraphic corpus that informs us of his whereabouts and interactions with cities and individuals. As there is no a single published corpus of Hadrianic inscriptions the scholar has to consult publications of texts in a number of monographs and journals. Special attention has been given to Hadrian's correspondence and modern scholars have made attempts to collect the available material. James Oliver's *Greek Constitutions* (Philadelphia 1989) and Fernando Martin's *La documentacion Griega de la cancilleria del emperador Adriano* (Pamplona 1982) can be a starting point. Paul Alexander's article *Letters and Speeches of the Emperor Hadrian* is useful in this respect as well[13].

Of particular usefulness are a number of online databases that provide a vast number of epigraphic texts for the scholar to consult and search. Such projects have been undertaken by the Packard Humanities Institute with special focus on Greek inscriptions (http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions). Also the research project of

[13] Alexander (1938). E.M. Smallwood's *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Nerva Trajan and Hadrian* (Cambridge 1966) remains an invaluable source.

the Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften focuses on the collection of Latin inscriptions (http://www.epigraphische-datenbank-heidelberg.de).

Legal texts are also of the utmost importance as they give us a picture of the legislative program of Hadrian through rescripts and court decisions. This information has been mainly preserved in Justinian's *Digesta*. Papyri can also contribute to our understanding of Hadrian's administration of Egypt and preserve legal decisions as well as land surveys. Hadrian's involvement in the life of the cities can also be seen in the large number of building projects throughout the empire. These have been well studied by Mary Boatwright and Trudie Fraser as we will see below. The coinage of the period, both imperial and provincial, can provide useful information for the study of Hadrian's imperial program, the provinces' conditions and the finances of the empire. The scholar is invited to consult the *BMCRE* and *BMC* series as well as special corpora, such as Metcalf's study of the *cistophori* of Asia Minor in Hadrian's reign[14]. Finally the much anticipated second volume of the Roman Provincial Coinage will contribute much to Hadrianic studies as it focuses on the provincial coinage of Hadrian's reign.

Thus a number of ancient sources can help scholars to recreate the picture of the Empire in Hadrian's reign. The scholar has to remember, though, that the state of evidence is such as to require parallel consultation of different sources in order to gain the most accurate picture.

In addition, a number of modern studies have contributed to our knowledge of the life and accomplishments of Hadrian. The most recent biography of the emperor was published by Antony Birley in 1997 and aspired to fill a gap in scholarship. As

[14] Metcalf (1980).

Birley said, "Hadrian has long needed a new biography."[15] Indeed, the last biography was that by B.W. Henderson in 1923. A brief look at Henderson's work will reveal its merits and flaws.

Henderson's biography was arranged in two parts, the first, a narration in chronological order, followed the emperor from his boyhood to his death at Baiae. The second part is arranged thematically and deals with subjects important for the administration of the empire: foreign policy and frontiers, administration of the army, law reforms, the Jewish war, and Hadrian's building activities. However, Henderson's weaknesses were the superficial analysis of the material at hand and the selective use of both primary sources (he relies mostly on the scarce literary evidence without using archaeological and other data) and modern scholarship. His notorious Germanophobia is evident in his discussion of A. von Premerstein's book *Das Attentat der Konsulare auf Hadrian im Jahre 118 n. Chr.* (Leipzig 1908). In Henderson's text Premerstein is "the German" and his book "the German's lengthy pamphlet."[16] We may attribute his neglect of Wilhelm Weber's work *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus* (Leipzig 1907) to his anti-Germanism. Weber's monograph assembled a substantial mass of epigraphic, numismatic and papyrological evidence (a still useful collection) to date the main events of Hadrian's reign down to the Jewish War. However, his work is more useful as a study of the emperor's journeys than as a biography.

Birley's work follows the chronological arrangement which we saw in Henderson's first part. The twenty-one chapters of his book narrate in much prosopographical, geographical and chronological detail the life of the emperor. The

[15] Birley (1997) xiii.
[16] Henderson (1923) 52-54.

epilogue is devoted to Hadrian's famous poem on his soul. Birley's interesting account brings together myriad facts from the empire at large. As in a documentary we follow the emperor as he inspected the troops, moved from city to city, met with prominent members of the local communities, made the fateful trip to Egypt anxious over his health, and listened carefully the Olympieion' inaugural speech by Polemon at Athens in 131. Birley's rich information however turns this book into a prosopographical study of the second century rather than a biography of Hadrian. One emerges with little sense of who Hadrian was, what program he really accomplished in the empire, and what he may have done. Birley eschews consideration of Hadrianic policy-financial, religious, military, legal, or administrative[17]. As a result, the overall picture of this text is that of a very useful prosopographical and geographical study of the empire in the second century and not of an imperial biography. The way things are presented in Birley's work, Hadrian seems to be a wandering, curious emperor whose activities complement a history of the first half of the second century.

Much of modern scholarship is devoted to the building program of the emperor. Hadrian adorned with buildings not only the capital but also a number of cities of the provinces, especially of the Greek East. Mary Boatwright contributed to the subject with her work *Hadrian and the City of Rome* (Princeton 1987), where she studied major Hadrianic buildings at Rome. Thirteen years later, the author completed what she started in 1987 with her book *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire* (Princeton 2000). This work accumulated a tremendous amount of information arranged by type of buildings, but chapters that deal with Hadrian's involvement in the (re)foundation of cities and the change of their status are also important parts of the book. It is a very useful study for the scholar who wants an accumulated evidence

[17] Birley (1997) xiv.

of Hadrian's building activities throughout the empire. More recently, Trudie Fraser published her work *Hadrian as Builder and Benefactor in the Western Provinces* (Oxford 2006). The author aspires her work to be a continuation of Boatwright's studies by adding all the available evidence of Hadrianic civic building, but also of road construction and military building from the western provinces.

A number of other studies have focused on various aspects of Hadrian's reign. For example, authors have attempted to retrace the exact itineraries of the emperor during his lengthy journeys. The basic study remains that of Helmut Halfmann, *Itinera Principum* (Stuttgart 1986). An interesting synthesis based on previous works and new evidence was presented by Antony Birley in 2003[18]. Although Hadrian's visit to a number of places remains unclear, Birley's chronological list of cities visited by the emperor is a very useful tool for the student of Hadrian. Other studies focus on the emperor's personality and deal with his literary interests and acquaintance with authors of the period. I will mention briefly Bowie's discussion of Hadrian's tastes in Greek poetry[19], the same author's examination of the relations between Hadrian, Favorinus and Plutarch[20], and Stertz's contribution in the *ANRW* series with a general paper on Hadrian's interactions with a number of intellectuals[21].

My study will approach Hadrian's reign from a different point of view. It will focus on two major themes: what was his program for the Greek East and how he promoted it in this region. There is no modern study that treats the program of Hadrian in the region and the mechanisms he used to set it in motion. Unfortunately, scholars examine different aspects of his reign in isolation without attempting to set

[18] Hence Birley (2003).
[19] Bowie (2002).
[20] Bowie (1997).
[21] Stertz (1993).

them in the context of his imperial program. Studies on his building activities, his Philhellenism, or his personality focus on them individually and attempt to give a general account without explaining them in terms of his imperial program and ambitions. On the contrary, this study will attempt to define his program and illuminate a number of ways by which he promoted it. The geographical focus will be the areas of the Greek mainland and Asia Minor as these are the Greek areas that received Hadrian's attention and benefactions the most. Moreover, contrary to Henderson's theory[22], I believe that the emperor desired to advance the regions' interests and accelerate their growth not solely on account of his philhellenic sentiments but mainly because he wished to bring the provinces closer to Rome, to raise them to a level of equality with the capital, and create a second cultural center of the empire. Thus he could accelerate the integration of these regions into the Empire and bring to completion his plan for its unification. This aspect of his reign has been underestimated in modern scholarship.

Moreover, my study will not only illuminate Hadrian's plans for the region and present the ways by which he promoted it but will also deal with the reaction of the local populations. It will become clear from this discussion that the promotion of Hadrian's program was a dynamic, evolving process involving considerable input from imperial circles and the public alike.

Any attempt to present and interpret Hadrian's program in the Greek East cannot carried through without first examining the circumstances in which the emperor and the people of the Greek East came into contact. Accordingly, I will start my first chapter by examining the political position of the Greeks in the Empire in the second century A.D. I will attempt to highlight the political status of the Greeks under

[22] Henderson (1923) 182-183.

the Romans in the second century; to examine how they viewed their necessary co-existence with the Romans; and to present their political expectations. Next I will examine Hadrian's policy with regard to the Greek East. I will argue that Hadrian envisaged a Greek world that could actively participate in the administration of the Empire and his program of unification. He advanced the idea of two imperial centers, one in the West, centered on Rome, and another in the East, centered on Athens and the great cities of Asia Minor. He showed that the region and its people must not be valued only for their past and cultural traditions but also and more importantly for the dynamism and energy that they could bring to the Empire. In the last part of this chapter I will focus on the institution which is believed to reflect his interest in the region the most: the Panhellenion. Founded in 131/132, the council aspired to be the focal point for communities that were able to demonstrate their Greek descent. The institution functioned more as a cultural rather than a political organization, mainly associated with the imperial cult. Contrary to other scholars, I will argue that it is this cultural and religious character of the Panhellenion that explains the absence of the most important Greek cities of Asia Minor: Ephesos, Smyrna, and Pergamos. I will suggest that the function of the council as Koinon, associated with the imperial cult, and the focus of the new league on Old Greece and in particular Athens must be seen behind the absence of the Asian cities mentioned above and the limited impact of the Panhellenion on cities outside of the mainland.

In the second chapter I will talk about the people that Hadrian addressed in the East: his audience. This is a subject that has not received the attention it deserves in modern scholarship. We hear about Hadrian's interactions with locals but we do not learn anything about them other than their names, genealogies, and offices they held. From what social strata did they come, how did their expectations fit in with

Hadrian's program, what was their role, if any, in its implementation? These are the questions I will try to answer here. In order to approach them I will first discuss Hadrian's travels as the means that brought him close to them. I will not only trace his route but, more importantly, I will attempt to explain his travels as a means of securing the empire, fostering relations with the local populations, and promoting his program. I will also discuss how the visit of the emperor was a major event both for the central administration and the provinces. The impact on the provinces and peoples the emperor visited and the gains sought from all sides are aspects of his travels that have not been adequately studied, and my discussion aspires to correct this[23].

Then I will shift my focus to the people Hadrian met and addressed. I will argue that not only local elites, magistrates, and religious officials received his attention, but also the lowest classes of a city, rustic people, farmers and merchants. All of them were looking forward to an imperial visit in order to present their case and advance their interests, personal and communal alike. I will argue that Hadrian's program did not address only the elites but aimed at the broad population as well, although, as is expected, the emperor relied first on the elites' support for the implementation of his program and its "distribution" to the masses.

The discussion in the first two chapters will help us understand better the local necessities and expectations as well as the imperial ambitions that dictated the contact of the emperor with the Greeks. It will set the framework within which the promotion of his program will be illustrated.

Chapters three and four will discuss how the emperor's plans for the Greek East were promoted through the medium of coinage and religion. Despite the volume

[23] This was a major flaw in Birley's narration. We hear about the administrative, logistical, social, and ceremonial aspects of imperial journeys only when a piece of evidence for that aspect can be placed precisely within Hadrian's itinerary (173,190-1,217,220-222,234).

of Hadrianic coinage, both imperial and provincial, no modern scholar has discussed the evidence with regard to Hadrian's program and its implementation. Therefore this chapter innovates in its method and approach. Chapter three breaks into two major parts. In the first part I will deal with the organization of the mints in the second century. I will examine evidence related both to the central imperial mint at Rome and the provincial mints of the Greek East. I will discuss the administrative mechanisms of these mints with particular focus on crucial issues, such as who was in charge of the mints and how independent were the Greek mints from local authorities.

The second part of this chapter will examine a number of iconographical types of the Hadrianic coinage. I will discuss not only coins from the Greek East but also from the central mint of Rome. I will show how coinage reveals a number of goals on the part of Hadrian: to associate himself and his reign with his predecessor and with myths and traditions both of Rome and of the Greek East; to present himself as the counterpart of Olympios Zeus in the East, the god of all the Greeks; to advertise the basic principles of his reign and his sincere interest in the welfare of the provinces individually and of the entire empire. Finally, I will use these types to prove that a number of persons were involved in the iconography of coins: from the emperor and his family to Roman officials and governors, from Greek local magistrates to officials of the mints, all were able to influence the selection of a certain type.

Chapter four will discuss the role of religion in the promotion of Hadrian's program in the Greek East. Jean Beaujeu's *La religion romaine* (Paris 1955) remains the best study of Hadrian's religious policy. Beaujeu discusses Hadrian's attitudes to Roman and Greek pantheons, to Egyptian and Eastern divinities, the imperial cult,

religious associations and others[24]. However, this study failed to see the connection between Hadrian's religious pursuits and his program. This is what I want to argue for here.

The first subject that I will discuss is Hadrian's claim to divine election. Numismatic and other evidence advertised that it was by the providence of Jupiter and the medium of Trajan that the new emperor was selected. Thus Hadrian legitimized his accession by invoking both earthly and divine commands. Next, I will discuss the use of religious language as reflected in the numerous epithets attached to Hadrian in a number of epigraphic documents. I will show that these epithets derived from local traditions and mythical and historical themes and eased the contact between emperor and locals. After that I will discuss certain traits of Hadrian's persona. I will suggest that Hadrian's association with superhuman, almost divine powers (as this is evidenced in his interest in, among others, magic, oracles, and astrology) was part of the religious language and themes that were familiar to the Greek populations in the East, and consequently facilitated the Greeks' approving of the emperor and his plans.

Finally I will study Hadrian's association with the goddess Roma at Rome and Zeus in the Greek East. Roma's cult received new emphasis in the reign of Hadrian. Contrary to current theories[25] I will suggest that the emphasis the cult received mainly in the Latin West but also in the East is indicative of Hadrian's desire to highlight the importance of the cult of Roma and Rome as unifiers of the empire. As I will show, his goal was not to Romanize the empire by means of Roma's cult but to bridge the past and present of the empire and bring West and East closer. At the same time Hadrian promoted the cult of Zeus in the Greek East and was assimilated with him,

[24] Although a monograph on Hadrian's cult is missing from modern scholarship, the reader may consult the works by Price (1984), Birley (1997), and Burrell (2004).
[25] E.g. Mols (2003).

most evidently by the title Olympios. I will argue that Hadrian's association with the Greek Zeus came as a response to Trajan's reception as Jupiter in the West and also placed Hadrian at the heart of the Greek pantheon, something that eased his reception among the Greeks. Moreover, I will suggest that this emphasis on the two cults reflects Hadrian's desire to underline first, the two main cultural components of the empire, Roman and Greek, and second, their crucial role in the stability of the empire.

The present study will contribute to our knowledge of Hadrian's program for the Greek East and his vision for the unity of the empire. Furthermore, I believe it will give us a better sense of who Hadrian and the Greeks he dealt with were.

CHAPTER 2

HADRIAN AND THE GREEK EAST: REALITIES AND EXPECTATIONS

2.1 Introduction

Any attempt to present and interpret Hadrian's program in the East (and for that matter that of any Roman emperor) cannot be carried through without first examining the circumstances in which the emperor and the people of the Greek East came into contact. Accordingly, in the first part of this chapter I will examine the political position of the Greeks in the Empire in the second century A.D. Looking at works of authors of the period I will highlight the political status of the Greeks under the Romans in the second century; examine how they viewed their necessary co-existence with their Roman rulers; and present their political expectations.

Hadrian's policy with regard to the Greek East will be examined next. The East was already acquainted with Hadrian before he succeeded his adoptive father in 117. The new emperor was ostensibly a philhellene and during his reign he repeatedly visited the Greek mainland and Asia Minor for long periods of time. His vision and program for the region and the Empire in general set the tone for his successors. I will argue that Hadrian envisaged a Greek world that more energetically participated in the administration of the Empire and his program of a political, and to a certain degree cultural, unification. He advanced the idea of two imperial centers, one in the West, centered on Rome, and another in the East, centered on Athens and the great cities of Asia Minor. He showed that the region and its people must not be valued only for

their past and cultural traditions but also and more importantly for the dynamism and energy that they could bring to the Empire. The Empire belonged to all its inhabitants, prominent among them Romans and Greeks. By bringing together peoples and traditions, local expectations, and imperial priorities, Hadrian believed that the unification of the Empire could be a reality.

In the last part of this chapter I will focus on the institution which is believed to reflect his interest in the region the most: the Panhellenion. Founded in 131/132, the council aspired to be the focal point for the communities that were able to demonstrate their Greek descent. Presided over by an archon, the council convened in Athens and organized the Panhellenia Games, first celebrated in 137. Despite the fragmentary state of evidence, it has been generally accepted that the institution focused more on cultural activities (e.g. games, the imperial cult) rather than on political ones. I will argue that it is the cultural and religious character of the Panhellenion that explains the absence of the most important Greek cities of Asia Minor: Ephesos, Smyrna, and Pergamos. I will suggest that the council's character as a Koinon associated with the imperial cult, and the focusing of the new league on Old Greece and in particular Athens, must be seen behind the absence of the Asian cities mentioned above and the limited impact on cities outside the mainland.

The examination of the above subjects will help us understand better the local necessities and expectations as well as the imperial ambitions that shaped the contact of the emperor with the Greeks. At the same time it will set the framework within which the promotion of his program will be examined later in this study.

2.2 Greeks and Romans in the Empire

The early period of Roman intervention in the East was for the Greeks, as for the entire Roman world, a time of great turmoil and wars in which the Greek cities seemed to have made all the bad choices by siding almost always with the wrong side: the Mithridatic Wars, the wars between Caesar and Pompey, Antony and Octavius. However, from Actium on, the Empire enjoyed stability, and, despite the bloody struggles for power after Nero's death, the prosperity that the Pax Romana ensured for the Mediterranean world was not at risk. This stability allowed the Greek world, as most of the peoples of the Empire, to recover and to adapt to the demands of the new status quo.

In terms of the political organization of the region, the advent of Rome did not change the traditional political structure of the East, which was based on the city, but it affected the way the Greeks viewed the world and their place in it. The city remained for the Greeks the main political, economical, and social unit. The Romans favored this structure and its diffusion in zones of weak urbanization, in particular in Thrace and central Asia Minor. However, the city was no longer the expression of a political ideal based on freedom and autonomy, even if, sometimes, some of them enjoyed a privileged status. The city became nothing more than a link of the huge chain that was the Roman Empire[26]. Now the *polis* and Hellas were parts of a large organized whole, which could guarantee peace and prosperity. They had to adapt to their new position within the imperial system.

As the Greeks had to adapt, so did the Romans (probably to a lesser degree) need to adjust to the new reality and the relations it involved. Although not always realistic, a mutual appreciation of each other's culture, and a respect of rights and

[26] Rizakis (1998) 600.

responsibilities were possible. Of course, in this era when the conquered populations needed to define their role taking into consideration both their needs and the expectations of Rome, a crisis was always possible. When we put under the microscope the populations of a Greek province, we see that Rome's dealings with them were not always harmonious. Roman dominance might occasion resistance, and factions at Rome could be reflected also among the members of a certain local class, in particular dependent elites.

However, from Augustus to the end of the first century A.D., it seems that the Greeks became gradually more eager to conform to the Roman presence. A number of factors allowed and also gave an incentive to Greek populations to explore the limits of their own microcosm within the Empire and examine it in relation to their past and Roman present. Among the most important were a degree of Roman tolerance towards the Greeks that derived from respect for the Greek past; the Philhellenic attitude of certain emperors of the first century, in particular that of Nero, with the famous grant of freedom to Achaea; the benefactions that adorned the Greek cities; and the increasing participation of local elites in imperial administration and their admission to the Senate (from Asia Minor under Vespasian, and from the Greek mainland under Trajan, the result being that in the mid-120's Spartan and Athenian senators were at the fore among the Greeks of the mainland in gaining membership in this body).

The desire for a Greek political rejuvenation and cultural renaissance reached a climax under the most Philhellenic emperor, Hadrian. It is during his reign and the following decades that the Greeks, in particular those of the Greek mainland and Asia Minor, more energetically explored their past. The literature of this period and

especially the works of the authors of the Second Sophistic, to which I will now turn, reveal the incessant struggle of the Greeks to define their role in the Empire[27].

2.2.1 Political Views and Expectations in the Works of the Second Sophistic

In the writings of the period we can discern a variety of attitudes regarding the participation of the Greeks in the administration of the Empire and their expectations[28]. As we will see, these can range from an unconditional acceptance of Roman rule to a more skeptical approach; from desire to participate in the imperial administration to refusal to do so; from welcoming of imperial interference into the affairs of the city to dissatisfaction over it and desire for more political autonomy. As a consequence, we can detect among the local ruling classes the display of a twofold loyalty: to their community and the imperial center. However, it would be a mistake to identify in this attitude a general diminishing sense of local identity. New forms of social behavior and new allegiances became more central to self-definition, especially of the elite, but this does not mean that old ones had to be abandoned[29]. The Greeks were more eager now to espouse the Roman imperial program and contribute to it by balancing its demands and their devotion to their community and culture. The material has been adequately discussed in modern scholarship and here it will suffice to examine in brief the main attitudes portrayed in selected passages from the Greek authors of the period.

A number of writings by Aelius Aristeides demonstrate this interaction between the elites and the central government. Aristeides hails the uniqueness of

---

[27] On the Second Sophistic in general see Anderson (1993); also, Bowersock (1969), Whitmarsh (2005) and Bowie (1974) on the use of the Greek past in the writings of the Second Sophistic.
[28] Swain (1996) is a fundamental study of these attitudes.
[29] Issues of identity in the literature of the period are beyond the scope of this study and therefore they will not be touched upon. On this subject the reader can consult Whitmarsh (2001) and Bowie (1996); also Gleason (1995), Bowie (1991), and Woolf (1994).

Greek culture and its claim to a privileged treatment by the Romans, but at the same time urges his fellow Greeks to show compliance with the new status quo and the necessities it dictates, for, he says, "it is a natural law for the weak to obey the strong"[30]. The superiority of Rome and the obligation of the Greek world to conform to its demands are presented as a natural law, which is dictated by the one who currently holds the scepters of power (ὑπὸ τῶν κρειττόνων καταδειχθεὶς). Obedience leads to conformity, which in turn allows people to live in concord and peace.

The recognition of the role of Rome in the creation of a world of peace and prosperity finds its best expression in Aristeides' speech *To Rome*, delivered in all probability before the imperial family at Rome[31]. Here, among others, the Romans are praised for ruling over free prosperous men[32]; for surpassing all peoples in power and moral values[33]; for the constitution which seems to be a mixture of democracy, aristocracy and monarchy[34]. The Romans are also praised for making a distinction simply between Romans and non-Romans instead of Greeks and barbarians[35]; for

[30] *To the Rhodians On Concord* 566: νόμος γάρ ἐστιν οὗτος φύσει κείμενος ἀληθῶς ὑπὸ τῶν κρειττόνων καταδειχθεὶς, ἀκούειν τὸν ἥττω τοῦ κρείττονος. (I follow W. Dindorf's edition of Aristeides' works).

[31] Since this speech is biased by its very nature, being encomiastic, and delivered before the emperor, I will not comment on it in depth. As Swain (1996) 274 says: "For some it is nothing but rhetoric devoid of content, for others a blueprint of the Roman Empire in the second century A.D., while for others the speech reflects the part not of Rome but of the eastern elites and their desire to exercise local control through Roman support". For similar views on Rome as the common homeland of the world, see the evidence gathered by Swain (1996) 364.

[32] *To Rome* 207, Μόνοι γὰρ τῶν πώποτε ἐλευθέρων ἄρχετε.

[33] *To Rome* 209, ἀλλὰ τὸ τοὺς μὲν βαρβάρους ταῖς περιουσίαις καὶ ταῖς δυνάμεσιν ὑπερβαλέσθαι, τοὺς δὲ Ἕλληνας σοφίᾳ καὶ σωφροσύνῃ παρελθεῖν, μέγα μοι δοκεῖ καὶ παντελὲς εἰς ἀρετῆς εἶναι λόγον καὶ παντὸς ἀγώνισμα λαμπρότερον.

[34] *To Rome* 222ff. Cf. Plutarch, *Old men in public affairs* 789e-790b, where he recognizes kingship as the perfect form of government: Ἀλλὰ μὴν ἥ γε βασιλεία, τελεωτάτη πασῶν οὖσα καὶ μεγίστη τῶν πολιτειῶν, πλείστας φροντίδας ἔχει καὶ πόνους καὶ ἀσχολίας·

[35] *To Rome* 214, καὶ τὸ Ῥωμαῖον εἶναι ἐποιήσατε οὐ πόλεως, ἀλλὰ γένους ὄνομα κοινοῦ τινος, καὶ τούτου οὐχ ἑνὸς τῶν πάντων, ἀλλ' ἀντιρρόπου πᾶσι τοῖς λοιποῖς. οὐ γὰρ εἰς Ἕλληνας καὶ βαρβάρους διαιρεῖτε νῦν τὰ γένη, οὐδὲ γελοίαν τὴν διαίρεσιν ἀπεφήνατε αὐτοῖς πολυανθρωποτέραν τὴν πόλιν παρεχόμενοι ἢ κατὰ πᾶν, ὡς εἰπεῖν, τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν φῦλον, ἀλλ' εἰς Ῥωμαίους τε καὶ οὐ Ῥωμαίους ἀντιδιείλετε, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἐξηγάγετε τὸ τῆς πόλεως ὄνομα.

treating the Greeks, who live in abundance of goods, like children their parents[36]; for having divine support, since the world after their accession to power and the coming of peace mirrors the one the Olympians created after they defeated the Titans[37]. That last point, the divine support of Roman rule (in particular the guidance of the emperor by the gods, who appointed him on earth) is a common *topos* in the literature of the period[38].

Along the same lines, Appian writing his *Roman History* under Antoninus, praised the emperors of Rome for increasing the greatness of the Empire and securing it. "On the whole", he writes, "already possessing the best parts of land and sea, they desire to preserve them by good counsel rather than to extend the rule endlessly over impoverished and unprofitable barbarian races."[39] "They have surrounded," he adds, "the Empire by a circle with great armies and guard it like some small plot of land."[40] In this passage, which reflects not only Antoninus' but even more Hadrian's achievements, Appian seems to believe that Roman imperialism has reached its limits, and efforts to extend the *imperium* beyond its current borders were tantamount to overextending Roman power[41].

Such displays of devotion to the Empire and loyalty to the emperor[42] surely influenced some emperors, who were eager to feel the adoration of their subjects. However, it is a mistake to assume that the emperor, even the most Philhellene among

---

[36] *To Rome* 224, διατελεῖτε δὲ τῶν μὲν Ἑλλήνων ὥσπερ τροφέων ἐπιμελόμενοι.
[37] *To Rome* 226ff.
[38] See, for example, Aristeides, *On Concord* 538; Dio Chrysostom, *Olympicus* 73-79, *Charidemus* 26-44, *Borysthenitic*us 31-32 (I follow J. von Arnim's edition in 1893-1896); Plutarch, *Philopoemen* 17.2 and *Flamininus* 12.10; Galen *On Theriac to Piso* 217.
[39] *Proemium* 26: ὅλως τε δι' εὐβουλίαν τὰ κράτιστα γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης ἔχοντες σώζειν ἐθέλουσι μᾶλλον ἢ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐς ἄπειρον ἐκφέρειν ἐπὶ βάρβαρα ἔθνη πενιχρὰ καὶ ἀκερδῆ.
[40] *Proemium* 28: τήν τε ἀρχὴν ἐν κύκλῳ περικάθηνται μεγάλοις στρατοπέδοις καὶ φυλάσσουσι τὴν τοσήνδε γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν ὥσπερ χωρίον.
[41] Cf. Dio Cassius 68.29.1-3; 33.1 and 75.3.2-3, where he regards both the Parthian campaigns of Trajan and that of Severus as burdens on the Empire undertaken to soothe their vanity.
[42] Cf. Plutarch's *To an uneducated ruler* 780d-781a, where the emperor is explicitly presented as the image of the god, ἄρχων δ' εἰκὼν θεοῦ τοῦ πάντα κοσμοῦντος.

them, Hadrian, or Nero and Marcus Aurelius, accepted the "gifts" of the Greeks without skepticism, and granted any petitions emanating from Greek circles[43]. In general, we must not conclude that the respect some Romans had for the Greek past led them to an uncritical acceptance of Greek culture. It is true that for Romans the past and culture of the Greeks were reasons to differentiate them from other, "barbarian", conquered peoples. However, what really happened under the Empire was the mutual acknowledgement of each other's importance (the Greeks on account of their past; the Romans for controlling both present and future) and of the necessity of a dialogue, which complemented the two peoples and at the same time frightened them with its dynamism[44].

It is in this atmosphere of Greek perceptions of imperial power that the Greeks of the East searched for their own political role in the Empire. Political ambitions within the community and beyond combined with a desire for as much independence as possible are discernible in Plutarch's writings to which I will now turn.

The text that perhaps expresses most eloquently these ambitions and expectations vis-à-vis the reality of Roman rule is Plutarch's *Political Advice*. The text is an essay on the civic life of a Greek politician under Roman rule. It is written in the form of advice to a certain Menemachos of Sardeis. After the introduction, Plutarch begins his essay by stressing the need for politicians to have a consistent policy (798c-799a). Then he deals with a number of subjects, all important to an aspiring politician, among them the need to know the character of the politician's fellow citizens (799b-800a); the importance of oratory (801c-804c); the correct and unblemished conduct towards the friends of a politician (806f-809b); and instructions

[43] For a comprehensive study of the Philhellenism of the Roman emperors from Augustus to the Antonines see Ferrary (1996).
[44] For the impact of the Roman conquest on the socio-political and cultural "landscape" of Greece see Alcock (1993) and (1997).

on dealing with one's political enemies (809b-811a). Then follow three important sections on the politician's relations with Rome (813c-816a), where the anxieties and concerns of the Greek politician of the Empire are perfectly mirrored.

Following on from the previous section Plutarch advises against excessive ambition which takes the form of holding on to office continually (813c-d). Upon obtaining office, Menemachos must remember the following advice Pericles gave to himself: "watch out Pericles, you are in command of free men, of Greeks, of Athenian citizens". But he must also say this to himself: "you are in command, but yourself are under command, the city being subordinated to the proconsuls and procurators of Caesar. 'There are no spearmen on the battlefield,'[45] or ancient Sardeis and Lydian power." Menemachos must "make his cloak more modest, look out of his office at the tribunal, and not put much pride in his crown when he sees the boots of the Roman magistrate above his head."[46] This is a reminder of the gloomy reality: Greece, now, is at best, a culturally influential, but politically a rather insignificant province that can contribute little to the administration of the Empire. From an individual's perspective it is a reminder of the political prospects of the local aristocracies. While within their own cities they were still dominant with regard to low classes, their position was precarious and ultimately dependent on the will of the

[45] Sophocles, *Trachiniai* 1058.

[46] *Political Advice* 813d-e: εἰσιόντα δ' εἰς ἅπασαν ἀρχὴν οὐ μόνον ἐκείνους δεῖ προχειρίζεσθαι τοὺς λογισμούς, οὓς ὁ Περικλῆς αὐτὸν ὑπεμίμνησκεν ἀναλαμβάνων τὴν χλαμύδα, "πρόσεχε, Περίκλεις· ἐλευθέρων ἄρχεις, Ἑλλήνων ἄρχεις, πολιτῶν Ἀθηναίων"· ἀλλὰ κἀκεῖνο λέγειν πρὸς ἑαυτόν, "ἀρχόμενος ἄρχεις, ὑποτεταγμένης πόλεως ἀνθυπάτοις, ἐπιτρόποις Καίσαρος"· 'οὐ ταῦτα λόγχη πεδιάς,' οὐδ' αἱ παλαιαὶ Σάρδεις οὐδ' ἡ Λυδῶν ἐκείνη δύναμις"· εὐσταλεστέραν δεῖ τὴν χλαμύδα ποιεῖν, καὶ βλέπειν ἀπὸ τοῦ στρατηγίου πρὸς τὸ βῆμα, καὶ τῷ στεφάνῳ μὴ πολὺ φρονεῖν μηδὲ πιστεύειν, ὁρῶντα τοὺς καλτίους ἐπάνω τῆς κεφαλῆς·

governor or the emperor. A wrong move and they might be banished, their estates confiscated, while their opponents could advance in their place[47].

Further confirmation of Rome's control of the life of the Greeks comes later in the text. The author advises Menemachos to seek balance between his obligation to the community and the priorities of the imperial administration. He warns against the use of historical examples that might stir up the crowd and cause the intervention of Rome[48]. Marathon, Eurymedon and Plataea are to be left in the schools of the sophists. As Simon Swain argues it is hard to believe that Plutarch was ideologically against the use of the teachings of Greek history; he rather seems to be concerned with the effect that an out-of-control manifestation of patriotic sentiments could have on the Romans and their policy in the area[49]. It is true that the late first century saw the beginning of ever-increasing interference by the imperial government in the administrative and particularly financial affairs of the Greek cities, a process that began with ad hoc appointments and ended with the permanent office of *curator*. It is perhaps no accident that the first evidence for these officials appears in the *Life* of Philostratus' earliest imperial sophist, Nicetes of Smyrna[50].

The politician must avoid anything that provokes the anger and intervention of Rome. In addition, he needs to seek the friendship and/or patronage of the local Roman governor or anyone from his milieu. Such a relationship, Plutarch continues,

---

[47] See for example Pliny, *Letters* X.81, for attempts to expose Dio Chrysostom to prosecution by his opponents in Prusa. There is no reason to suggest that elite members in the West, and even at Rome, had more political space than those in the East.

[48] *Political Advice* 814a: οἱ δ' ἄρχοντες ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν ἀνοήτως τὰ τῶν προγόνων ἔργα καὶ φρονήματα καὶ πράξεις ἀσυμμέτρους τοῖς παροῦσι καιροῖς καὶ πράγμασιν οὔσας μιμεῖσθαι κελεύοντες ἐξαίρουσι τὰ πλήθη.

[49] Swain (1996) 167-168.

[50] *Lives of the Sophists* 512 (I follow the paragraph division of C.L. Kayser's edition in 1838).

will safeguard the prosperity of the city[51]. Plutarch, however, warns the politician against extremely submissive behaviors that could turn him and his community into slaves of Rome. "In ensuring," he says, "that your fatherland is obedient to those in control, there is no need to humble it any further." Some politicians, he argues, keep on referring all matters, regardless of importance, to Roman officials. The result is that by their attitude, these politicians bring on a reproach of slavery[52]. He blames the greed and contentiousness of the local magistrates for this phenomenon. Either they succeed in driving out their opponents or they bring in the Romans to help them. In this way, city, council, people, and courts all lose their power and even privileges and honors[53]. The politician has to seek balance between independence and obedience[54].

It is surprising that nowhere in the *Political Advice* does the author speak openly of imperial posts and particularly of a senatorial career. He only alludes to it and remarkably in a negative tone. After advising the politician to seek the friendship of a Roman official ("for the Romans are very keen to support their friend's political interests"-814c) he cites a couple of examples in which the friendship between the Roman official and the local politician resulted in the benefit not only of the latter but also of his fatherland. But then Plutarch shifts his tone and asks "is there any

---

[51] *Political Advice* 814c: Οὐ μόνον δὲ δεῖ παρέχειν αὐτόν τε καὶ τὴν πατρίδα πρὸς τοὺς ἡγεμόνας ἀναίτιον, ἀλλὰ καὶ φίλον ἔχειν ἀεί τινα τῶν ἄνω δυνατωτάτων, ὥσπερ ἕρμα τῆς πολιτείας βέβαιον· αὐτοὶ γάρ εἰσι Ῥωμαῖοι πρὸς τὰς πολιτικὰς σπουδὰς προθυμότατοι τοῖς φίλοις·

[52] *Political Advice* 814e-f: Ποιοῦντα μέντοι καὶ παρέχοντα τοῖς κρατοῦσιν εὐπειθῆ τὴν πατρίδα δεῖ μὴ προσεκταπεινοῦν, μηδὲ τοῦ σκέλους δεδεμένου προσυποβάλλειν καὶ τὸν τράχηλον, ὥσπερ ἔνιοι, καὶ μικρὰ καὶ μείζω φέροντες ἐπὶ τοὺς ἡγεμόνας ἐξονειδίζουσι τὴν δουλείαν, μᾶλλον δ' ὅλως τὴν πολιτείαν ἀναιροῦσι, καταπλῆγα καὶ περιδεᾶ καὶ πάντων ἄκυρον ποιοῦντες. Dio Chrysostom gives a similar warning to the Tarsians (*Or. 34, To the Tarsians Second*, 38). For a discussion of Plutarch's attitudes towards Rome and Roman politics in his *Lives*, see Pelling (1995) and more general Jones (1971).

[53] *Political Advice* 815a: αἰτία δὲ τούτου μάλιστα πλεονεξία καὶ φιλονεικία τῶν πρώτων· ἡ γὰρ ἐν οἷς βλάπτουσι τοὺς ἐλάττονας ἐκβιάζονται φεύγειν τὴν πόλιν ἢ περὶ ὧν διαφέρονται πρὸς ἀλλήλους οὐκ ἀξιοῦντες ἐν τοῖς πολίταις ἔχειν ἔλαττον ἐπάγονται τοὺς κρείττονας· ἐκ τούτου δὲ καὶ βουλὴ καὶ δῆμος καὶ δικαστήρια καὶ ἀρχὴ πᾶσα τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἀπόλλυσι. Similarly, Dio Chrysostom, *Or. 46, On Revolt*,14, warns a rioting crowd of the risk of proconsular intervention. See also Tacitus' *Annals* 4.36 on Cyzicus' loss of freedom in A.D. 25 on account of offences including violence to Roman citizens.

[54] Cf. *Political Advice* 824c, where Plutarch seems to consider undesirable the gift of more freedom to the Greeks by the Romans in his own day.

comparison between this sort of favor and lucrative procuratorships and administrations of provinces which men pursue, growing old before other people's doors and neglecting their affairs at home?"[55] He then paraphrases Euripides, *The Phoenician Women* 524-525 and proclaims that "if you have to lose sleep and frequent the court of another man and submit yourself to the familiarity of a leader, it is best done for the fatherland."[56] According to Plutarch, it is wrong for a politician to sacrifice his self-respect and damage his city's prosperity for the sake of obtaining imperial posts.

Simon Swain has erroneously interpreted the above comments as Plutarch's advice to the politician to stay at home and not to integrate[57]. On the contrary, I believe that Plutarch's advice must not be viewed as a negative attitude towards provincials taking up posts in the imperial government. I think the author is more concerned with the correct conduct of the politician, a conduct which would secure his own self-respect and the city's prosperity and would not oppose the plans of the central administration. Moreover, the author, perhaps having in mind certain Greeks who held posts at that time or before, is more concerned with local magistrates neglecting the interests of their community on account of their personal ambitions, an attitude which can precipitate the intervention of Rome, something that Plutarch is against. It is clear that these dangers are what he had in mind when in the next lines he warns against the politician's submissive conduct and excessive ambition (814e-815a).

---

[55] *Political Advice* 814d: ἆρά γ' ἄξιον τῇ χάριτι ταύτῃ παραβαλεῖν τὰς πολυταλάντους ἐπιτροπὰς καὶ διοικήσεις τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν, ἃς διώκοντες οἱ πολλοὶ γηράσκουσι πρὸς ἀλλοτρίαις θύραις, τὰ οἴκοι προλιπόντες·

[56] *Political Advice* 814e: τὸν Εὐριπίδην ἐπανορθωτέον ᾄδοντα καὶ λέγοντα, ὡς εἴπερ ἀγρυπνεῖν χρὴ καὶ φοιτᾶν ἐπ' αὔλειον ἑτέρου καὶ ὑποβάλλειν ἑαυτὸν ἡγεμονικῇ συνηθείᾳ, πατρίδος πέρι κάλλιστον ἐπὶ ταῦτα χωρεῖν, τὰ δ' ἄλλα τὰς ἐπὶ τοῖς ἴσοις καὶ δικαίοις φιλίας ἀσπάζεσθαι καὶ φυλάττειν;

[57] Swain (1996) 169ff.

Besides, it would have been a contradictory position, if Plutarch himself had held a post. According to the eighth-century historian George Syncellus, Plutarch was appointed by Hadrian as procurator of Greece[58]. Simon Swain argues that if the information is correct, the procuratorship was only nominal[59]. Given the involvement of Plutarch in the administration of the oracle of Delphi and the Delphic Amphictyony, the high esteem in which Hadrian held him, and the service that Plutarch could offer to the advancement of Hadrian's plans for the region, I believe that it is still possible that Plutarch's procuratorship was an actual office. The involvement of the intellectual in the political life of the region was not a surprise and certainly resonated with the participation of intellectual figures of the Greek East in the politics of the Empire[60].

As we will see in the next chapter of this study it is this involvement that many Greek aristocrats sought. For many of them the limited political space of their city did not satisfy their personal ambitions and interests. Moreover, it is possible that the incessant competition for the city's magistracies had exhausted them both financially and morally and their career was destined to end at the boundaries of the community or the governor's office. It was a way out of this situation that the local elites sought from the Roman officials, offering in return their support to the regime. The elites were a key structural element in Roman provincial rule with imperial strategies largely dependent upon the co-operation of local power networks. It is they who needed concord in quiet, obedient provinces (as of course the Roman authorities did),

[58] *Ecloga Chronographica* 426, 22: Πλούταρχος Χαιρωνεὺς φιλόσοφος ἐπιτροπεύειν Ἑλλάδος ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος κατεστάθη γηραιός.
[59] Swain (1996) 172.
[60] I will return to the participation of local elites and intellectuals in the imperial administration in the next chapter of this study.

and as little imperial intervention as possible[61]. The accession to the throne of the most philhellene emperor, Hadrian, was certainly greeted with joy by the elites for the benefits it could bring. Hadrian's vision for the region, to which I will now turn, encouraged the Greeks to embrace the Empire as their own and participate more energetically in the implementation of his program.

2.3 Hadrian's *adventus*

When Hadrian succeeded his adoptive father in 117, he had to face the suspicion of Romans focusing on the rumors of his false adoption by his predecessor[62]. This mistrust was intensified when in the early days of his reign the killing of prominent figures of Roman politics cast a shadow over the new emperor[63]. Senatorial sentiments, as these are expressed in Dio, himself a senator, hardly changed during Hadrian's reign, even more so when the emperor made a decisive turn in the Empire's policy by applying the "non expansion" doctrine of Augustus. Accordingly, shortly after his accession to the throne, Hadrian abandoned the provinces of Mesopotamia, Armenia and Assyria, newly conquered by Trajan, as Roman presence there faced resistance already before Trajan's death, and Hadrian judged as disadvantageous any attempt to hold them under Roman control. Hadrian even thought of letting Dacia go. This was a decisive step in his reign for which he engendered the enmity of many at Rome. As Clifford Ando nicely remarked, Hadrian

[61] The need for concord was a matter much emphasized in the writings of the period. See, for example, Aristeides, *On Concord*, and *To the Rhodians on Concord*. On the notion of concord and co-operation within a city see also Plutarch*, Political Advice*, 805d; 819d; and 824c-e. See also Dio Chrysostom's *Or. 38, To the Nicomedeians*, for the importance of concord among cities. The message is twofold: Greece and its culture can only survive if the people live in a state of concord; and this wish can only be fulfilled and guarded by the emperor. Thus, the emperor is at the center of the cultural survival of the Greek East.

[62] Dio Cassius 69.1.

[63] Dio Cassius 69.2.5-6.

"risked the scorn of senators who had been deluded by Trajan's exaggerated letters from the front."[64]

However, Hadrian insisted on holding the Empire within its limits, on the one hand by ceasing further expansion, on the other by marking the limits of the Empire. Beginning in 121, a continuous palisade was to mark the empire's limits on the Rhine frontier. Besides its military value, to the barbarians it marked off the Empire more clearly than ever before. In Britain he began, in 122, the great Wall and in North Africa he organized the southern frontier of the Empire. In all three works Hadrian sent a double message: the separation of the barbarians from the Romans, and the end of the doctrine of an *imperium sine fine*. It was a message that certainly the admirers of Trajan's expansionist policy did not welcome. There must be an allusion to this in Tacitus: when talking of Tiberius, he complains about the confined space and the princeps with no interest in expanding the Empire[65].

Nevertheless, this new policy set the tone for the administration of the Empire in the second century and affected the reigns of his successors and in particular that of Antoninus Pius. By abandoning the expeditions to the East, and by securing the Empire by impressive constructions, the training of the army, and the loyalty of his subjects, Hadrian sought a peace, which clearly paved the way for the next decisive step of his reign: that of the development and prosperity of the Empire. Along with his efforts to consolidate his rule (most conspicuously by improving his damaged relations with the Senate) the emperor took a number of measures that improved the life of his subjects, secured their loyalty, and as a consequence increased the power and welfare of the Empire.

---

[64] Ando (2000) 319.
[65] *Annals* 4.32. So, Birley (1997) 116.

In what concerns us here, I will focus on his policy regarding the Greek East. As the emperor never announced his plans publicly, in a proclamation or decree, we can identify his intentions only by his actions in the region. Here I will attempt to show how he envisaged the Greek East and I will suggest that what Hadrian had in mind for the region was a long-term plan that would raise the living conditions in the cities, revitalize the cultural and political structures of the region, increase the participation of Easterners in the imperial program, and as a result, create a second center in the East, mostly of a cultural character but with a certain political power too, that could contribute to the stability of the Empire along with the imperial center at Rome. As Hadrian's activities in the East have been extensively discussed by previous scholars, here I will summarize the evidence[66].

2.3.1 Hadrian's involvement in the life of the East

In A.D 125 the Greeks who annually met at Plataea to celebrate the deliverance from the Persians in 479 BC dedicated a thank-offering to the emperor Hadrian, whom they addressed as "savior, who healed and nourished his own Greece."[67] The emperor is praised for his contributions to the life of the region. As a savior (ῥυσαμένῳ) and parent (θρέψαντι) Hadrian came to the rescue of his Greece and provided it with anything that it needed to recover and advance. What provoked the expression of such gratitude in addressing the emperor as healer and parent of the Greeks? Without any doubt the answer is found in the unparalleled benefactions to the cities, manifested in his interest in their everyday life and their cultural and political

[66] See the most recent biography of the emperor by Birley (1997). Also, Boatwright (2000) on his building program and other activities in the cities of the Empire, and Arafat (1996) 159-188 on the building activities of the emperor in the Greek mainland as these are presented in Pausanias' *Periegesis*.

[67] *Sylloge* (3) 835A: Αὐτοκράτορι Ἀδριανῷ σωτῆρι,/ῥυσαμένῳ καὶ θρέψαντι τὴν/ἑαυτοῦ Ἑλλάδα, οἱ ἰς Πλαται/ὰς συνιόντες Ἕλληνες χαρι/στήριον ἀνέθηκαν.

progress; in unmatched building programs; in donations to cities, leagues and individuals alike; and finally in his passion for everything Greek and respect for the culture of the region and its people. Before I outline his vision for the region, I will first touch upon these activities briefly.

The Greeks had been familiar with Hadrian's personality for a long time before he succeeded Trajan in 117. The Athenians, who were already aware of the Greek educational background of the *princeps* and his sentiments, invited the *Graeculus* to become an Athenian citizen (probably in 111-112), and when the offer was accepted Hadrian was made a member of the deme of Besa. It is interesting that an outstanding member of the local elite, C. Julius Antiochus Epiphanes Philopappus, grandson of King Philopappus of Commagene, was enrolled in the same deme, and one may suppose that he played a role in the offer of citizenship[68]. In 112 Hadrian was elected archon eponymous of the city and was honored with a statue in the Theater of Dionysus[69]. Very few Romans of his rank had accepted the honor before him. Among them, Domitian had consented to be archon, though without coming to Athens[70].

Hadrian's assumption of a city's highest magistracy was not surprising. Such an action is attested in many places throughout the Empire, from Italica in Spain to Odessos in the Black Sea[71]. In the Greek mainland and Asia Minor he is known to have assumed the supreme position at Sparta (in 127/128 the city offered Hadrian the office of eponymous magistrate, *patronomos*, a title which Hadrian accepted *in*

---

[68] See Oliver (1951) for a brief but useful study on the Athenian citizenship of Roman emperors.
[69] *IG* II² 3286: the long list of Hadrian's titulature concludes with the dedication: ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλὴ καὶ ἡ τῶν ἑξακοσίων καὶ ὁ/δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων τὸν ἄρχοντα ἑαυτῶν/ Ἀδριανόν. Hadrian later showed again his respect to the festive culture of Athens by presiding as agonothetes at the Great Dionysia in 125.
[70] *IG* II(2) 1996. For more examples see Birley (1997) 64.
[71] For the evidence see Boatwright (2000) 57ff.

absentia), Delphi (at least twice, probably sometime in 118-120, and in 125), Cyzicus (twice, at unknown dates), and Colophon.

The emperor was much involved in the political life of the cities in a number of ways. He is credited with the revision of the Athenian Constitution-although the evidence is not certain[72]-as well as with the regulation of the sale of olive oil in Attica, sometime after 126/127[73]. He assumed the role of *nomothetes* for the Athenians as he did also for the Megarians and the Cyreneans[74]. The cities responded to his interest in their political mechanisms and expressed their gratitude by, among others, adding a new tribe, Hadrianis (Athens by adding a 13th tribe, Megara by adding a 4th) or by beginning a new era in the local calendar from the year of his visit, as Epidauros and Tegea did on the occasion of his imperial visit in 124[75].

The life of the cities gained Hadrian's attention in other respects too, such as his interest in various organizations, guilds, and associations. This, for example, is manifested in the correspondence between the emperor and Plotina regarding the Successor of Epicurus at his School at Athens in 121[76]. The current head of the school (Successor), a Popillius Theotimos, requested permission (through the service of the dowager empress as intermediary) to choose his successor regardless of citizenship (until then the succession was restricted to Roman citizens) and to compose his will in Greek. The empress reported that the emperor, "the benefactor and overseer of all culture (l.21)" granted both requests to the School. Four years later, in 125, the

[72] So Boatwright (2000) 91; cf. Birley (1997) 177, who considers the information correct. For the most recent discussion of the subject see Kapetanopoulos (1992-1998).
[73] *IG* II(2) 1100. See also Kapetanopoulos (1992-1998).
[74] Megara: *IG* VII 70-72; 3491 (see the famous "Fish Tax" decree which exempts the Eleusinian fishermen from Athens' two-obol tax while selling at Eleusis, *IG* II(3) 1103); Cyrene: *SEG* 9.54=17.809.
[75] Megara: see, for example, *IG* VII 74;101. Epidauros: *IG* IV(2),1 384. Tegea: *IG* V,2 50.
[76] *IG* II(2) 1099=Oliver (1989) 73.

emperor confirmed his previous decision in a letter to the School[77]. Another manifestation of Hadrian's involvement in the life and mechanisms of associations is revealed in a letter of May 5th, 134 addressed to the athletic synod of Heracles[78]. The delegate of the synod, Ulpius Domesticus, had requested a new religious and administrative center. Hadrian accepted his request and in addition granted the synod the right to revise its statutes if it wished so (ll. 7-9: καὶ τόπον ἔνθα · βούλεσθε · κελεύσω δοθῆναι ὑμεῖν · καὶ · οἴκημα/ὡς τὰ γράμματα ἀποτίθεσθαι τὰ κοινά· καὶ εἰ τῶν διπλῶν τὴν/μεταποίησιν · ἀνανκαίαν · νομίζετε, τοῦτο ἐφ' ὑμεῖν ἐστιν).

Hadrian's interest was seen most impressively in the huge building program that he pursued throughout the region. Under Hadrian, the Athenians saw their city transformed from a relative poor city to a cultural capital of the Greek East. Hadrian filled Athens with a series of constructions that embellished the city and eased the life of its people: the construction of an aqueduct and reservoir on the lower slopes of Mt Lycabettos augmented the city's water supply; the gift of the gymnasium contributed to the city's cultural life[79].

Hadrian left his everlasting mark on the city with works such as the Library, the temple of Hera and Zeus Panhellenios, the Pantheon, and the transformation of the area of the temple of Zeus. In a letter of 131/2 to his favorite city, Athens, regarding the gymnasium, the emperor did not miss the opportunity to remind his addressees of his intentions: "know that I use every kind of excuse to benefit both the city in public and, in private, certain individuals."[80] Therefore, what Pausanias says regarding the

---

[77] *IG* II(2) 1097+*SEG* 3.226. See now *SEG* 43.24. For possible relations of the emperor with the Epicureans see Birley (1997) 109; 182.
[78] *IGUR* I.235.
[79] For a list of Hadrian's utilitarian buildings and those serving religious activities and spectacles in the Empire see Boatwright (2000) 108ff.
[80] *IG* II² 1102, ll 10-11: ἵστε ὡς πάσαις χρῶμαι προφάσεσιν τοῦ εὐ ποιεῖν καὶ δημοσίᾳ τὴν πόλιν καὶ ἰδίᾳ Ἀθηναίων τινάς.

statue of Hadrian in a portico in the Kerameikos area is hardly surprising: "he was a benefactor to all of his subjects and especially to the city of the Athenians."[81]

Not only Athens but the entire Greek world benefited from the presence of the emperor. During his frequent visits to the Greek East, the cities enjoyed the benefactions of the emperor in the form of financial aid, land donations, and building programs. Accordingly, for example, he granted Sparta, in 125, the island of Caudos off the coast of Crete and the port of Corone on the gulf of Messenia, both valuable sources of revenue[82]. It is possible that he allowed the city to import corn from Egypt[83]. A series of altars from Sparta honoring Hadrian as savior, founder, and benefactor reveal the city's gratitude[84].

Frequent visits to Asia Minor led to unparalleled cultural and building activity there. All the major cities of the region attracted the interest of the emperor and local intellectuals, such as Polemon, struggled to gain the emperor's favor for their own homeland. Ephesos was allowed to import grain from Egypt and received funds on a lavish scale for the temple of Artemis, while at the same time Hadrian contributed to the repairing of its ports[85]. Smyrna received 10 million drachmae for the construction of a grain market and for a gymnasium as well as for the temple of Zeus in 124[86]. In the same year, the city of Cyzicus was granted the role of *neokoros*, temple warden of the imperial cult, joining Pergamos, Ephesos, Smyrna, and Sardeis[87]. Throughout the Empire the advent of the emperor was seen as an opportunity for transformation and renaissance.

---

[81] *Periegesis* 1.3.2: ἐνταῦθα ἕστηκε Ζεὺς ὀνομαζόμενος Ἐλευθέριος καὶ βασιλεὺς Ἀδριανός, ἐς ἄλλους τε ὧν ἦρχεν εὐεργεσίας καὶ ἐς τὴν πόλιν μάλιστα ἀποδειξάμενος τὴν Ἀθηναίων.
[82] Caudos: *SEG* 11.494; Corone *SEG* 11.495.
[83] Birley (1997) 217.
[84] *IG* V,1 381-405.
[85] *IEph* 274.
[86] Philostratus, *Lives of the Sophists* 531.
[87] For the neokoroi see Burrell (2004).

2.3.2 Hadrian's vision for the Greek East

Without being exhaustive, the evidence of Hadrian's activities presented above defines the context in which the Greeks came into contact with Hadrian and shared his regional program. As I have stated earlier the emperor never formulated his program officially. So, what I will present here is my own synthesis based on an analysis of Hadrian's involvement in the region and discussion in modern scholarship.

Hadrian envisaged a Greece, traditional but active, culturally independent, but politically in accordance with his vision for the Empire. The emperor aimed at the unification of the Empire by bringing together its two most important elements, Roman and Greek, and, as a result, creating two imperial centers, one in the West and the other in the East. By gaining the loyalty of the locals and seeking balance between his duty to Rome and his love for everything Greek, the emperor aimed at the cooperation of West and East and the prosperity of the Empire. At the core of this project he set the Greek cities of the mainland and Asia Minor, in particular the former, most prominently among them that of Athens. The cities of Asia Minor had received more attention by his predecessors and perhaps Hadrian wished to redress the balance in terms of contemporary importance between the two provinces. Hadrian acknowledged that cultural and historical eminence was as deserving of imperial recognition as economic and political muscle[88].

An undoubtedly genuine *erastes* of Greece, Hadrian appealed to the traditions as well as the cultural and political sentiments of the Greeks. He knew that the pursuit of their culture could facilitate his reception among the Greeks. In his frequent and long visits to the region he reached out to the provincials and asked for their support. He showed visible signs that for the first time the central administration was honestly

[88] Spawforth and Walker (1986) 104.

willing to incorporate this people into its plans for the future of the Empire. We may suggest that the Greek populations felt that now they could become active members of the Empire and that they meant to Rome not merely a land of sight-seeing and taxation but an indispensable part of the Empire.

His encouragement of the Greek world reflects this desire to link East and West by, first, seeking a balance between the promotion and integration of Greek culture and the respect for Roman sensitivities and, second, by attempting to treat the two parts as equally as possible[89]. This was a difficult task. Hadrian was aware of the ambivalent relations between Roman and Greek culture. From Augustus onwards, Hellenism had received some degree of imperial sanction, but the amount of active support varied from emperor to emperor and certainly the example of Nero had to be avoided. As Lomas says, there was a "need to be seen to espouse Hellenism only in carefully controlled circumstances[90]", and Hadrian was careful not to obtrude philhellenism at Rome. In his plans for the Empire this balance was a priority.

However, what distinguished Hadrian from previous Roman philhellenes was first, that his philhellenism was not limited to the admiration and study of the classical past, and second, that he combined his feelings with a desire to make the Greek East an active member of his Empire. He knew that every member was important to his Empire and it was the task of the emperor to fit each member into its place. Hadrian knew that the Empire could survive only if its members (Romans and Greeks in particular) were given the same attention.

Without challenging Roman sensitivities and by acknowledging the special weight of the Greek cultural past, he initiated a dialogue with his Greek subjects and

[89] So Lamberton (1997) 158.
[90] Lomas (1993) 181.

encouraged them to participate in it actively. The emperor carefully presented his Greek program to them, a program that could lead to the elevation of the Greek East to a status of equality with Rome. Latin West and Greek East could function as the two centers of the Empire producing culture and advancing politics. Hadrian fostered his relations with the local populations, secured their loyalty, exchanged ideas, and invited them to share in and contribute to his vision for the Roman Empire, of which they must be now active members.

The culmination of his efforts was the foundation of the Panhellenion, which could be a point of reference for the Greeks of the East. This organization certainly caused the Greeks to feel important again and an indispensable part of the Empire. They felt now for the first time in centuries that their cultural survival was officially secured while there was the prospect of political power within the mechanisms of the Empire. But was the goal of Hadrian the creation of a council with political power or the foundation of a center that advanced the unity and prosperity of the Greek cities (thus contributing to the stability of the Empire) through the medium of culture? As I will show next, it was rather the latter.

2.4 The Panhellenion

Since the publication by James Oliver in 1970 of a corpus of inscriptions relating to the Panhellenion, a number of articles have dealt with the administrative mechanisms, the activities and finally the role of the league[91]. All modern scholars have underlined the difficulty of defining the exact role of the league on account of

[91] Romeo (2002); also Jones (1996), Spawforth (1999), Spawforth and Walker (1985) and (1986).

the scarcity of evidence, especially the literary one[92]. Here, I will summarize the information we have regarding its foundation and structure, and then, focusing on its activities, I will argue that Hadrian's goal, by creating the Panhellenion, was not so much to unite the Greeks politically but rather to highlight their cultural traditions with special emphasis on his cult. Then, I will attempt to interpret the limited participation of Greek cities in the league, and in particular the absence of the most important cities of the province of Asia: Smyrna, Pergamos, and Ephesos. I will suggest that it was the function of the league as a Koinon with special interest in the imperial cult and its focus on Old Greece that discouraged many cities from taking part in its activities. Associated with this absence are the competition among the Greek cities and their struggle for prestige and preeminence which certainly deterred cities such as Smyrna from entering a league in which their role would be second to that of Athens or Sparta.

2.4.1 Foundation of the Panhellenion

Hadrian formally inaugurated the league and the associated temple of Hadrian himself, the Panhellenion, in 131/132, the same year in which he dedicated the sanctuary of Olympian Zeus. For the capital of the new league he chose the most famous among the cities of the Greek mainland, Athens. The scarcity of evidence does not leave much space to reconstruct either the creation process or to determine the area of Athens in which his temple stood and the Panhellenion convened. As to the inspiration of the project, recent scholarship has attributed it to the emperor's personal initiative, "though he was assisted and perhaps inspired by prominent

[92] Only two passages, one in Dio Cassius (69.16.2) and one in Pausanias (1.18.9) make a reference to the temple of Zeus Panhellenios built by Hadrian (Pausanias) and Hadrian's temple, called Panhellenion (Dio).

citizens in the provinces" a theory which seems to have some merit[93]. The most explicit evidence for this theory is considered to be a decree in honor of Hadrian that was erected on the Athenian Acropolis between 131/2 and 138 by the Lydian member city of Thyateira. The decree records the role of the emperor in convening the Panhellenic council in the city of Athens and in submitting its formation to the approval of the Roman Senate[94]. The city expresses its gratitude to the emperor for his benefactions and wishes to set a decree on the most prominent place of Athens, the Acropolis. "It will, thus, be clear to all how much the city was profited by the emperor (ll. 12-13), who benefited all the Greeks when he summoned the council from among them to the most brilliant city of Athens, who gave the reward of the Mysteries to all[95]. He also gave both the *ethne* and the cities a share in this Panhellenic council, after the Roman senate approved it on his proposals."[96] It is possible, then, that the initiative originated among the imperial entourage. The emperor, probably after he had secured the support of the Greeks, proceeded to present the proposal to the Senate for its formal approval.

It is possible that the Panhellenion was not Hadrian's original plan. It has been suggested that the emperor initially wished to transform the Delphic Amphictyony itself into a common assembly of all the Greeks[97]. In a letter to Delphi in 125

---

[93] So Romeo (2002) 21ff, following Spawforth (1999), contra Jones (1996) 31ff who attributes it to a local initiative, approved and modified by the emperor.
[94] *IG* II(2) 1088+1090+*IG* III 3985, recently re-edited by Jones (1999).
[95] Fritz Graf has pointed out to me that Thyateira's claim of Athens the benefactor that gave humanity the Mysteries is a traditional one and goes back to Isocrates' *Panegyricus* 28-29, who in turn adopted the claims of Athens when it introduced the tithe on the grain harvest at some point under Pericles.
[96] ll. 13-18:
…….. ὅτ[ι ἅμα τε κοι]νῇ πᾶν τὸ τῶν Ἑλλή[νων] εὐεργέτησεν
ὁ βασιλεύς, συναγα[γὼ]ν ἐξ αὐ[τῶν ἐκεῖνο τ]ὸ συνέδριον, ὡς φ[ιλο]τειμίαν κοινήν,
εἰς τὴ[ν λαμ]προτάτη[ν Ἀ]θην[αίων] πόλιν, τ[ὴ]ν Εὐεργέτιν, καρπ[ὸν τῶ]ν Μυστηρίων
ὁμ[οῦ πᾶσι διδοῦ]σαν, τὸ [δὲ σεμνότα]τον Πανελλήνιον, δι' ὧν ἐψη[φίσατο, ὁ]μολογούν-
[των τῶν Ῥωμαίων δόγματι] συνκλήτου, κα[ὶ ἰ]δίᾳ τά τε ἔθνη κ[αὶ τὰς πόλεις τ]ούτου τοῦ τει—
[μιωτάτου μετέδωκε συνεδρ]ίου……
[97] Romeo (2002) 24ff, following Jones (1996) 45 and Spawforth (1999) 341.

regarding the Amphictyony and the Pythian games, the emperor reports a proposal that was brought, probably by a senatorial committee, to the Senate regarding the votes of the Thessalians in the Amphictyony[98]. The emperor informs the city that the authors of the proposal suggested that the excess votes of the Thessalians be given to the Athenians, the Spartans and to other cities, so that the council might be a common one of all the Greeks[99]. It is hard to believe that the "panhellenic" tenor of this proposal arose independently of the emperor[100]. However, Hadrian never implemented this proposal. If indeed this text is related to Hadrian's panhellenic project, it seems that it was long meditated, and that the idea of basing it on Delphi was considered at an earlier stage but later abandoned[101].

Ilaria Romeo also notes that the cities of the Greek mainland with membership in the Panhellenion coincide with those groups which were still, even in the Hadrianic period, endowed with voting rights in the Delphic Amphictyony. The similarities, she argues, between the two councils become more striking in light of certain administrative and organizational aspects, such as the four-year duration of office both of the archon of the Panhellenion and the *epimeletes* of the Amphictyony, and the fact that in both organizations the membership of the cities was annual. "On the basis of these similarities", she concludes, "there are those who believe that Hadrian initially attempted to transform the Delphic Amphictyony itself into a common assembly of all Greeks according to those same rules of selectivity and Athenian

---

[98] *CID* 4.152.
[99] Col. II, ll. 1-6:
[κα]θ' ἃ μέντοι χρὴ ποιεῖν κατὰ τοὺ[ς] νόμους, [εἰ]σ[ήνεγκαν]
γνώμην εἰς τὴν λαμπροτάτην σ[ύγ]κλητον εἰσηγη[σάμε]-
νοι τὰς ψήφους ἃς πλέονας τῶ[ν] ἄλλων ἔχουσιν Θεσ[σα]-
λ[οὶ Ἀ]θηναίοις καὶ Λακεδαιμονίο[ι]ς διανεμηθῆναι καὶ ταῖ[ς]
ἄλ[λαι]ς πόλεσιν, ἵνα ᾖ κοινὸν πάντ[ω]ν τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὸ συνέ-
δρ[ι]ον.
[100] So Spawforth (1999) 342.
[101] Spawforth (1999) 342.

preeminence that, once the Delphic project failed, were applied in founding the Panhellenion."[102]

It is also possible that Hadrian wanted to emulate the great Athenian statesman Pericles[103]. As Plutarch says, Pericles introduced a bill to the effect that all Greeks, in Europe or in Asia, should be invited to send deputies to a council at Athens. This would deliberate over the Hellenic sanctuaries which the barbarians had burned down, the sacrifices which were due to the gods in the name of Hellas, and the sea so that all might sail it fearlessly and keep the peace[104]. But, as he later adds, "nothing was accomplished on account of the Spartan opposition" (*Pericles* 17.4). Plutarch also registers the fact that the Athenian statesman was called Olympios[105]. So, it seems that Hadrian by imitating the Athenian statesman was bringing the abortive program of Pericles to fruition.

2.4.2 Membership in the Panhellenion

At present, membership is known to have embraced cities in no fewer than five provinces: Achaea, Macedonia (represented by the Thessalians, included as an ethnos and by the capital Thessalonike), Thrace, Crete-and-Cyrene and Asia- the Aegean provinces[106]. An inscription from Thessalonike shows that the Panhellenion

---

[102] Romeo (2002) 25.
[103] So Birley (1997) 219.
[104] *Pericles* 17.1: Ἀρχομένων δὲ Λακεδαιμονίων ἄχθεσθαι τῇ αὐξήσει τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ἐπαίρων ὁ Περικλῆς τὸν δῆμον ἔτι μᾶλλον μέγα φρονεῖν καὶ μεγάλων αὐτὸν ἀξιοῦν πραγμάτων γράφει ψήφισμα, πάντας Ἕλληνας τοὺς ὁποίποτε κατοικοῦντας Εὐρώπης ἢ [τῆς] Ἀσίας παρακαλεῖν, καὶ μικρὰν πόλιν καὶ μεγάλην, εἰς σύλλογον πέμπειν Ἀθήναζε τοὺς βουλευσομένους περὶ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ἱερῶν, ἃ κατέπρησαν οἱ βάρβαροι, καὶ τῶν θυσιῶν, ἃς ὀφείλουσιν ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἑλλάδος εὐξάμενοι τοῖς θεοῖς, ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐμάχοντο, καὶ τῆς θαλάττης, ὅπως πλέωσι πάντες ἀδεῶς καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην ἄγωσιν.
[105] *Pericles* 8.2.
[106] The cities that so far are known members of the Panhellenion are: Athens, Sparta, Argos, Epidauros, Methena, Corinth, Megara, Chalcis, Akraiphia, Amphikleia (Boeotia), Naryka (Locris), Hypata (Thessaly), Demetrias, Thessalonike, Perinthos, Aizanoi, Synnada, Eumeneia (?) (Phrygia), Cibyra,

divided its membership into "cities" (poleis) and "peoples" (ethne)[107]. The text was inscribed on a statue base for Antoninus Pius set up by the Panhellenes according to a decree submitted by the league to the emperor and then sent to all members. "Peoples" here refers to certain regional leagues, representing (for the most part) small cities which might otherwise have had difficulty in sustaining the cost of representation at Athens; the epigraphic evidence shows that the Cretan and Thessalian peoples were represented in this way.

As for the requirements for membership, the available evidence points to one direction: that of origin. In order to be admitted to the Panhellenion a city had to prove its Greekness. Those of the Greek mainland must be considered as automatic or "charter" members on account of their geographical location in the heart of Historical Greece and also due to their status as mother cities of the most important colonies. Among them must be numbered in the first place Athens and Sparta but also Argos, Corinth, Megara, Chalcis, and the Thessalian, Locrian and Boeotian communities. The cities outside the mainland invoked their relationship with a city, or cities, of the mainland, and based their Greekness on their *suggeneia*. The relationship between a colony and its metropolis was a fundamental tool for the validation of a community's Greek status. For others, there were attempts to trace their foundation to eponymous heroes or mythical figures, which were closely tied to ancestral Greece[108]. As O. Curty says, this was not a new phenomenon. Already in the Hellenistic period,

---

Magnesia ad Maeandrum, Tralleis, Miletos, Thyateira, Sardeis, Rhodes, Samos (?), Apameia, Lyttos, Gortyn, Hierapytna, Cyrene, Apollonia and Ptolemais-Barca.

[107] Oliver (1978) 189,2, ll. 8-10: .....ἀ̣π[ά]/σας τὰς μετεχούσας πόλεις κ[αὶ]/ἔθνη τοῦ πανελληνίου. Cf. l. 17 of the decree of Thyateira.

[108] For the phenomenon see Strubbe (1984-1986); Scheer (1993); Curty (1994) and (1995). For an interesting study of the use of real or fictional kinship between Rome and cities of the West and the East in Rome's foreign policy see Elwyn (1993).

barbarian or semi-Hellenized kings insisted on being recognized as Greeks[109]. However, a major difference from the Hellenistic period was that in the Roman period the cities were not just looking to establish kinship with the Greek *genos*, but rather to associate themselves with the most prestigious cities of the Greek mainland, mainly Athens and Sparta or Argos[110].

Two documents are revealing here. The first is the decree of the Panhellenes regarding the admission of Magnesia ad Maeandrum[111], the second a dedication by the Phrygian city of Cibyra in connection with its membership in the league[112]. The first text comes from the Athenian Acropolis and is dated to the reign of Pius. Only the upper part of the text is preserved, but before it breaks off, the decree lists those qualities that made the city a good candidate for the league: the city is a colony of the Magnesians of Thessaly, the first ever of the Greeks to cross across to Asia and settle there, true Aeolians themselves; they have been honored by the Roman people on account of their alliance; and have also received exceptional gifts from the god Hadrian[113]. Although the theme of ancestral Greekness was essential to qualify for admission to the Panhellenion, other prerequisites included good relations with Rome, benefits received from Hadrian, and other sorts of links, both private and public.

---

[109] Curty (1995) 254 and n.1
[110] See Curty (1995) 259ff for some examples.
[111] *IG* II(2) 1091.
[112] *SEG* 44.823.
[113]
ἀγαθῆι ν τύχηι. Λεύκιππος.
[ψήφισ]μα τὸ γενόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν Πανελλήνων.
[ἐπειδὴ Μάγνητες οἱ] πρὸς τῷ Μαιάνδρῳ ποταμῷ ἄποικοι
[ὄντες Μαγνήτων] τῶν ἐν Θεσσαλίᾳ, πρῶτοι Ἑλλήνων
5 [διαβάντες ε]ἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν καὶ κατοικήσαντες, συνα-
[γωνισάμενοι δὲ] πολλάκις Ἴωσι καὶ Δωριεῦσι καὶ τοῖς ἐ-
[κ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γ]ένους Αἰολεῦσι, τιμηθέντες καὶ ὑπὸ
[τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥω]μαίων δι' ἃς ἐποιήσαντο συμμα-
[χίας πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ δ]ωρεῶν ἐξαιρέτων τυχόντες ὑ-
10 [πὸ θεοῦ Ἁδ]ριανοῦ, πατρὸς Τ Αἰλίου Καίσαρος
[Αὐτοκράτο]ρος Ἁδριανοῦ Ἀντωνίνου τὰς
— — — — — — — — — — — — — — ῦτ..εμ — —

Similar is the idea in the second text. The inscription is dated to Hadrian's reign or slightly after 138. In this inscription, the city of Cibyra invokes interstate relationships and imperial beneficence to justify its membership in the Panhellenion and its prosperity: the city is the colony (ἄποικος) of Sparta, kin and friend (συγγενὶς καὶ φίλη) of Athens. In addition, it is a Greek city (γένος Ἑλληνικὸν), enjoys the friendship and favor (φιλίαν καὶ εὔνοιαν) of Rome, while it was given honors (εὐξῆσθαι τειμαῖς ἐξαιρέτοις) by the emperor, Hadrian[114]. Ilaria Romeo has rightly pointed out the fact that both cities refer in the same order to their Greek ancestries, their history of good relations with Rome, and the benefactions which they had received from Hadrian. As a result it is possible that this arrangement replicates the official formula of documents concerning admission[115].

Association with ancestral Greece and good relations with Rome are thus interrelated under the Empire in this network of interstate relations. As S. Elwyn says, "this network of legendary relationships allowed each city-state to find self-definition in a world of increasing contacts with non-Greeks and to develop, with its fellow Greeks, a way to overcome the parochial nature of the classical polis and expand on a Panhellenic system of international relations."[116] The case of Cibyra is a good example of the desire of such communities to attach themselves only to the most prestigious cities of old Greece. Still, in our sources, Greekness, direct origin from the

---

[114] [ἀ]γαθῆι τύ[χ]ηι Ζεὺς Σω[τήρ].
ἡ Κιβυρατῶν πόλις, ἄποικος Λ[ακεδαιμονίων καὶ]
συγγενὶς Ἀθηναίων καὶ φί[λη, μετέχουσα καὶ]
αὐτὴ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῆς Ἑλλάδος [συνεδρίου,ἐν ταῖς]
ἐνδόξοις οὖσα καὶ μεγάλαις [τῆς Ἀσίας πόλε]-
σιν διά τε τὸ γένος Ἑλληνι[κὸν καὶ διὰ τὴν]
πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐκ παλαιοῦ φι[λίαν καὶ εὔνοι]-
αν καὶ διὰ τὸ εὐξῆσθαι τειμαῖ[ς ἐξαιρέτοις ὑπὸ]
θεοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ, ἀνέθηκε τῆι [θεᾶι(?),κατὰ τὸ δό]-
γμα τ[ο]ῦ Πανελληνίου ἐνγρα[φεῖσα εἰς τὸ συνέδριον]
[115] So Romeo (2002) 31.
[116] Elwyn (1993) 267.

Greek mainland (argued mainly through mythical claims), was regarded as the first and foremost prerequisite for any city that wished to be a member of the league.

2.4.3 Administration and Responsibilities of the Panhellenion

The surviving inscriptions shed light on the league's administrative machinery: the highest office, that of archon, of which no fewer than thirteen are known by name, and the council (*synedrion*) of delegates, called Panhellenes. The archon held office at Athens for a period of four years (as the Delphic *epimeletes*), the Panhellenes for one. It is unknown how the archon was selected, but presumably his appointment was approved by the emperor. Of lesser officials we hear only of the deputy-archon (*antarchon*), to whom a treasurer should perhaps be added, since the league is found from time to time disbursing monies; among other personnel we should allow for secretaries, who maintained the "minutes" (*hypomnemata*) of sittings of the council and perhaps drafted the official documents emanating from the league; also for more humble employees concerned with the maintenance of buildings associated with the league in Athens.

As for the delegates, they were elected by the member-bodies which they represented according to rules of individual eligibility laid down by Hadrian, including a minimum age-limit and the requirement to have held local office before entering the body. This is inferred from a fragmentary inscription that preserves a number of texts, among them judicial questions and appeals from Athens to the emperor Marcus Aurelius. In one of these cases, a Ladicus, son of Polyaenus, was refused a seat on the Panhellenion on the grounds that he was not of legal age and had not held office previously as Hadrian had prescribed. He appealed to the emperor, but

Marcus upheld the decision of the Panhellenic council[117]. As for the number of delegates to which each city was entitled, we do not know the exact number, but it is clear that the membership was not uniformly represented on the council; the number probably depended on the size and greatness of a city or its Greekness compared to other candidates (as was the case with Cyrene and Ptolemais-Barca). Accordingly, some cities sent one Panhellene to Athens, such as Ptolemais-Barca, or more, such as Cyrene (two), and Sparta (at least two and perhaps more)[118].

A number of activities performed by the council are attested in our sources. To begin with, the Panhellenion regulated its own membership. Hadrian's letter to Cyrene suggests that in the early years of the league's existence the archon took a leading part in administering applications for membership, submitting queries to Hadrian himself (l. 6). We can also infer from the decree concerning the admission of Magnesia ad Maeandrum, that the admission procedure also involved the council once it was large enough to function effectively[119].

Among the most important activities of the league was the cult of the emperor, evidenced in Dio[120] and in the inscriptions that mention the priest of the god Hadrian Panhellenios. A monument from Aezanoi, honoring the citizen M. Ulpius Eurycles, reveals that the archon of the Panhellenion wore a crown adorned with busts of the emperors: his had two busts, of Hadrian and Pius[121]. In association with the cult there

---

[117] *SEG* 29.127, plaque II, ll 15-20: Λάδικος Πολυαίνου ὁ ἐκκεκλημένος πρὸς Σωφάνην Σω[φά]/νους ἀπὸ Ἰουλ Δαμοστράτου τοῦ ἄρχοντος τῶν Πανελλήνων φαίνεται κατὰ τὸν ὡρισμένον χρόνο[ν ἤδη]/ἐντὸς οὗ ἔξεστιν δικάζεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς κεχειροτονημένους Πανέλληνας κληθεὶς ἐπὶ τὴν κρίσιν, ἀπ[ελεγ]/χθεὶς δέ, καίτοι μετὰ τὴν νενομισμένην προθεσμίαν τῆς χειροτονίας γεγενημένης, οὔπω τὴν ἔννο[μον]/ἡλικίαν γεγονὼς οὐδὲ τότε καὶ οὐδεμίαν ἀρχὴν πρότερον ἄρξας ὡς ὁ θεὸς πάππος μου ὥρισεν, ἀδίκως [ἐφει]/κέναι [δ]οκεῖ.

[118] Ptolemais-Barca and Cyrene: letter of Hadrian to Cyrene regarding the cities' admission, Reynolds (1978) re-edited by Jones (1996) 47ff; Sparta: *IG* V,1 164.

[119] See above, note 113, l. 2.

[120] Dio Cassius 69.16.2: τόν τε σηκὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ, τὸ Πανελλήνιον ὠνομασμένον, οἰκοδομήσασθαι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἐπέτρεψε, καὶ ἀγῶνα ἐπ' αὐτῷ κατεστήσατο.

[121] Jones (1996) 35.

was a festival, celebrated every four years, the Panhellenia, first attested in 137. The league presumably appointed both the priest of the cult and the *agonothetes* of the festival, posts often-but not invariably-combined with the archonship of the league. Philostratus mentions two of his sophists, Herodes Atticus and Marcus Aurelius Rufus of Perinthos as generous *agonothetes*[122]. Inscriptions mentioning victors at the Panhellenia extend well into the late third century, whereas no text referring to other functions of the council can de dated beyond the first decade of the same century[123].

The Panhellenion orchestrated the offering of honors to the ruling emperor. The most appropriate moment for such a large-scale vote of honors for the emperor was his accession, when Greek cities customarily sent congratulatory embassies to the new ruler. The evidence here comes from the statue-base set up at Thessalonike in honor of Antoninus Pius according to the decree of the Panhellenes[124]. Oliver noted that the Panhellenion, by moderating the conferment of honors in this way, obviated the need for its members to send individual embassies to Pius[125].

The league must also have administered a certain amount of routine expenditure. It is possible that the Panhellenion was able to distribute money to the Athenian ephebes when they participated in celebrations of the Panhellenia[126]. It has also been argued that the institution was in charge of the financial administration of the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis[127]. Presumably the league was also responsible for the maintenance of the premises with which it was associated at Athens and which it owned: the meeting place of the council and the sanctuary of the

[122] Herodes Atticus: *Lives of the Sophists* 549-550; Rufus: *Lives of the Sophists* 597. See also *SEG* 28.97, where Rufus is attested not only as agonothetes but also as archon of the Panhellenion and priest of Hadrian Panhellenios.
[123] Jones (1996) 37-38.
[124] See above note 107.
[125] Oliver (1978) 190.
[126] This is inferred from an observation in an ephebic catalog (*IG* II(2) 2105) dated to 173/4-178/9 that the ephebes did not obtain their part of the distribution on the occasion of the Panhellenia.
[127] Clinton (1997) 175 and note 93.

Panhellenion. The Panhellenion occasionally engaged in the setting up of dedications and even building projects, such as the Hadrianic commemorative arches at Eleusis set up by the Panhellenes in honor of Hadrian and the goddesses[128]. Exceptional expenditure of this kind was probably financed by subscription among the membership or even donations by the emperor.

Such were the activities that were undertaken by the league in its short history. The question that comes up is what was the role of the council in the life of the region? Was it restricted to cultural (such as festivals) and religious activities that united the Greeks around the common traditions and the cult of the emperor? Did it have real political power? What was Hadrian's goal when he founded the league? In answering these questions I will also take into consideration a matter that has troubled modern scholars: how can we explain the limited participation in the council and the absence of the great cities of Asia? These are the issues to which I will now turn.

2.4.4 The Impact of the Panhellenion

So far, we have seen that the activities of the league centered around three subjects: regulation of the admission and function of the league; the cult of the emperor; and the supervision of the Panhellenia games. I believe that none of these activities can be described as political, strictly speaking. Actions such as the setting up of a statue of a Roman official or the conferment of honors to an emperor, as well as monetary contributions to the life of the city were very common in the life of the Greek cities and emanated not only from leagues but also individuals. Therefore, these activities cannot be seen as political. There is no evidence that the Panhellenion ever sent embassies or intervened between quarreling cities, even among the league

[128] See discussion in Clinton (1989) and briefly (1997) 174ff.

itself, or prosecuted a provincial governor (as the Koina of Asia had done), or had rescripts addressed to it, except for those concerned with its own constitution (such as those mentioned above by Marcus Aurelius)[129].

Despite its lack of political authority at a corporate level, at another level, that of the individual, the Panhellenion provided its members with the opportunity of advancing their careers. There is some evidence that service in the Panhellenion was seen as a source of personal prestige. So for example, in the reign of Severus, Geminia Olympias, the daughter of Titus Aelius Geminius, was proud to record that her father had been the first man from the most brilliant city of Thessalonike to become archon of the Panhellenes[130]. For at least three generations service in the Panhellenion offered a prestigious outlet for the *philotimia* of upper-class Greeks; some seventy years after the league's foundation aristocrats from neighboring provinces were still willing to serve in Athens as archons. The league's personnel included magnates from the elites of the Greek cities, who tended to dominate the organization's high offices; but its council also provided an arena for Greeks of lower status[131]. Service in the Panhellenion was considered a career step.

The career of M. Ulpius Eurycles from Aezanoi provides the most obvious example of a Greek who sought to benefit personally from his association with the league. The evidence derives from a series of testimonials written in his favor following his term as Panhellene, which fell in 156. A total of five such testimonials are attested, copies of three of which have survived (they had been inscribed at Aezanoi for public view). Four were composed by the archon and the Panhellenes and addressed respectively to Antoninus Pius, the city of Aezanoi, and (two letters) the

[129] So Jones (1996) 42ff.
[130] *IG* X,2 1 181, ll. 7-9: πρῶτον γε/νόμε̣νον ἄρχοντα Π̣α̣νε̣λλήνων ἀπὸ τῆ̣ς/λ̣α̣μπροτάτης Θεσσα̣λο̣νε̣ικέων πόλεως,
[131] I will return to the class representation in the council in the next chapter.

Asian Koinon; the fifth was addressed to Aezanoi by the Athenian Areopagus[132]. These testimonials provide an insight into what was probably a routine part of the league's activities. They also imply that its recommendation was thought to carry weight among the addressees (including the emperor). Eurycles presumably wished to be drawn to their attention in order to enhance his personal prestige, with a view to his future career. How efficacious they were one cannot say; but one addressee, the Asian Koinon, later twice conferred on Eurycles the post of high priest (the second term falling between 180 and 190). In addition, Eurycles held the post of curator to the Ephesian *gerousia* in 162 or 163, and later the same post at Aphrodisias[133].

For a prospective member of the league there were also the blandishments of a stay in Athens. Not only had the city been provided with splendid new amenities by Hadrian and Herodes Atticus, (the physical appearance of Athens was transformed by gifts of magnificent buildings) but intellectually, culturally, and socially the city became the center of Greece, as she was hostess to delegates coming from at least five provinces, as well as to other Greek notables. The prospect of breathing for a while the cosmopolitan air of Antonine Athens might well have seemed congenial to a Greek from Aezanoi or Cyrene.

Given the limited political role of the Panhellenion, we have to seek its importance at a different level, that of culture. The negligible political role of the Panhellenion has already been underlined above, while the prerequisite of Greekness must not be viewed as an expression of political aspirations or a manifestation of chauvinism. What seems to be Hadrian's plan, I believe, was the "unification" of cities and regions with Greek roots that could advance a sense of Greekness (as it is

[132] See discussion in Spawforth and Walker (1985) 89-90.
[133] Spawforth and Walker (1985) 89-90.

testified by the name "Panhellenion") and focus on cultural activities that were for long common practice in the cities of the East: festivals, games and cult of the emperor. All three were in accordance with standard imperial practice in the region and certainly appealed to the idiosyncrasies of the locals. Therefore we must see the activities of the league as manifestations of widespread cultural phenomena.

The focus on emperor cult, first of Hadrian Panhellenios and then of Hadrian and his successors, is hardly surprising. The Greek East was familiar with the mechanisms of the imperial cult since Augustus (following Hellenistic parallels). The closest equivalent to the Panhellenion's religious activities is found in the Koina of Asia. I will dare to call the Panhellenion a Koinon even though the term was never applied to the league, either in epigraphic sources or modern scholarship. But this is what the Panhellenion really was: a body aspiring to bring together cities of Greek origin (with particular emphasis on Old Greece), with shadowy political authority (limited only to the administration of the body itself), and featuring cultural displays, such as the Panehellenia and the cult of the emperor. It is true that the Panhellenion did not have the political authority that the Asian Koinon had in bringing charges against governors; but besides the fact that no such abuse has been recorded for the second century in the mainland, the political power of the Asian Koinon was not as great. It, too, focused mostly on the administration of the imperial cult and the benefits that accrued from it[134]. As for the notion of Greekness, I contend that this needs to be seen as an expression of Hadrian's emphasis on the role of the Greek mainland and as a response to the expectations of Old Greece, in particular its most glorious cities and peoples, Athens and Sparta, Ionians and Dorians. As I will show

[134] The basic work on the Koina is Deininger (1965). See also the recent discussion of the association of the Koina with the Neokoria in Burrell (2004) 343-358.

now it was the Koinon-character of the Panhellenion and the focus on Old Greece that explains the limited participation in the league.

The absence of the most important cities of Asia Minor, Smyrna, Pergamos, and Ephesos has been attributed by modern scholars to the scarcity of epigraphic evidence[135]. Here I wish to advance a different theory. The limited participation of cities and the absence of the major cities of Asia Minor are not due to the amount of evidence preserved but rather to the function of the Panhellenion as a Koinon of the Greek mainland (though open to cities of proven Greek origin) and to the centrality that Old Greece and in particular Athens had in the organization. The cities of Asia Minor already enjoyed the benefits of hosting the imperial cult, not only of Hadrian but of his predecessors as well, while the competition among the cities for preeminence discouraged cities such as Smyrna from entering a league in which they would have to accept the preeminence of other cities, such as Athens, and play a secondary role.

It is true that the Panhellenion had limited impact on the Greek world. Important cities did not participate; no contemporary Greek author directly mentions the Panhellenion. There is the suggestion that already under Pius not all panhellenes troubled to sit out their whole term in Athens; under Marcus the rules laid down by Hadrian for the eligibility of the Panhellenes had been flouted; in the 170's the institution was in (perhaps temporary) financial straits, to judge from its inability to make its customary distribution to the Athenian ephebes, as we saw above; and by the later second century the Panhellenia were having repeated difficulty attracting professional contestants[136].

[135] So Romeo (2002) 35 and Spawforth and Walker (1985) 81.
[136] Spawforth (1999) 350ff.

Spawforth attempts to explain this and concludes that since the league was imposed by Rome (without it being a Greek initiative) and was a Roman, in particular Hadrianic, scheme we can expect "a certain air of half-heartedness which hangs over it."[137] He even argues that the known limits of the league's membership to Greeks from the mainland and their direct colonies reflect reluctance on Rome's part to permit the permanent union of a large part of the Greek world within an organization administered by the Greeks themselves[138].

Spawforth's last hypothesis is totally unfounded. The character of the Panhellenion, a cultural rather than political organization, is already found in the creation of the Asian Koina, and certainly it did not pose any political danger to the administration of the Empire. On the contrary, I believe, by diverting Greek national feeling, as this is expressed in the prerequisite of Greekness, into cultural and ceremonial channels, Hadrian anticipated any possible tension and dissatisfaction in the region and gave local ambitions a way out through cultural activities. If indeed Rome, meaning the Senate and certain imperial circles, wanted to prevent the membership of a number of Greek cities, this could be done with regard to the cities of Southern Italy and Sicily. Although this is possible, there is no evidence that such a decision was ever taken. As for the senatorial provinces of Achaea and Asia, it is not certain that the Senate found it necessary to intervene.

The absence of major cities from the league must be first attributed to the centrality of Old Greece and Athens in particular. This is an idea that was first

[137] Spawforth (1999) 350ff; also Swain (1996). Cf. Jones (1996) 46: "In the history of Greek culture, (Panhellenion) is an important monument to the Greek sense of self and unity, and to Greek perceptions of imperial power: it is in that history not in the context of Roman benefaction, administration, or political advancement, that it finds its proper setting."
[138] Spawforth and Walker (1985) 81.

expressed by Spawforth, but not really advanced[139]. Hadrian's selection of Athens as the center of the league underlines the preeminence of the city, something that is highlighted in the Thyateiran decree (ll. 14-15). So, I think, it is possible that participation was interpreted by some cities as a form of subordination of one city to another. A survey of the Asiatic cities currently included in the Panhellenic list seems to suggest that it was often the smallest and least relevant communities that claimed pure Greek descent in order to be admitted to that potentially prestigious organization. Against the enthusiasm of, for example, Aezanoi, we should set the indifference of Ephesos, Smyrna and Pergamos. The extreme sensitivity of those proud cities makes it difficult to see their omission as merely a matter of epigraphic preservation[140]. In a world of fierce inter-state rivalries, such institutionalized deference to the Athenians would not necessarily have a wide appeal. It is hardly acceptable that cities of such caliber were content with a place other than the first, particularly in a period when their prestige in terms of political power and cultural production was above that of most Greek cities, if not all of them. The "constitution" of the Panhellenion expresses not horizontal relations between equal cities, but rather vertical relations within which a city that wanted to participate in the Panhellenion had to prove its Greekness with relation to the most important cities of Greece, Athens and Sparta. The center of the Panhellenion was old Greece, particularly Athens and Sparta, and its periphery the mainland's colonies. It was impossible for Smyrna to be at the periphery.

[139] Spawforth (1999) 343.
[140] Their struggle for preeminence in Asia is frequently seen in the literary, epigraphic and numismatic evidence.

As a second reason I suggest the Koinon-function of the Panhellenion. The role of the Panhellenion in the administration of the imperial cult has been acknowledged by modern scholars, but not really examined to its full extent[141]. As was mentioned above the cult was administered by the council and initially focused on the living emperor Hadrian, under the title Hadrian Panhellenios. After the emperor's death the cult included his successor, and evidently evolved into one of the Theoi Sebastoi both living and dead, a familiar pattern in the Greek East. We saw above that the crown of Eurycles bore the images of both Hadrian and Antoninus. Dio also, as I mentioned, informs us of Hadrian's cult: the emperor allowed the Greeks to build in his honor a temple (*sekos*) which was named the Panhellenion and instituted a series of games in connection with it.

Given the current state of the evidence, the cult of the emperor was the most important activity of the league. It is possible that Hadrian intended his worship as a unifying force for the Greeks, especially of the mainland, and built the league around it. The cities of Asia Minor were already deeply involved in the institution of the imperial cult and were enjoying its benefits and the largess of the emperor. Perhaps this can also explain their absence from the league. However, it is a mistake to focus only on cities such as Smyrna, Pergamos, and Ephesos. For example, staying in Asia Minor, we notice that one of the most important cities of Bithynia, Nicaea, was also not a registered member of the Panhellenion. The city had attested Greek roots, and the emperor was familiar with it before he founded the Panhellenion. The city, as most of Bithynia, had been damaged by an earthquake shortly before the emperor's visit in 123-124. Both Nicaea and Nicomedeia were rebuilt with lavish donations

[141] Spawforth (1999) 344ff.

from Hadrian[142]. The good relations with the emperor could guarantee the city a seat in the council, but still its membership is not attested. The reasons for its absence can be the same as for Smyrna above: prestige and earlier possession of a religious-oriented institution similar to the one that Hadrian desired to found on the mainland. It is noteworthy that cities that had held a neokorate before Hadrian, or those that received the neokorate by him were not among the members of the Panhellenion[143].

2.5 Summary

In this chapter I put together the historical context for this study and approached it from two different points of view: that of the Greeks and that of the emperor. First, I examined the political situation of the Greeks of the East in the second century AD as this is portrayed in the works of contemporary authors. By examining this evidence we can create a picture of the thoughts of an ambitious local with regard to his political career in the Roman Empire. We can detect a number of attitudes, mainly a conservative appreciation for the current regime on account of the security and stability it offered with regard to external dangers as well as with regard to the elites' position vis-à-vis the lower classes of the community. At the same time we notice a desire for more political freedom and initiative, as an ambitious magistrate looks beyond the boundaries of his community to a more prestigious position in the imperial administration. This need is combined with a feeling of caution as to the dangers that such an involvement might entail for the community. Finally, a desire not to provoke interference of Roman officials can be detected here.

[142] Birley (1997) 157.
[143] See list in Burrell (2004). The only exception was Miletos, which allegedly received an imperial temple but not neokorate by Gaius. On the evidence see discussion in Burrell (2004) 55ff.

In the second part of this chapter, I identified the basic elements of Hadrian's program for the region. I examined certain aspects of his involvement in the life of the Eastern cities and showed that the emperor was genuinely interested in almost every aspect of their communal life: cultural, political, religious, and economic. Hadrian contributed not only in the form of money donations and building initiatives but also by means of administrative reforms and most importantly by showing his deep and sincere respect for the traditions and culture of the people. I showed that the emperor, during his frequent and long trips in the area, aimed at the support of the locals as he set forth his ambitious plan: that of the unification of the Empire by bringing together its two most distinct elements, Roman and Greek. By gaining the loyalty of the locals the emperor aimed at the cooperation of West and East and the prosperity of the Empire.

Finally, I focused on the institution which has attracted the attention of modern scholars mostly on account of its title rather than its impact on the history of the second and third centuries. I showed that by creating this organization, of which unfortunately we know little, Hadrian aimed at a kind of unification of the Greek cities focusing on cultural rather than political activities. I suggested that the Panhellenion was essentially a manifestation of a tradition long established in Asia Minor, that of a Koinon. I argued that it was the cultural activities of the league and the focus on the cult of the emperor, as well as the central role of Athens and the mainland, that discouraged many from entering the league. In any case, the Panhellenion remains the Hadrianic institution that most clearly reveals its creator's plans to contribute to the renaissance of the region and its participation in his imperial program.

The audience that Hadrian reached through this institution and his other activities in the region is what I will turn to in the next chapter in an attempt to identify whom did Hadrian address and whose support did he seek, when he set forth his program for the region and the Empire.

CHAPTER 3

HADRIAN AND HIS AUDIENCE

3.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter I presented the historical context in which Hadrian and the Greeks came into contact. I also discussed the political expectations of his Greek subjects and I outlined his vision for the region and the empire in general. Here, I will talk about the people that Hadrian addressed in the East: his audience. This is a subject that has not received the attention it deserves in the biographies of the emperor, especially the latest by Anthony Birley. We hear about the emperor, his personality, and his achievements, but we do not really hear about the people he conversed with. This is what I will talk about here: the people Hadrian met and how he met them.

As the only way by which Hadrian came directly into contact with the Greeks was his travels I will first talk about them. This is a necessary step in my overall discussion of his audience as it will set the geographical and chronological context. Based on ancient evidence and recent scholarship I will reconstruct the routes of his long and frequent visits to various places throughout the empire. I will examine the motives for his frequent travels and I will argue that Hadrian desired to strengthen the frontiers of the empire, to secure the loyalty of the legions, and foster his relations with the local populations, aristocrats and common people alike.

As his travels played an important role in advancing his relations with the locals and in promoting his program, I will next discuss the mechanisms of imperial travels focusing on Hadrian but also using material from other emperors. Clifford Ando has already noted the absence of such discussion in Anthony Birley's biography of the emperor[144]. I will show that the visit of the emperor was a major event both for the administration and the provinces he visited: every tour had to be planned well in advance and provisions needed to be made at Rome to facilitate the imperial train. In the provinces, the archons of the cities were notified by the local Roman authorities to be ready to accommodate the emperor and his entourage. Thus, a large number of provisions, food supplies, for men and animals alike, facilities, and temporary constructions had to be in place well before the advent of the emperor. These preparations were often viewed as a burden, but the benefits that could be gained from the emperor's visit were too many to ignore.

Next I will talk about the people Hadrian met in the Greek East and the gains that each side, emperor and Greeks, expected to win. I will focus my discussion on two different groups. On the one hand, local elites and magistrates expected the emperor to solve a number of problems either communal or personal. Financial assistance to the city's treasury or great sanctuary, settling land disputes among cities, and the support of individuals' careers were among issues that the emperor often had to rule on. Of particular importance for the elites was their participation in the local councils and imperial posts in the province, and finally membership in the Roman Senate. Thus, embassies formed of the most prominent citizens of a community visited Rome on a regular basis, and when the emperor visited a city they were the first to request a hearing.

[144] Ando (1998) 184.

On the other hand, a number of people of lower status, residing either in the cities or in the country and even slaves, would look forward to an imperial visit in order to present their case and advance their interests. We can imagine them, along with the elites, as they visited the emperor in his camp, or crowded the house that he settled in, probably of a local aristocrat, or welcomed him as he passed by. In festivals organized by the local magnates, they celebrated his advent. In the theater they praised and blessed him for the gifts they hoped he came to grant them.

As it will become clear in the presentation of the above subjects, whenever Hadrian visited the provinces he was expected to deal not only with the elites and archons of a community, but also common people. It will be more evident then that Hadrian's program did not address only the elites but also the broad population, although, as it is expected, the emperor relied first on the elites' support for the implementation of his program and its subsequent "distribution" to the masses.

3.2 Hadrian's Travels

Synesius of Cyrene, the philosopher-bishop of Ptolemais in Cyrenaica, in a letter to a certain Olympios, contemplates the remoteness of the emperor and the court in the early fifth century[145]. "The names of the emperor and his court", he says "are similar to flames: they rise up to a great height of glory and are then extinguished." In his hometown, there is a silence about these names and "our ears are spared from news of that sort". The writer complains that the only reason that "we know very well (σαφῶς) that there has always been an emperor" is the tax- collectors, "who remind us of this every year. But, who the emperor is," he continues, "it is not very clear. In fact,

[145] Synesius, *Epistle* 148; for other letters to the same individual see letters 45, 96-99 and 133.

some of us" he concludes, "believe that Agamemnon is still on the throne!"[146] The sarcastic tone of the ending lines cannot hide the provincials' dissatisfaction over the indifference and remoteness of the emperor and central administration[147].

It is very unlikely that Synesius would feel this way, had he lived in Hadrian's time. Hadrian was the emperor who honored the provinces with his presence more than anyone else: "hardly any emperor ever traveled with such speed over so much territory" the *Historia Augusta* informs us[148], and later the same text argues "so fond was he of travel, that he wished to inform himself in person about all that he had read concerning all parts of the world."[149]

Besides the scarce literary testimony, traces of Hadrian's presence have survived from the entire empire in the form of statues, buildings erected in his honor and by him, coins depicting his *adventus* and inscriptions commemorating the passage of his entourage through cities and villages. This information was discussed in detail by Halfmann in 1986 (his work remains the fundamental work on imperial travels) but due to the increasing volume of epigraphic information a new study was deemed necessary. This was carried out by A. Birley over a decade later and, although this study is satisfactory, it has become outdated as new evidence has emerged. Therefore, what I present here is largely based on the studies of Halfmann and Birley as well as of other scholars and takes into consideration inscriptions published afterwards[150].

---

[146] ll. 130-141: βασιλεὺς δὲ καὶ βασιλέως φίλοι καὶ δαίμονος ὄρχησις, οἷα δὴ συνιόντες ἀκούομεν, ὀνόματά τινα καθάπερ αἱ φλόγες ἐπὶ μέγα τῆς δόξης ἐξαπτόμενα καὶ σβεννύμενα, ταῦτα δεῦρο ἐπιεικῶς σιγᾶται, καὶ σχολὴ ταῖς ἀκοαῖς τοιούτων ἀκροαμάτων. ἐπεὶ καὶ βασιλεὺς ὅτι μὲν ἀεὶ ζῇ, τοῦτ' ἴσως ἐπίστανται σαφῶς (ὑπομιμνησκόμεθα γὰρ ἅπαν κατ' ἔτος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκλεγόντων τοὺς φόρους)· ὅστις δὲ οὗτός ἐστιν, οὐ μάλα ἔτι τοῦτο σαφῶς, ἀλλ' ἐν ἡμῖν εἰσί τινες οἳ μέχρι καὶ νῦν Ἀγαμέμνονα κρατεῖν ἥγηνται τὸν Ἀτρείδην, τὸν ἐπὶ Τροίαν, τὸν μάλα καλόν τε κἀγαθόν·

[147] See Synesius' *On Kingship* (especially 13ff), addressed to Arcadius, where the author strongly disapproves of the remoteness of the emperor.

[148] *Hadrian* XIII.5: *nec quisquam fere principum tantum terrarum tantum celeriter peragravit*

[149] *Hadrian* XVII.8: *Peregrinationis ita cupidus, ut omnia, quae legerat de locis orbis terrarum, praesens vellet addiscere*

[150] Halfmann (1986) 188- 210; Birley (2003); Dräger (2000).

Accordingly, the current evidence suggests the following route for Hadrian's imperial travels:

117: Antioch- Cilicia- Antioch- Tarsos (October 12th)- Mapsucrene (October 13th)- Panhormos (October 14th)- Aquae Calidae (October 15th)- Tynna (October 16th)- Tyana (October 17th)- Andabalis (October 18th)- Ancyra- Iuliopolis (November 11th)- winter at Nicomedeia and/or Byzantium?

118: Thrace- Moesia Inferior- Dacia- Moesia Superior- Pannonia- Italy- Rome (July 9th)

119: Rome- Campania- Rome

120: Rome

121: Rome- Gaul- Germania Superior- Raetia- Noricum- Raetia- Germania Superior

122: Germania Inferior- Britain- Gaul

123: Gaul: Nemausus- Apta- Spain: Tarraco- Legio- Mauretania Tingitana?- Cyrenaica- Crete?- Side- Aspendos- Perge- Attaleia- Cyprus?- Syria: Antioch- Euphrates- Cappadocia: Neocaesarea- Trapezous- Pontus- Bithynia: Nicomedeia?- Thrace

124: Cyzicus- Ilium- Hadrianutherae- Pergamos?- Thyateira- Saittae- Sardeis- Smyrna- Erythrai- Ephesos- Rhodes- Athens- Eleusis- Megara- Epidauros- Troezen- Hermione- Argos?(December of 124?)

125: Mantineia- Tegea- Sparta- Corinth- Athens (March)- Thespiae- Coronea- Abae- Hyampolis- Delphi- Dyrrhachium (May 20th?)- Sicily- Rome- Tibur (between August 14th and September 12th)- Rome

126: Rome

127: Rome

128: Rome- Sicily- Africa- Numidia: Lambaesis (July 1st)- Zarai (July 7th)- unknown *castellum* (July 12/13th)- Mauretania- Rome- Athens (September)- Sparta- Athens

129: Athens- Eleusis- Ephesos- Miletos- Lycia: Patara- Maeander Valley- Tralleis- Laodiceia on the Lycus (June 29th)- Apameia (July 23rd)- Melissa- Cappadocia- Antioch

130: Antioch- Mt. Cassius- Palmyra- Gerasa- Jerusalem- Gaza (July)- Pelusium- Alexandria- Libyan Desert (September)- Heliopolis- Memphis- Oxyrhynchus- Hermopolis- Antinoupolis (October 30th)- Ptolemais?- Thebes (November 18th-21st)- Oxyrhynchus (November 29th- 30th)- Tebtunis (December 1st)- Alexandria

131: Alexandria- Antinoupolis? (March- April)- Alexandria- Syria- Cilicia- Pamphylia: Phaselis- Ephesos?- Mysia?: Hadrianoi- Hadrianeia?- Athens

132/133(?)/134(?): Athens- Judaea- Athens- Macedonia- Thrace?- Moesia Superior?- Dalmatia?- Pannonia- Italy- Rome

134-138: Italy-Rome-Baiae

We can say with confidence that Hadrian, with the exception of the years during which he remained at Rome and its vicinity (119-120, 126-127, and the final years of his reign), devoted at least half of his reign to the inspection of the provinces and in particular the eastern ones. This was in marked contrast to some of his predecessors (e.g., Augustus, Trajan) and successors (e.g. Marcus Aurelius), who traveled outside of Italy mostly for military reasons. Others remained for most of their reign in the vicinity of the capital (such as Tiberius and Antoninus Pius), while Nero's cultural journey to Greece in 66-67 seems to be the major exception.

A general trait that we can discern here is that Hadrian wished to inspect the provinces of the empire and assess their needs and imperial priorities there. Thus we can explain his travels from 118, on his way to Rome, to 125, when he returned to the capital, during which the emperor inspected almost the entire empire. Specifically speaking, I suggest that there were three main motives for his tours: strengthening of the frontiers of the empire, securing of the loyalty of the legions, and fostering his relations with the local populations. The emperor's inherent curiosity and personal interests, such as the Eleusinian mysteries, certainly played a role in planning his travels.

After he was declared emperor in 117, Hadrian returned to Rome through Asia Minor and the north-eastern provinces in order to present himself to the people and the Senate of Rome. The senatorial body was especially alarmed by the killings that took place shortly after his accession to the throne[151]. According to the biographer, when he returned to Rome, Hadrian appeared before the Senate and tried to clear himself of the blame for what happened, while he promised never to cause harm to any of its members unless the Senate so decided[152].

Soon after, the strengthening of the empire's frontiers became a priority for Hadrian. Accordingly, during his first trip from 121 to 125 Hadrian paid special attention to the borders of the empire. It was in this period that he inaugurated the construction of the British wall (122) as well as of a palisade on the Rhine frontier (121), and there is evidence that he attempted to construct a similar border in

[151] Dio Cassius 69.2.5 and *HA, Hadrian* VII.
[152] *HA, Hadrian* VII.4: *iuravit se numquam senatorem nisi ex senatus sententia puniturum.* cf. Dio Cassius 69.2.4, where he states that the promise was expressed in a letter to a senate rather than by a speech there. It is possible that the emperor, while in Syria, sent a letter to the senatorial body in order to anticipate any hostile move, and on arriving in Rome, appeared before the senators and presented his case.

Northern Africa[153]. To further secure the borders of the empire, Hadrian improved military discipline by example. According to Dio, the emperor so trained and disciplined the army both by his example and his precepts that even in Dio's own days "the methods then introduced by him (Hadrian) are the soldier's law of campaigning."[154]

An even more important motive for Hadrian's first trip as emperor has been largely neglected in modern scholarship: to secure the legions' loyalty. Given the nature of his policy of non-expansion and the fact that with the exception of the Jewish revolt there was no other major conflict during his reign, we may perceive his reported insistence on the discipline of the army both as his interest in maintaining battle-ready legions and as his acknowledgement of their power and role in selecting an emperor and of the need to secure their loyalty. There were plenty of precedents to consider from Nero and later. We know that there were legions in, among others, Germany, Syria, Cappadocia, North Africa, places that the emperor visited in his first

[153] Wall: *HA Hadrian* XI.2. There is a huge bibliography on the Wall. The reader may consult Hill (2004), Breeze and Dobson (2000), and Birley (1997) 123-141; Rhine frontier: Birley (1997) 116. A passage in *HA* may allude to it. The author claims that "in many regions where the barbarians are back not by rivers but by artificial barriers, Hadrian shut them off by means of high stakes planted deep in the ground and fastened together in the manner of a palisade" (*stipitibus magnis in modum muralis saepis funditus iactis atque conexis barbaros separavit*. *Hadrian* XII.6); Africa: Birley (1997) 209. The reader may also consult the useful work on imperial frontiers by Whittaker (1994).

[154] Dio Cassius 69.9.4: συνελόντι τε εἰπεῖν, οὕτω καὶ τῷ ἔργῳ καὶ τοῖς παραγγέλμασι πᾶν τὸ στρατιωτικὸν δι' ὅλης τῆς ἀρχῆς ἤσκησε καὶ κατεκόσμησεν ὥστε καὶ νῦν τὰ τότε ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ταχθέντα νόμον σφίσι τῆς στρατείας εἶναι. See a similar statement in the *HA*, "the emperor incited others by the example of his own military virtue" (*exemplo etiam virtutis suae ceteros adhortatus, Hadrian* X.4*).* cf. M. Cornelius Fronto who saw here a decline in the morale and performance of the army. In his *Principia Historiae,* addressed to the emperor Lucius Verus in 165, he praised the latter's military virtues and compared them to Hadrian's organization of the army (*Princ. Hist*. 10ff-I follow C.R. Haines's Loeb edition). He initially accused Hadrian of giving up the provinces that Trajan had annexed instead of holding them with an army. Moreover, Hadrian entertained his troops with dances rather than with battles and arms, more like a performer and not a general. Fronto also treated with contempt the emperor's travels. Stephen Stertz argued that Fronto had at least three motives for attacking Hadrian: first, as a member of the senatorial order, he disliked Hadrian in the same way that Dio does in his work; second, he seems to have fallen into the tendency of the panegyrist to magnify the current emperor's virtues by denigrating those of an earlier emperor; and finally, it is possible (though not certain) that a reason for his hostility was that, at an uncertain date, he was engaged in a lawsuit in which the Greek intellectual and friend of Hadrian Herodes Atticus was on the opposite side (Stertz (1993) 615).

tour. In fact, his address to the North African legions at Lambaesis, in Numidia, has been preserved on an inscription[155]. Although this took place in 128, we may certainly assume that similar events happened during his first tour. It was important for a new emperor to prove himself a valiant and strong imperator in peace and war and to present to his soldiers evidence of his ability to lead them.

After his accession to the throne, between his departure from Antioch in 117 and until his return to Rome in late 125, Hadrian had visited all the provinces. With the exception of the visit to Lambaesis[156] and its area in 128, when he left Rome for his second trip to the Eastern provinces, Hadrian, to the best of our knowledge, did not again visit the Western provinces and Africa. On the contrary, he turned his attention to the East, where he spent most of the period from 123 to 125 and 128 to 134. Hadrian no doubt wished to meet with his Greeks and bring to conclusion affairs of a personal nature, such as his initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries in 124 and 128, or of a public nature, such as building activities, a proof of his beneficence to Greek populations. In the long term, though, his travels to the Greek East aimed at inspecting the region, estimating its demands and potentials, and fostering his relations with the local populations. The Greek East was an indispensable part of the Empire Hadrian wanted to build, and surely his frequent trips to the region kept alive and warmed his relations with the people.

During his long visits there, it is possible that he came into contact with almost all kinds of people within a community: local dignitaries and aristocracies, merchants, priests, rustic people, and representatives of athletic and religious associations. Before

---

[155] *CIL* 8.2532. See also, for example, his interest in the soldiers as this is manifested in his reply to the Prefect of Egypt, Rummius Martialis, in 119 on the children of soldiers (Oliver (1989) 70).

[156] According to the *HA*, when he came to Africa it rained for the first time in five years and for this he was beloved by the Africans: *quando in Africam venit, ad adventum eius post quinquennium pluit, atque ideo ab Africanis dilectus est* (*Hadrian* XXII.14).

we turn to these people that were his audience, we may take a look at the circumstances in which an imperial visit took place and its impact on the provinces and their people. This discussion will help us understand better the relations between the emperor and the Greeks.

3.3 Imperial Journeys

Communities invested a lot on an embassy to Rome to meet with an emperor, but it was on hearing of an imperial visit that their expectations ran really high. All emperors had an idea of what to expect when they set off on a journey to the provinces[157]. A few examples, both Hadrianic and from other periods of the empire, will suffice to give the picture.

The itineraries of Roman emperors were fixed very early in order to secure the supplies of the emperor and his suite. Dio claims that when Hadrian traveled outside of Rome he never had with him the imperial apparatus[158]. It seems that Dio implies that the emperor traveled as modestly as possible, setting an example to the aristocracy. However, we may assume that Hadrian was accompanied everywhere he went by a large entourage including members of the imperial family, *amici*, secretaries, Roman and Greek intellectuals and aristocrats, not to mention army units and the servants that accompanied them. Dio also states that "both in Rome and abroad he always kept the best men with him."[159] We know, for example, that

[157] Halfmann (1986) remains the best account on the Roman emperors' tours. See also MacCormack (1981) and Millar (1977) 28-40 on the conditions of such journeys and their impact on local communities.
[158] Dio Cassius 69.10.1: περιπορευόμενος τὰς πόλεις, ἄνευ τῆς βασιλικῆς μέντοι παρασκευῆς· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔξω τῆς Ῥώμης ἐχρήσατό ποτε αὐτῇ.
[159] Dio Cassius 69.7.3: ἀεί τε περὶ ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ καὶ ἔξω τοὺς ἀρίστους εἶχε.

Polemon, the sophist from Laodiceia, accompanied Hadrian on his travels in the East in 124 as the sophist himself reveals in his work *De Physiognomonia*[160].

The impact that the size of the imperial train had on the provincials is evidenced in a letter from a village secretary to the *strategos* of the district of Oxyrynchus in Egypt. Some eight months before Hadrian visited Egypt in the summer of 130, on December 19th of the previous year (129), the local official had to make a list of the provisions stored for the "presence of the greatest emperor Hadrian!"[161] Apparently the village officials had been ordered some time before to take measures and to give a detailed list to the *strategos*, probably from time to time. The provisions included, among other things, 3000 bundles of hay, 372 sucking pigs, and 200 sheep[162]. Extra supplies of barley were evidently being collected at the end of the following May, as an ostrakon fragment suggests[163]. Halfmann infers from the quantities mentioned on the papyrus fragment that there were at least 5000 persons in Hadrian's entourage[164]. However, as Birley rightly has pointed out[165], Halfmann did not consider how many days' supplies might be involved, nor did he take into consideration local visitors who came to greet the emperor.

This is an example of what must have happened all over the empire in places the emperor was expected to visit. It is true then that for the cities the emperor's travels involved a heavy economic burden. The disapproval with which Suetonius treats Tiberius' repeatedly abortive travels is characteristic. The emperor, according to

---

[160] *De Physiognomonia* 12v.20: *etenim aliquando regem maximum comitabar*. See Halfmann (1986) 245-253 on a list of imperial *comites*.
[161] ll. 4-8: γραφὴ τῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος μέ/χρι εἰκάδος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος μηνὸς/ Χοιὰκ ἡτοιμασμένων πρὸς παρου/σίαν τοῦ μεγίστου Αὐτοκράτορος/ Καίσαρος Τραιανοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ.
[162] The papyrus is published by Van Groningen (1957).
[163] Published by Sijpesteijn (1969), who on page 116 mentions two other ostraka that report the receipt of barley supplied in connection with the emperor's visit.
[164] Halfmann (1986) 110.
[165] Birley (2003) 437, note 73.

Suetonius, rarely traveled during his reign. “Yet” he says, “he often announced that he would revisit the provinces too and the armies, and nearly every year he made preparations for a journey by chartering carriages and arranging for supplies in the free towns and colonies. He even allowed a person to make vows for his safe voyage and return, so that finally everybody jokingly gave him the name of Callippides, who was proverbial among the Greeks for running without getting ahead a cubit’s length.”[166] Apparently, the emperor was compared to the comic actor, famous for his imitation of a runner who never moved from the same spot[167]. The economic burden of an imperial visit on a community was a matter that raised the skepticism and often the dissatisfaction of people[168].

However great the cost was, cities and in particular their leading men were preparing embassies, festivals, and monuments such as city gates or triumphal arches, to please the imperial family and receive benefits from it. Such an initiative can be seen, for example, in the case of Males from Palmyra. In a bilingual text, in Greek and Palmyrian, the city honored Males, who was for the second time *grammateus* of the city when Hadrian visited the area in 130. During the emperor’s visit, Males, provided food for the citizens and visitors alike and saw to the reception of the army that accompanied the emperor[169]. A similar case is witnessed in Ancyra, in Galatia. The city erected a statue in honor of Latinia Kleopatra, daughter of Latinius Alexandros,

---

[166] *Tiberius* 38: *quamuis prouincias quoque et exercitus reuisurum se saepe pronuntiasset et prope quotannis profectionem praepararet, uehiculis comprehensis, commeatibus per municipia et colonias dispositis, ad extremum uota pro itu et reditu suo suscipi passus, ut uulgo iam per iocum "Callippides" uocaretur, quem cursitare ac ne cubiti quidem mensuram progredi prouerbio Graeco notatum est.*

[167] The same proverb is found in Cicero, *Epist. Ad Atticum* 13.12.2.

[168] See for example, Philo’s account on Gaius’ prospective visit to Syria (which in fact did not take place) in *On the Embassy to Gaius* 33.252-253, or Dio Cassius’ complaint of Caracalla’s burdensome journey (77.9.5-7).

[169] *Sanct.Baalshamin* III 55, 44, side A, ll. 1-10: [ἡ βουλὴ καὶ] ὁ δῆ[μος]/ Μαλην τὸν καὶ Ἀγρίππα[ν]/ Ιαραιου τοῦ Ραιου, γραμμ[α]/τέα γενόμενον τὸ δεύτε/ρον ἐπιδημίᾳ θεοῦ Ἀδρ[ι]/ανοῦ, ἄλιμμα παρασχό[ν]/τα ξένοις τε καὶ πολείτα[ις],/ ἐν πᾶσιν ὑπηρετήσαντα/ τῇ τ[ῶν] στρατευμάτων/ ὑπο[δοχ]ῆ ……..

who among other magistracies distributed supplies to the city population on the occasion of Hadrian and his armies' passing through the city[170].

Once the emperor entered a populated area, he was immediately surrounded by a group of people not only from the area but also all neighboring districts. The emperor became the object of petitions and requests on a variety of matters from individuals and cities alike. A vivid image of the fervor with which the local populations rushed to hail the imperial train is nicely given in a later source, Mamertinus' *Panegyricus* of Maximian. The author relates the journey of Diocletian and Maximian to meet at Mediolanum in the winter of 290/291. As soon as Maximian crossed the Alps and came closer and closer, the people began to recognize him, and "all the fields were filled not only with men running forth to see but even with flocks of beasts leaving their distant pastures and woods; farmers rushed about among each other, told everyone what they had seen, altars were ignited, incense placed among them, libations of wine were poured, sacrificial victims slain, everything glowing with joy, everyone danced and applauded, to the immortal gods praises and thanks were sung."[171]

The advent of the emperor caused unprecedented hope, and people, regardless of age, gender or class, rushed through the fields and crowded the roads to welcome the emperor. Organized embassies and individual petitioners arrived not only from the

---

[170] *Bosch, Quellen Ankara* 141, 117, ll. 8-12: ἐπὶ <τ>ῆ τοῦ μεγίστου/ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τραιανοῦ/ Ἀδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ παρόδῳ καὶ τῶν/ ἱερῶν αὐτοῦ στρατευμάτων δόντος/ διανομὰς τῇ πόλει……..

[171] *Panegyricus* XI (III) 10.5: *ut vero propius propiusque coepti estis agnosci, omnes agri oppleti non hominibus modo ad visen dum procurrentibus sed etiam pecudum gregibus remota pascua et nemora linquentibus, concursare inter se agricolae, nuntiare totis suis visa, area incendi, tura poni, vina libari, victimae caedi, cuncta gaedio calere, cuncta plausibus tripudiare, dis immortalibus laudes grotesque cantari*. See also the enthusiasm and the expectation of relief from heavy taxation with which Constantine was received in Autun in 311: *miratus es, imperator, unde se tibi tanta obviam effunderet multitude, cum solitudinem ex vicino monte vidisses. Omnes enim ex agris omnium aetatum hominess convolaverunt…..* (*Anonymi Panegyricus* V (VIII) 8.1ff) (See C.E.V. Nixon and B. Saylor Rodgers*, In Praise of Later Roman Emperors. The Panegyrici Latini*, Berkeley 1994 for these and other Latin texts of this kind).

region he settled in, but also from all over the empire. The petitioners could indeed overcome distance and financial obstacles in order to see the emperor and consult him. People saw an opportunity to present their individual and collective issues and were not willing to miss it. The passage of the imperial train was also viewed as a kind of spectacle and certainly the locals felt proud to witness it. We may assume that a similar atmosphere took place wherever Hadrian happened to visit.

In light of these remarks, little surprises us what Dio reports regarding the earthquake that struck Antioch when Trajan was there in 114/5. According to the author, not only was Trajan passing the winter there, but also many soldiers and a vast crowd of embassies and individuals who came there from all over the world on business or just for the spectacle. As that was the case, when the earthquake hit, there was not a race or a city that escaped the disaster, but on the contrary the whole world under Roman sway suffered[172].

Of course, Dio exaggerates when he speaks of the entire world being hit by the earthquake, and certainly Trajan assembled his troops for the war with Parthia, but this does not mean that people from all the area did not gather there on account of the emperor's presence. It is evident, therefore, that wherever Hadrian went, a huge crowd was waiting for him: the local Roman authorities, the governor or any other official, as well as representatives of the military, and a crowd of soldiers; local and foreign dignitaries and aristocrats, individually or in embassies; common people from the city or the country who came to witness the spectacle, or present their case; priests, presidents of guilds, religious and athletic associations; a number of choruses

[172] Dio Cassius 68.24.1-2: διατρίβοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ σεισμὸς ἐξαίσιος γίνεται· καὶ πολλαὶ μὲν ἔκαμον πόλεις, μάλιστα δὲ ἡ Ἀντιόχεια ἐδυστύχησεν. ἅτε γὰρ τοῦ Τραϊανοῦ ἐκεῖ χειμάζοντος, καὶ πολλῶν μὲν στρατιωτῶν πολλῶν δὲ ἰδιωτῶν κατά τε δίκας καὶ κατὰ πρεσβείας ἐμπορίαν τε καὶ θεωρίαν πανταχόθεν συμπεφοιτηκότων, οὔτε ἔθνος οὐδὲν οὔτε δῆμος οὐδεὶς ἀβλαβὴς ἐγένετο, καὶ οὕτως ἐν τῇ Ἀντιοχείᾳ πᾶσα ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ ὑπὸ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις οὖσα ἐσφάλη. See Millar (1977) 38-39 for more examples of this kind.

to welcome the imperial train. All these rushed forth hoping to meet him in person, converse with him, present their case and advance their interests. It is this crowd that Hadrian met in his long and frequent journeys. These people became his audience as he promoted his program in the region, and to them I will now turn my attention.

3.4 Hadrian and his Greek Subjects

It is evident from the above that Hadrian, when he visited the Greek East, expected to deal with all social strata of the region and give answers to a variety of issues, communal and private. Some cities entrusted their petitions to prominent figures of the province, such as Smyrna to Polemon, who as we saw accompanied Hadrian in his travels. In the spirit of competition between the leading cities of mainland Greece and Asia, the communities had to select their best men to represent them. Polemon was able to win for Smyrna huge favors from the emperor: among them, ten million drachmas for the construction of a grain-market and a gymnasium, and a second neocoria. In the contest with Ephesos and Miletos, Smyrna could momentarily appear as Hadrian's favorite city thanks to Polemon's efforts. Cities presented their case, ranging from the need for financial support to the settlement of land disputes. Hadrian, as most emperors, was often called upon to settle land disputes around the empire[173].

Large and small cities alike were struggling to attract Hadrian's interest. Even the otherwise unknown κώμη of Kaparanaia in southern Samaria set up a dedication to the gods for the safety of Hadrian, "the father of *patris*, the savior and benefactor of

[173] For the emperor's role in fixing the boundaries between cities see Millar (1977) 435ff and 328ff for a number of Hadrianic examples.

the world and the village of Kaparanaia."[174] Although it is uncertain whether Hadrian had visited the small village when he crossed Judaea in 130, it is possible that the archons of the community thought it necessary to remind the emperor of their existence and perhaps sent an embassy to him, no doubt including its best members. In this case, the inscription in question, as the editor of the text argues too, may have been set up not in the village itself, but somewhere in its vicinity, where Hadrian was expected to pass. As to the gift that they might have received from the emperor, there is no concrete evidence that there ever was one, but it is possible that they had actually benefited from Hadrian's *Lex de rudibus agris*, which had accorded permanence of occupation to tenants who had proved themselves good farmers[175].

The correspondence between the cities and the emperor can give us a glimpse into the relations between the emperor and local authorities[176]. As was customary, soon after the accession of a new emperor the cities sent an embassy to him, if they could afford one, or a letter, by which they hailed the new *princeps* and expressed their warm wishes and the sentiments of joy that filled them on the announcement of his accession. It was then the emperor's turn to make a move. In one case, Hadrian replied in 118 to an embassy sent by the city of Delphi on his accession. Hadrian praised the archons for the antiquity of their city, for celebrating his reign, and praying for his well- being. As a result, he concluded, "I guarantee your freedom,

[174] *SEG* 44.1361: [θ]εοῖς Ὀλυμπίοις ὑπὲρ σωτηρί/[α]ς Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρο<ς> Τραια/νοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ/ πατρὸς πατρίδος τοῦ/ σωτῆρος καὶ εὐεργέ/του <τοῦ> κόσμου καὶ κώμης/ Καπαραναίας. See similar dedications by *the inquilini vici Lartidiani* in Italy (*AnnEph* 1977.200) or by the Roman citizens who dwelt (temporarily) in the Numidian *vicus Haterianus* south-west of Carthago (*CIL* 8.23125).

[175] So the ed. pr. Di Segni (1994) 584.

[176] A very good account of the correspondence of the Roman emperors is given by Oliver (1989), in particular nrs 57-122, 164-166, 241-242, 283 on Hadrian; see also Martin (1982) which includes most of the texts presented by Oliver. However, he limits his sources to Greek epigraphic and papyrological evidence. Therefore, one should also consult Alexander (1938) who includes many Latin inscriptions as well as letters mentioned in Justinian's *Digesta*.

autonomy and all grants given to you by Trajan."[177] The city was in all probability familiar with the new emperor during his stay in Greece a few years earlier and on hearing the news of his accession, put together an embassy of its best people in order to congratulate him and ask confirmation of the privileges bestowed to it by Trajan. Such an act was quite customary and in accordance with the "diplomacy" of the era. Cities all over the Greek world rushed to congratulate the new emperor, introduce themselves and win his favor[178].

The selection and dispatch of embassies to the emperor was an established and familiar function for the cities and participation in them was viewed as an opportunity to gain prestige and perhaps some personal benefits directly from the emperor. Plutarch, speaking of the few opportunities left for distinction in city life, says "there remain lawsuits on behalf of the city and embassies to the emperor, which require a man who is ardent, bold and intelligent."[179] But embassies are also viewed as a burden to be avoided, as when Plutarch considers one of the compensations of exile the fact that a man did not find himself compelled by his city to make contributions, to go on

[177] *FD III* 4.301, ll. 3-10: ὐ[μεῖς μὲν ἐπηγγείλατέ μοι τὰ τῆς πό]/λεως π[ρεσβεῖα το]ῖς παρ' ὑμῶν ἐπεσταλμέ̲ν̲[οις γράμμασιν, ἐγὼ δὲ ὑμᾶς ἐπαινῶ]/ [ὅτι μὲν ὑφ' ὑμῶν ὦ]δε ἡ ἀρχαιότης καὶ ἡ εὐγέ̲ν̲[εια τῆς πόλεως τῆς ὑμετέρας]/ [ἀνεμνήσθη μοι], οὐχ ἥκι[στ]α δὲ ὅτι φανερὰ̲ν̲ [ἀπεδείξασθε τὴν πρὸς ἐμὲ προθυ]/[μίαν ὑμῶν συνηδόμ]ενοι μὲν ἐπὶ τῷ διαδέξ[ασθαί με τὴν πατρῴαν ἀρχήν, τὸν]/ δὲ θεὸν δ[οῦναί μοι πάντα] ἀγαθ[ὰ] παρακαλοῦντε[ς. δι' ὃ τῆς ὑμετέρας πόλεως τήν]/ τε ἐλευθε[ρίαν καὶ τὴν αὐ]τονομίαν κα̲ὶ̲ τὰ̲[ς ὑμῖν πάλαι συγκεχωρημένας]/ δωρεὰς β[εβαιῶ καὶ τὰ δοθέν]τα καὶ ὑπὸ̲ τ̲οῦ̲ [θεοῦ Τραιανοῦ πρεσβεῖα].

[178] See, for example, Hadrian's reply in 117/118 to the archons of the small island of Astypalaia who sent him an embassy on his accession. The emperor assures them that he is aware of their joy (καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ψηφίσματ[ος ὑμῶν]/ [ἔμαθον] ὅπως ἥσθητε διαδεξαμέν[ου ἐμοῦ]/ [τὴν πατ]ρῴαν ἀρχήν, ll. 7-9), and as it is expected in such cases he guarantees their freedom ([καὶ εἰ ἀλ]ηθῶς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ὑ[μῖν ὁ]/[πατήρ μου ἔδωκεν, αὐτὴν κατακυρώσας — —] ll. 10-11), (*IG* XII,3 175).

[179] *Political Advice* 805a: νῦν οὖν ὅτε τὰ πράγματα τῶν πόλεων οὐκ ἔχει πολέμων ἡγεμονίας οὐδὲ τυραννίδων καταλύσεις οὐδὲ συμμαχικὰς πράξεις, τίν' ἄν τις ἀρχὴν ἐπιφανοῦς λάβοι καὶ λαμπρᾶς πολιτείας; αἱ δίκαι τε λείπονται αἱ δημόσιαι καὶ πρεσβεῖαι πρὸς αὐτο κράτορα ἀνδρὸς διαπύρου καὶ θάρσος ἅμα καὶ νοῦν ἔχοντος δεόμεναι.

embassies to Rome, to give hospitality to the governor, or to accept liturgies. "Any reasonable person", he concludes, "will choose, instead, exile on a small island."[180]

3.4.1 Elites and Hadrian

The role of local elites in these embassies and other contacts with the emperor was twofold: on the one hand, they represented their city or their clientele by whom they had been entrusted with the task of reaping benefits for them (security of the area, regularization of taxation, solution to a land dispute, economic assistance, and building plans were, among others, requested on behalf of the city; judgment on a personal problem, support for future plans, advancement of career were the expectations of one's clientele). A positive outcome would certainly gain for the elites the appreciation of the community and the gratefulness of their clients, whose support would increase. It is also possible that more people would join their clientele.

On the other hand, in what concerns us here, the aristocrat who came into contact with the emperor certainly sought personal benefits in addition to those for his community and/or his clientele. As I will now suggest, Hadrian in his dealings with local aristocrats was often expected to answer to the latter's request for, first, support in advancing a political career within the limits of the community and the region, and also access to regional imperial offices; second, quite frequently, requests for personal financial assistance on account of the burdensome liturgies or immunity from them; and finally, entry into the Roman Senate.

---

[180] *On Exile* 602c: καὶ πατρίδα μὴ περισπῶσαν μὴ ἐνοχλοῦσαν μὴ προστάττουσαν ‘εἰσένεγκε, πρέσβευσον εἰς Ῥώμην, ὑπόδεξαι τὸν ἡγεμόνα, λειτούργησον. ἂν γὰρ τούτων τις μνημονεύῃ φρένας ἔχων καὶ μὴ παντάπασι τετυφωμένος, αἱρήσεται καὶ νῆσον οἰκεῖν φυγὰς γενόμενος Γύαρον ἢ Κίναρον. I will return later to the financial burdens that offices involved and the aristocrats' attempts to avoid them.

3.4.1.1 Participation in local administration

In both the Greek cities and the Roman colonies of Achaea and Asia Minor aristocrats promoted themselves inside their community and sought to extend their influence and prestige beyond this[181]. In what concerns us here, the elites of the Greek cities were equally interested in their participation in the local councils and their promotion to provincial imperial offices. Aristocratic Greeks wanted a political life wherein their decisions could be seen to affect people's lives, since they saw this as their inherited prerogative. Recognizing the limits of the *polis*, aristocrats competed with each other within the city and the province in gaining preeminence and constructing ties with their Roman counterparts. The circle was a closed one, and only wealth or education could allow entry.

Ties of patronage played an important role in the relationship between the emperor, Roman elites and Greek subjects[182]. Within the community, common people reached out to the wealthy seeking short-or-long-lasting benefits. The same persons often appealed directly to the local Roman authorities, presenting their problems and requesting solutions. Sometimes they approached an imperial *legatus* or even the emperor and his train if by some chance he happened to pass through their city or the nearby area.

Euergetism and patronage linked the demos to the elite class and the latter to the Roman officials and the imperial family. Therefore, patronage links or alliances with members of the Roman ruling elite were deliberately sought by the local

[181] See Rizakis (2001) on the participation of indigenous elites in the administration of the Roman colonies of Achaea.

[182] The subject of patronage is huge and cannot be dealt with within the limits of this study. On patronage in the Roman Empire see the seminal work of Saller (1982). Also Eilers (2002) on patronage in the late republic and early empire with special emphasis on the Greek East; more specifically see the study of Tobin (1997) on Herodes Atticus. On the related topic of euergetism see Veyne (1990).

aristocrats[183]. As C. Ando nicely puts it, "where cities could compete-indeed, where the fact of Roman power required them to compete- was in the contest for Roman esteem: a contest conducted through behavior and language, and drawing upon sentiments and aspirations, that were themselves long familiar. If, prior to the coming of Rome, Ephesos had boasted its preeminence in Asia, in the late first century AD it measured and advertised its preeminence by the tokens of Roman favor."[184] Cities and individuals, Roman officials and the emperor were expected to play their role in this atmosphere of patronage and competition.

Susan Alcock has underlined the role of the Greek landscape in the strengthening of the bonds between Roman and Greek elites. She argues that Greece attracted Romans not solely as a land of history and glory, but also as a place where they could spend time pleasurably, especially in the company of their elite provincial counterparts[185]. For Greek and Roman aristocrats alike, Greece was certainly a place that could inspire *otium* and offer an escape from the cares of the world. Both the large cities and smaller communities could offer suitable retreats for visiting Romans and members of the native aristocracy. Plutarch tells us, for example, how the city of Aidepsos could offer the opportunity for the pursuit of leisure and relaxation[186]. Through these paths, and also by winning the favor of Roman authorities and the emperor, elites held hopes for advancing to offices and even receiving Roman citizenship.

---

[183] See Plutarch' advice on seeking the patronage of a Roman official in *Political Advice* 814c discussed in detail in the previous chapter.
[184] Ando (2000) 132.
[185] Alcock (1993) 224.
[186] *Quaestiones Convivales* 667c: πολλοὶ γὰρ ἀφικνοῦνται τὴν ὥραν αὐτόθι καὶ συνουσίας ποιοῦνται μετ' ἀλλήλων ἐν ἀφθόνοις πᾶσι καὶ πλείστας περὶ λόγους ὑπὸ σχολῆς διατριβὰς ἔχουσι. Cf. also 723a: ἅπαξ δὲ τοὺς μάλιστα φίλους καὶ φιλολόγους οἴκοι δεχομένου καὶ αὐτοὶ παρῆμεν.

These elites were a key structural element in Roman provincial rule and could not be ignored. Therefore, Rome, in laying out its imperial strategies, largely depended upon the co-operation of local power networks. These elites were, among other things, the arbiter of the degree and nature of land use, the survival of cities, the patronage or abandonment of the less fortunate, the securing of taxation and regional stability. In return, those classes which remained faithful to Rome could normally rely upon Rome's assistance in maintaining their position vis-à-vis the rest of the population and in acquiring access to the administration.

A number of examples illustrate elite's demand for administrative positions within the community and the province. The composition of the Panhellenion council can be the starting point[187]. According to current evidence, almost all the senior officers of the league- the archons, antarchons, agonothetai and priests- can be identified as Roman citizens. The high officers of the Panhellenion can be defined socially as members of the leading families of their home cities: they belonged to the same stratum of provincials which provided Rome with its intake of eastern knights and senators. On the other hand, although the possession of equestrian status is assured for few archons, no archon can be identified as an active Roman senator. Spawforth and Walker suggest, and it is possible, that the chief executive post in the Panhellenion tended to be held by notables whose own careers, as opposed to those of kinsmen, had not taken them into the Senate[188].

On the other hand, of 25 known councilors, about half of them were not Roman citizens. Since, by the Antonine period, the leading families of Greek cities usually possessed Roman citizenship[189], the fact that over half the known Panhellenes

[187] For a detailed discussion of the subject see Spawforth and Walker (1985) 86ff.
[188] Spawforth and Walker (1985) 87.
[189] On the Roman citizenship see Sherwin-White (1973) and also Buraselis (1989).

were *peregrini* suggests in itself that the council was by no means dominated by the narrow social stratum which supplied the high officers of the league. Moreover, as the authors state (p. 88), some of them do not seem to be among the leading families or especially rich. Thus a number of the Spartan delegates cannot be connected with the city's leading families, or with tenure of the posts particularly associated with the local elite (such as the eponymous patronomate, the gymnasiarchy and agoranomate, the priesthoods and the position of *bouagos* in the ephebic training[190]), while their wealth does not seem to be especially great.

It has also been noted that some of the league's personalities were men of culture[191]. So, the Panhellenes C. Curtius Proclus, A. Maecius Faustinus and Dionysius son of Hermogenes are styled "rhetors" in honorific inscriptions. Also the archon Antiochus qui et Synesius, was head of the Museum at Athens, the agonothetes Rufus a famous sophist, and certainly Herodes Atticus. It seems that culture or education were qualities especially appreciated among the Panhellenes. Thus Flavius Amphicles was a former student of sophistic rhetoric under Herodes Atticus and Eurycles of Aezanoi was praised by the Athenian Areopagus for (among other things) "concerning himself with *paideia*" during his term at Athens. However, the league did not seem to have been a forum of Greek intellectuals as such. They did not dominate its milieu, to judge from the surviving evidence, and men such as Eurycles should be better considered as Greeks active in political life.

It is clear from the case of the Panhellenion that local aristocrats, and also people of lower status, were highly ambitious with regard to the entry into political bodies. As we saw earlier the Panhellenion itself was not a political body as such, but

[190] As it was noted in the previous chapter (p. 48), one of the requirements for participation in the Panhellenion council was that the delegate had to have held office in his native city.
[191] Spawforth and Walker (1985) 88.

it provided its members with an opportunity to promote themselves, as in the case of Eurycles. Local magistrates and ambitious individuals competed with each other for positions that could advance their career and enhance their prestige in their community and in the eyes of Roman officials.

This desire for participation in the political councils of the Greek cities can be seen in the cases of Lucius Erastos and Philokyrios. In 124 Hadrian, in his first great tour of the provinces, sailed from Ephesos to Rhodes. A number of ships accompanied the emperor, among them two under the commands of the Ephesian captains, Erastos and Philokyrios, who along with other captains transported other members of the entourage and necessary supplies. A few years later, in 129, the same captains accompanied the imperial fleet carrying Hadrian as he sailed from Eleusis to Ephesos. In two almost identical letters to the council and the magistrates of Ephesos, Hadrian asked that the two men be made councilors[192]. The captains, the emperor informed the Ephesians, claimed to be Ephesian citizens, to have sailed across the sea repeatedly, to have benefited their fatherland by their occupation and to have transported local magistrates many times. Apparently the two captains operated in the Aegean Sea and especially on the routes between the Greek mainland and Asia Minor. Hadrian underlined the fact that both captains had been in his service twice in 124, sailing out to Rhodes, and again in 129, sailing in from Eleusis. Each man wished to be councilor (εὔχεται δὲ βουλευτὴς γενέσθαι). Hadrian endorsed their application and promised to pay the necessary fee a councilor pays upon entry.

Although the two men do not seem to have belonged to the city's elite, and to have been of moderate wealth, they made use of their service to the emperor and sought to advance in the politics of their city by participating in the Ephesian boule.

[192] *IEph* 1487 (Erastos) and 1488 (Philokyrios).

3.4.1.2 Relief from the economic burdens of office

I think that the reverse process, of avoiding offices, was another reason many local magistrates and aristocrats looked forward to the emperor's visit. It has been observed that throughout the empire municipal elites were declining in numbers and becoming impoverished by the constant financial pressures of office and the demands of civic euergetism. As Peter Garnsey argues, local office had lost its appeal by the late second century due to the mounting costs of government, external interference in city administration, and a decline in local prosperity[193]. Local office that in the early Empire carried enough prestige and privilege to compensate for the expenditures it entailed was not viewed as such anymore. Wealthy citizens were required to perform local services and at the same time to maintain the role of *euergetes* not only in their home town but also in the entire region. There were members of the local councils who simply could not afford to hold magistracy, perform a liturgy, or be sent to an embassy, when their turn came to do so. As a consequence, many members of the local upper classes were unwilling to perform a service. In the early empire, service in the local council of a city was both voluntary and sought-after; but, by the third century it was often compulsory, to be avoided if possible. Severus, for example, in one of his rulings on the repetition of office, reported by Paulus in the *Digesta,* makes a distinction between unwilling and willing office-holders[194].

That the problem was identified already in the early second century is evident from a number of sources of Hadrianic date. In one of them, a letter of Hadrian to the city of Aphrodisias in 125, Hadrian replied to an official request regarding the funding of the city's aqueduct and the unwillingness by a number of citizens to serve as high

[193] Garnsey (1998) 3.
[194] *Dig.* 50.1.18 (*Ad municipalem et de incolis*): *Divus severus rescripsit intervalla temporum in continuandis oneribus invitis, non etiam volentibus concessa, dum ne quis continuet honorem.*

priests of the imperial cult[195]. In his reply the emperor refers the matter to the city council to examine whether those individuals were unable to undertake the liturgy and were evading it, or were telling the truth (ll. 32-35). That the reason of their reluctance was certainly economic becomes clear in the next line: "if, however, some of them", the emperor continues, "were to appear to be better off, it is fair that they should hold the high priesthood first" (ll. 35-36). Apparently, some citizens invoked their financial disability, whether real or not, in order to avoid the magistracy.

Additional evidence of a financial crisis among the elites is seen in Hadrian's rulings preserved in the *Digesta*. In one of them, cited by Callistratus, Hadrian sent a rescript on the repetition of liturgies. The emperor is reported to have answered a request regarding a liturgy that "if there are no men suitable for the performance of this liturgy, others should be appointed from among those who have performed it already."[196] It is obvious that the city was unable to man its own magistracies by its own men either because their number was limited or some of them were in financial strains. The prospective office holders were unable to respond to their community's call and in all probability their further decline could be arrested only if they were excused from magistracies and liturgies, at least for the immediate future.

Indeed, some of them were already facing bankruptcy. Ulpian reports the answer given by Marcus and Verus to a certain Aufidius Herrenianus[197]. The two emperors had to decide whether or not debtors to the state could undertake office. They replied that certainly state-debtors cannot take up magistracies, unless, of course, they have first made reparation for the debt they owed. "But", the passage

---

[195] Reynolds (2000) = *SEG* 2000.1096, inscribed on a single stone along with three other letters of the same emperor to the city.
[196] *Dig*. 50.4.16.4 (*De muneribus et honoribus*): *illud consentio, ut, si alii non erunt idonei qui hoc munere fungantur, ex his, qui iam functi sunt, creentur.*
[197] *Dig*. 50.4.6.1 (*De muneribus et honoribus*).

continues, "as state-debtors we should regard only those left in debt as a result of an administrative office. Those who are not debtors as a result of office but have borrowed money from the state are not so placed that they should be prevented from holding magistracies."[198] As Peter Garnsey points out, we cannot be sure whether the differentiation of two kinds of debtors is that of Ulpian or is based on this and/or other rulings[199]. In any case, the passage is revealing of the financial condition of some aristocratic families drained by the responsibilities of an office.

The reaction of the emperor to this problem could usually take two forms. First, that of direct financial assistance to the petitioner himself or to the entire city. There was always the danger that lack of money, which meant lack of expenditure on the part of the governing classes- for instance, on building, patronage, food distributions- could lead to the decline of this class and lack of incentives for residence within the community. This could dangerously affect the socio-political conditions of a city, alter the spatial geography of the region, and create instability in the province unless the central government reacted. I believe that Hadrian and other Roman emperors found it to be in the empire's best interest to react immediately and prevent this from happening, and it is possible that Hadrian in his frequent contacts with the locals attempted to do so.

The second form of reply could be that of the temporary exemption from an office or the permanent immunity from it. There was a particular group of people who were granted immunity quite often: philosophers, orators, grammarians, doctors, men of culture. Hadrian's alleged incidents with intellectuals and his relations with men of

---

[198] *sed eos demum debitores rerum publicarum accipere debemus, qui ex administratione rei publicae reliquantur: ceterum si non ex administratione sint debitores, sed mutuam pecuniam a re publica acceperint, non sunt in ea causa, ut honoribus arceantur.*
[199] Garnsey (1998) 7.

culture are topics much discussed in the sources[200]. An intellectual himself[201], Hadrian was prone to accept their requests and grant them privileges. Intellectuals had been exempted from taxes and liturgies by Trajan; orators, grammarians, and doctors as early as Vespasian[202]. Hadrian further extended these exemptions by an edict immediately after his accession. This decision is quoted in a letter of Antoninus Pius and exempts the above categories from, among other things, the offices of *gymnasiarchia, agoranomia*, priesthoods, and embassies[203].

However, it seems that this privilege must have been taken up on a greater scale than had been anticipated, and so his successor, Antoninus, perhaps on the invitation of the local authorities, imposed some limitations. In a letter addressed to the Koinon of Asia, but referring to the whole of the empire, the cities are asked to set limits on the number of the permanent exemptions: the largest cities, for example, could excuse from liturgies ten doctors, five orators, and an equal number of grammarians. Smaller cities could excuse even less. "Not even the largest city is allowed to exceed this number" (ὑπὲρ δὲ τοῦτον τὸν ἀριθμὸν οὐδὲ ἡ μεγίστη πόλις τὴν ἀτέλειαν παρέχει.)[204]

Some of the intellectuals were awarded additional privileges, such as those given to Polemon both by Trajan and Hadrian. According to Philostratus, the sophist had obtained from Trajan the right to travel by land and sea for free. Hadrian extended

---

[200] See for example the famous exchange of poetry between him and Florus (*HA Hadrian* XVI.1-4), or his habit of questioning and "torturing" scholars with questions, such as at the Museum of Alexandria (*HA Hadrian* XX.2; see also XV.10-11), or the case of Caninius Celer, *ab epistulis* to Hadrian (cf. *Lives of the Sophists* 524ff). For an interesting collection and discussion of the evidence see Stertz (1993).

[201] Dio Cassius 69.3.1: φύσει δὲ φιλολόγος ἐν ἑκατέρᾳ τῇ γλώσσῃ· καί τινα καὶ πεζὰ καὶ ἐν ἔπεσι ποιήματα παντοδαπὰ καταλέλοιπε.

[202] *Dig*. 50.4.18.30 (*De muneribus et honoribus): Magistris, qui civilium munerum vacationem habent, item grammaticis et oratoribus et medicis et philosophis, ne hospitem reciperent, a principibus fuisse immunitatem indultam et divus vespasianus et divus hadrianus rescripserunt*.

[203] *Dig*. 27.1.6.8 (*De excusationibus*). Hadrian granted similar privileges to the association of the Dionysiac artists (such as the Edict reported on a papyrus from Oxyrynchus, *BGU* 1074).

[204] *Dig*. 27.1.6.2 8 (*De excusationibus*).

this right to his descendants (Ἀδριανὸς δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ πᾶσιν.)[205] Furthermore, Polemon was enrolled in the Museum of Alexandria by the emperor, gaining the upkeep, *sitesis*, which went with it. The sources state that the same privilege was granted, among others, to Dionysios of Miletos and to a poet named Pancrates, whom Hadrian met in Alexandria in 130 and rewarded for reciting a poem on the lion which the emperor had just killed in Libya[206].

It is clear that the pressure of liturgies had mounted by the first half of the 2nd century. However, despite efforts to avoid offices and services of state, membership in the council was among the first goals of ambitious citizens and remained prestigious under the empire. On the contrary, expulsion from a council could be seen as a disgrace and arrest an individual's further career[207].

3.4.1.3 Entry into the Senate

The peak of an aristocrat's ambition was often the entry into the Senate. Participation in this body increased an individual's prestige and gained benefits for him and his community. The history and mechanisms of this political body throughout the history of the empire as well as prosopographical remarks regarding the entry of Easterners into the Senate during Hadrian's reign have been discussed extensively by previous scholars[208]. However a few remarks are useful here.

The promotion of *novi homines* in the administrative structure, especially the Senate, became a constant characteristic of the political life of Rome. Caesar had

[205] *Lives of the Sophists* 532.
[206] For Dionysios see *Lives of the Sophists* 524. Cf. the statement in Dio Cassius, 69.3.4, who claims that the emperor attempted to destroy Dionysius, Favorinus and others. I will return to Pancrates' poem in the fifth chapter.
[207] See the evidence gathered by Macro (1980) 689.
[208] The fundamental study on the Roman Senate remains Talbert (1984). For the admission of Easterners see Halfmann (1979), and Eck (1982) and (1983).

introduced a few provincials. Augustus and Tiberius continued the trend cautiously. During their reigns provincials came almost entirely from the western part of the empire. Claudius continued along the same lines, so that from his time onwards provincials became a notable group in the Senate. Yet it was not until after the civil war of 69 and the accession of Vespasian that more than a handful of Greeks and Easterners felt ready and qualified to enter the House. Under Trajan the Senate saw the first senators from the Greek mainland.

As Talbert notes, the disappearance of the old senatorial families necessitated the admission of provincials, first Westerners and then Easterners. Natural death, lack of sons to succeed their fathers, refusal to be a member, execution on service, financial problems, physical or mental disabilities played a role in the introduction of provincials[209]. In other cases, as probably in Vespasian's admission of Easterners, we can detect a desire to reward certain communities or entire provinces for their support to an emperor or would-be-emperor. I believe that the central administration also needed local senators as it gradually realized their importance in tying the empire together and the rights of provincials in an empire that was theirs. There was a need to channel the enthusiasm and energy of local elites for the benefit of the Roman *imperium*.

Entry into the Senate was an important accomplishment (for the prestige and personal benefits it had) for local aristocrats and many individuals were eager to go to great lengths in seeking entry[210]. As a result, their pride in being its member and a feeling that the Senate was a special elite body are manifested in monuments throughout the empire. So, M. Arruntius Claudianus was a Lycian from Xanthos who

[209] Talbert (1984) 30.
[210] Such attitudes are nicely portrayed by Dio Cassius on narrating Cleander's, Commodus' freedman, selling of senatorships and many individuals' spending of their property in order to enter the body (72.12.3).

gained entry into the Senate in Nerva or Trajan's reign. On a monument he erected in his native land he called himself "the first man of the nation to become a senator of the Roman people."[211] An unknown senator of Neronian times from Miletos described himself with astonishing pride on a stone found at Didyma as "laticlavius of the Roman people, the fifth man ever to enter the senate from the whole of Asia, and from Miletos and the rest of Ionia the first and only one."[212] Another inscription from Ephesos from the first half of the third century honors Claudia Caninia Severa, priestess of Artemis, "daughter of Tiberius Claudius Severus, first Ephesian to be consul."[213] However, it must be pointed out here that not all elite members wanted to be senators. As Giovanni Salmeri notes, many of them, and especially those engaged in intellectual activities, preferred to stay in their own fatherland and participate in its administration[214]. So, for example, Polemon spent his time between Laodiceia and Smyrna engaging with local politics and gaining the appreciation of Roman emperors, but he never entered the Senate. Still, membership in the Senate was for many of them a goal.

It is certain that Hadrian (or any emperor for that matter) responded to this desire. Statistically speaking, his reign did not see a great influx of Eastern senators[215]. However, he continued along the same lines as his adoptive father in admitting a notable number of Greeks, a policy which was continued by the Antonines, under whom we see an increase in numbers. It has been suggested, but not proven, that Hadrian had to practice moderation in dealing with the Senatorial class in

---

[211] *ILS* 8821, ll. 3-5: ….[καὶ ἐν τῷ]/[γένει] πρῶτος συνκλητικὸς [γεγενημένος τοῦ]/[δ]ήμου Ῥωμαίων…. On this senator see Halfmann (1979) 125, 28.
[212] *IDidyma* 296, ll. 6-11: αὐτὸς δὲ πλατύ[ση]/μος δήμου Ῥωμαίων, πέμπ[τος]/ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας ὅλης ἐκ το[ῦ αἰ]/ῶνος εἰς σύγκλητον εἰσελθ[ών,]/ [ἀ]πὸ δὲ Μειλήτου καὶ τῆς ἄλλη[ς Ἰ]/ωνίας μόν[ος καὶ πρ]ῶτος. For discussion of his identity see Halfmann (1979) 108, 12.
[213] *IEph* 892, ll. 12-13: θυγατέρα Τιβ(ερίου) Κλ(αυδίου) Σευήρου,/πρώτου ὑπατεύσαντος Ἐφεσίων.
[214] Salmeri (2000) 59ff.
[215] See Halfmann (1979) 78ff.

Rome on account of their tense relationship, especially in his early reign[216]. Normal prudence dissuaded the emperor from importing a mass of new senators either from the West or East. It is an interesting hypothesis that has some merit.

In promoting Greek senators, Hadrian displayed signs of favor towards the educated class in the cities and urban aristocrats. The career of Flavius Arrianus from Nicomedeia is a good example of Hadrian's preference for men of culture[217]. Philosopher and man of letters, Arrian is the first known senator from Bithynia. His first attested service in Roman government was as a member of the council of the consular C. Avidius Nigrinus during the latter's correctorship in Greece around 112/113. After apparently seeing service with Trajan on the emperor's Parthian campaign, Arrian was rewarded with the praetorian proconsulship of Baetica in the 120s. Afterwards, he was suffect consul probably in 129, and finally imperial legate in Cappadocia in 131-137. Finally he retired to Athens, where he was archon in 145/146.

I will conclude this section with the discussion of a family case which is representative of the direction in which many ambitious aristocrats of the Greek cities wished to move: the Ulpii Carminii, a leading family that originated from the Carian city of Attuda but was particularly active at Aphrodisias of the second century. M. Ulpius Carminius Claudianus, son of Carminius Claudianus, who had been a high priest of the provincial cult of Roma and the Augusti, was honored in a late second century decree by the city of Aphrodisias for his generosity and service to the people[218]. Among other offices, he had served as high priest (as his father did), treasurer of the imperial cult, priest for life of Aphrodite, and as curator at Cyzicus,

[216] Syme (1985) 351ff.
[217] On his career see the interesting article by Syme (1982).
[218] *CIG* 2782 and p. 1112.

"after *consulares* had held the post" (ll. 13-14). This was remarkable as Carminius was neither consul nor senator himself. The inscription also reveals that he was honored on many counts by the emperors (ll. 4-5).

The same document mentions also in part the career of his elder son, Carminius Athenagoras (ll. 10-11). The evidence is supplemented by another document in honor of another one of his sons, M. Ulpius Carminius Claudianus the younger[219]. In lines 10-13 Athenagoras appears again, and the combined evidence reveals that he became a Roman senator and proconsul of the province of Lycia-Pamphylia-Isauria, presumably sometime between 180 and 205 when, it seems, Isauria was temporarily removed from Cilicia and attached to Lycia-Pamphylia. A third document, an honorary inscription for his son Mar(cus) Fl(avius) Carm(inius) Athenagoras Livianus, confirms the fact that Athenagoras' career was crowned with the consulship[220]. His son is also attested as senator in the same document.

The careers of the members of this family mirror the political ambitions of many aristocrats who wanted to advance in imperial politics in the second century and later. The grandfather, looking beyond the local aristocracy of Aphrodisias, held a provincial position; his son was successful in maintaining the magistracy that his father held and obtained an imperial appointment while the grandson, more emancipated from provincial parochialism by his father's success, became a *consularis*[221]. Various other examples of leading families could parallel the course of the Ulpii Carminii and be witnesses of some aristocrats' desire for inclusion in the provincial and imperial administration and of their competition for distinction in the empire of the second century.

---

[219] *MAMA* 6, 74.
[220] *CIG* 2783.
[221] On the career of M. Ulpius Carminius Claudianus see Macro (1979) and (1980) 686.

3.4.2 The *πολλοί*

There was a particular category of provincials who apparently had "secured" a permanent exception from public offices: the low classes, *οἱ πολλοί*. The poor citizens of the city and the rustic inhabitants of the country were the least privileged among the free people in terms of rights and benefits. They seem to have been excluded from the administration, unless they managed to acquire wealth and be under the protection of a powerful patron. However, a ruling by Hadrian and a subsequent one by Antoninus left some room for the participation of lower class people in offices. According to this, both Hadrian and Antoninus decreed that occasionally mean status and rustic life can be an excuse for exemption. This means that sometimes mean status and rustic life cannot prevent someone from taking an office! As for the illiterate, this cannot be an excuse, unless that person is ignorant of the transaction of business affairs[222].

Apparently, I think, either the local assemblies were faced with a demand by common people and sent a letter requesting instructions, or the person(s) interested sent a *libellus* to the emperor protesting exclusion from office. The correspondence between the emperor and common people and the latter's presentation of their case before him was not unusual and there is evidence of it. Among the most interesting is the so-called *Sententiae Hadriani*. This is a curious document that includes imperial replies to pleas from ordinary people. The replies are presented in two parallel columns in Greek and Latin, and in two versions, one short, and the other long[223]. A variety of requests are being addressed by the emperor: in two different cases a father

[222] *Dig*. 27.1.6.19 (*De excusationibus*): Periì tw½n a)groi¿kwn kaiì tw½n tapeinw½n kaiì tw½n a)gramma/twn gra/fei Pau=lo$ ou(tw$i¿: *Mediocritas et rusticitas interdum excusationem praebent secundum epistulas diuorum Hadriani et Antonini. eius qui se neget litteras scire, excusatio accipi non debet, si modo non sit expers negotiorum.*

[223] *Corp. Glos. Lat*. III. 30-38; 387-390. See Lewis (1991) for a discussion of this document and in particular p. 267- 268 for past bibliography.

(case 3) and a mother (case 13) complain of neglect by a son. In the second case, Hadrian replies to the son who does not recognize the woman as his mother: "if you do not recognize her as your mother, I do not recognize you as a Roman citizen"; in another case (case 6) a petitioner asks that his father be allowed to return from exile; a manufacturer complains that his freedmen stole from him (case 7); an applicant for military service asks to be enrolled in the Praetorian Guard (case 1).

Whether these petitions are authentic or a rhetorical invention or an exercise[224], they suggest that ordinary people were expecting the emperor and his court to pay attention to their problems with the zeal and devotion with which they attended to those of the aristocrats. The emperor was viewed as the *pater patriae* who would deal with all social strata and confer on all kinds of issues. Even slaves could approach the emperor and submit their requests, such as the petition sent to Diocletian in December of 294 by Pythagoris, a slave, who asked the emperor to decide whether she should be freed or not[225]. These examples reveal that the emperor was expected to decide on a number of requests from people of various social backgrounds. It is interesting in Pythagoris' case that the final solution was given not by a local official, whether the governor of a province or a magistrate in Rome, (in this case by the governor of Bithynia, as Diocletian was at Nicomedeia at that time) but by the emperor. We do not know if Pythagoris first presented her case to the local official, but the emperor was the one who gave the final verdict on her case[226].

---

[224] Hadrian's *Sententiae* are not the only ones preserved. cf. the ἀποκρίματα of Septimius Severus published by Westermann and Schiller (1954).

[225] *Cod. Just* 7.4.13 (*De fideicommissariis libertatibus*): *Si te, donatam ante matrimonium uxori suae, post ei legato relicto manumitti testamento seu codicillis verbis precariis a successoribus voluit, tam hos ad redemptionem et manumissionem quam eam, quae in capiendis relictis defuncti consensit iudicio, teneri tibique fideicommissariam debere libertatem non ambigitur. * diocl. et maxim. aa. et cc. pythagoridae. * <a 294 s. vii id. dec. cc. conss.>*

[226] For cases of slaves manumitted before the emperor, see Millar (1977) 488ff; also 465-477 on petitions to the emperors. On the subject of slavery the reader may consult Wiedermann (1981) and also the interesting study by Boulvert (1970).

Hadrian was accessible to all classes and, as the *Historia Augusta* tells us, he was accustomed to the company of the humblest of men and despised any person who, under the pretext of imperial dignity, begrudged him the pleasure of such friendliness[227]. Despite the reliability issues that the biography presents, it abounds with examples of his beneficence to the poor and invalid, which do not seem to be far from reality: to the poor he saw, he gave money of his own (XXII.9); he increased the *alimenta* paid to the children of the poor (VII.8); he boasted more than anyone about his love of the plebs, "*fuit et plebis iactantissimus amator*" (XVII.8); and he often bathed in the public baths, even with the common crowd (XVII.5). In the eyes of his subjects the emperor seems to value quality and character more than birth and rank. He was a *princeps civilis*, and in the meetings of the people and in the senate he often said that he would so administer the empire that people would know that it was theirs and not the princeps[228]. The people should be at the center of the imperial program.

His contemporaries seemed to welcome his intentions and even the hostile Dio pays him a tribute. Dio goes on to say how Hadrian was accustomed to the contact with common people and was not offended by it. On one case, he says, Hadrian while on a journey passed by a woman who made a request. The emperor initially replied "I have not time", but when she cried out "then, cease being an emperor", he turned about and granted her a hearing[229]. Almost identical stories are told twice by Plutarch,

---

[227] *HA Hadrian*, XX.1: *In conloquiis etiam humillimorum civilissimus fuit, detestans eos qui sibi hanc voluptatem humanitatis quasi servantes fastigium principis inviderent.*

[228] *HA Hadrian* VIII.3: *et in contione et in senatu saepe dixit ita se rem publicam gesturum, ut sciret populi rem esse, non propriam.*

[229] Dio Cassius 69.6.3: ἀμέλει γυναικὸς παριόντος αὐτοῦ ὁδῷ τινι δεομένης, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὅτι "οὐ σχολάζω", ἔπειτα ὡς ἐκείνη ἀνακραγοῦσα ἔφη "καὶ μὴ βασίλευε", ἐπεστράφη τε καὶ λόγον αὐτῇ ἔδωκεν.

once of Philip II and once of Demetrios Poliorcetes, and again by a writer called Serenus about Antipater[230].

These stories, probably fictitious, fit well with Hadrian's reputation and his profile of the good, *civilis* emperor. In addition, I think, they underline the importance of the emperor administering justice and examining petitions given to him by people when he was passing by their community. The role of the emperor as administer of justice is underlined in all four passages. In Plutarch's *Life of Demetrios* in particular, we hear that after the old woman complained to the king, he came back and for several days did nothing else but receive the complaints of all, starting with the old woman. "Surely" says Plutarch, "nothing so befits a king as the work of justice…… and Homer…… calls as a disciple and "confidant" of Zeus not the most warlike or unjust or murderous of kings but the most just."[231]

Accordingly in Dio, after Hadrian granted the old woman a hearing, he is next presented as participating in the meetings of the Senate and administering justice either in the palace, the Forum, or the Pantheon. He even joined the consuls when they were trying cases[232]. In all probability Dio had read Plutarch and adapted the story to the needs of his presentation of Hadrian. I believe that on Dio's part it reveals the author's wish for a just ruler who respects the institutions of the empire (the Senate) and is not indifferent to the administration of justice in the city and the provinces alike.

---

[230] On Demetrios, see Plutarch, *Demetrios* 42.7, which is the most elaborated example of the four stories; on Philip II, see Plutarch, *Regum et imperatorum apopthegmata* 179c; Serenus' story of Antipater is preserved in Ioannes Stobaeus' *Anthologium* 3.13.48, under the general heading "ΠΕΡΙ ΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑΣ". In this story, which is the shortest, the petitioner is a rustic man.

[231] *Demetrios* 42.8-10: οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτως βασιλεῖ προσῆκον ὡς τὸ τῆς δίκης ἔργον……Ὅμηρος… καὶ τοῦ Διὸς οὐ τὸν πολεμικώτατον οὐδὲ τὸν ἀδικώτατον καὶ φονικώτατον τῶν βασιλέων, ἀλλὰ τὸν δικαιότατον ὀαριστὴν καὶ μαθητὴν προσηγόρευκεν (*Odyssey* 19.179).

[232] Dio Cassius 69.7.1: ἔπραττε δὲ καὶ διὰ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου πάντα τὰ μεγάλα καὶ ἀναγκαιότατα, καὶ ἐδίκαζε μετὰ τῶν πρώτων τοτὲ μὲν ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ τοτὲ δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ τῷ τε Πανθείῳ καὶ ἄλλοθι πολλαχόθι, ἀπὸ βήματος, ὥστε δημοσιεύεσθαι τὰ γιγνόμενα. καὶ τοῖς ὑπάτοις ἔστιν ὅτε δικάζουσι συνεγίγνετο, ἔν τε ταῖς ἱπποδρομίαις αὐτοὺς ἐτίμα.

Therefore, Hadrian's familiarity with common people did not seem to be surprising and this is evident even in the generally negative Jewish tradition, where Hadrian is represented as conversing with ordinary Jews and Rabbis[233]. Thus, Hadrian (אדריינוס in the texts) is portrayed questioning Rabbi Yehoshua b. Hananya about various themes of the Jewish religion (mentioned by Schäfer on p. 236); is compared to King Solomon (p. 237); in another story, he treats kindly a little girl affected by leprosy (p. 238-239); and in one anecdote (p. 241-242), Hadrian, "may his bones rot" (as virtually every reference to him in the rabbinical literature adds), questions a centenarian peasant whom he encountered planting a fig tree. It is unknown whether these stories were fictional or not but they can be indicative of the power of perception. I believe that as Hadrian was reputed to be *plebis iactantissimus amator* and conversing with leading figures and common people alike, so it is reasonable to assume that the authors and the people in general would think about and judge him according to that reputation[234].

3.5 Summary

In this chapter I analyzed the emperor-subject relationship by focusing on the question: what was Hadrian's audience in the East, whom did he meet and address his messages to? First I dealt with Hadrian's travels, and I argued that the purpose of them was the consolidation and strengthening of the empire by securing its frontiers, and maintaining the army's loyalty; the examination of the potentials and needs of the

[233] Schäfer (1981) 236-244; see also Herr (1971) who examines the dialogues between Jews and Roman dignitaries from a historical perspective.
[234] Herr, in his article, argues that these dialogues represent a literary genre rather than valid testimony; yet, there is some likelihood, he concludes, that these types of encounters could have taken place in the reality of Roman rule in Palestine.

provinces, especially those of the Greek mainland and Asia Minor, where he spent a considerable amount of time; and the fostering of his relations with local populations.

By using evidence from Hadrian's and others emperors' reigns and by summarizing discussion in modern scholarship, I next examined how imperial travels affected the cities and their peoples. I showed that a province had to be ready to accommodate imperial notables and provide them and their attendants with anything they might request. Quite often such visits were a financial burden on a community, but still the visit of an emperor was something that all looked forward to from city magnates to rustic people.

Hadrian's dealings with local magistrates and aristocratic and wealthy families are easier to trace due to the vast amount of epigraphic evidence of their participation in a number of activities related to the emperor: embassies, festivals, constructions, dedications and so on. I argued that this group of people was in particular interested in meeting with the emperor, and presented him with a number of requests. I showed that their participation in the administration both of the city and the region was definitely among their most important concerns addressed by Hadrian. The emperor could reply in a number of ways: by endorsing their application to a governing body, financing their office, relieving them from the expenses of it, and helping them enter imperial offices and finally the Roman Senate, if they wished so.

In addition to the elites, a number of other individuals were equally interested in appearing before the emperor. We may assume that the low classes of a city, rustic people, and even slaves at some point found it necessary to appeal to the emperor. Although we lack evidence of the contacts between Hadrian and certain individuals of this social status, we may suggest that their requests reached Hadrian's *ab epistulis* (among them Suetonius) in the hope that they would be read by the emperor. Judicial

matters, hereditary issues, family problems and applications for office posts were, among others, things that needed to be solved either by the local Roman authorities or even the emperor.

As a result it was not surprising that Hadrian during his visits to the cities of the East found a large and diverse audience waiting for him, from local archons, to aristocrats, men of culture, priests, poor people, even slaves. Hadrian was aware that matters of any kind and consequence, vital to the empire or important to individuals of any class, could be brought to his attention. It was this crowd that Hadrian came into contact with and eventually it was they to whom he addressed his messages, advertised his policy, and in the presence of whom he performed. Actually, everyone was ready to perform and persuade: the locals in order to gain privileges, the emperor to receive their support and advertise his program. Performer and audience shared roles and hopes.

In the following chapters we will see how he promoted his vision for the empire among the Greeks of the East by examining numismatic evidence from Rome and the Greek cities, and finally by discussing the role of religion in the promotion of his political program.

CHAPTER 4

COINAGE AND HADRIAN'S PROGRAM

4.1 Introduction

This chapter will explore the role of coinage in advertising Hadrian's program for the Greek East and the Empire in general. This is the first attempt in modern scholarship to examine Hadrian's policy through the medium of coinage. In 1988 Kevin Butcher expressed his disappointment over the fact that provincial coinage had been neglected by scholars on account of its enormous volume [235]. This fact began to be corrected with the edition of the first volumes of the *Roman Provincial Coinage* series by Burnett, Amandry, and others. However, Volker Heuchert underlined the fact that the provincial coinage of the period from Nerva to Hadrian is still understudied and not catalogued systematically[236]. No modern scholar has brought together coinage of the central mint and the provinces in a study of Hadrian's program. Thus, this chapter aspires to be a first contribution of such kind to Hadrianic studies.

Here, I will attempt to answer the following questions: what were the messages channeled through the coins? Who was in charge of the mints? Who took the initiative for an image and legend to be struck? Was it the local authorities, the local Roman governor, or the emperor and his court? How independent were the mints of the Greek East from central administration? To answer these questions I will

[235] Butcher (1988) 11.
[236] Heuchert (2005) 29.

focus on the coinage from the mints of Achaea, Macedonia and Asia Minor but will also bring into discussion iconographical themes from the imperial mint of Rome or elsewhere that supplement the information we have from the eastern mints' issues.

This chapter is divided into two major parts. In the first part I deal with the organization of the mints in the second century. I examine evidence related both to the central imperial mint at Rome and the provincial mints of the Greek East. I discuss the administrative mechanisms of these mints focusing on the people who were involved in coin production. This part examines crucial themes, such as who was in charge of the mints, and how independent the Greek mints were from local authorities. This discussion is a necessary step towards the presentation of the themes of Hadrianic coinage as it will help us understand better the circumstances under which a particular message was carved on them. It sets the context, narrative and historical, in which the messages of Hadrianic coins can be better appreciated.

The second part of this chapter examines those messages. Bringing together evidence from coinage but also from other sources I will show that Hadrianic coinage reveals the emperor's desire to associate himself and his reign with his predecessor and with myths and traditions both of Rome and of the Greek East. I will also show that he was interested in being portrayed as the counterpart of Olympios Zeus in the East, a subject to which I will return in the next chapter. By discussing two other coin series, the "Virtues" and the "Provinces", I will reveal Hadrian's plan to advertise the principles by which he wished to rule and his sincere interest in the welfare of the provinces, and by extension, of the entire empire.

After examining the messages displayed on Hadrianic coins I will conclude this chapter with a discussion of iconography selection. By presenting ancient evidence and modern scholarship, and by bringing forth my ideas I will argue that a

number of persons were involved in the production of coins: from the emperor and his family to Roman officials and governors, from Greek local magistrates to officials of the mints, all were able to influence the selection of a certain type.

I believe that this study will contribute much not only to the field of numismatics but more importantly to our understanding of Hadrian's vision for the empire.

4.2 Mint Organization

The problem of the organization of the mints is one that still puzzles scholars. Since the publication of the first volume of *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum* by Harold Mattingly in 1923 this question has not found a definite answer[237]. A first obstacle appears when we attempt to define the number of mints at Rome. Mattingly promoted the idea (earlier expressed by Mommsen) that under the empire there were two separate mints: an imperial one in charge of the issues in gold and silver, and a senatorial in charge of the bronze ones. This theory has been treated with skepticism by later scholars. Philip Hill[238] and R.A.G. Carson[239], both agree that during the empire there was only one mint, imperial, in charge of all issues. This mint was housed next to the Temple of Juno Moneta on the Capitoline Hill and was in use already in the Republic. Sometime between 64 and the early 2nd century the mint was moved to a new location on the Caelian Hill. Philip Hill appears more flexible and accepts the slight possibility that there could have been two mints in the early empire (p.4), whereas Carson insists that there only was one mint already from Augustus. I believe that Carson's theory is correct and, as I will show now, the disagreement

[237] Extensive work on this subject has been done (to name just few) by Mattingly, in his introductions to the volumes of the *BMCRE,* Carson (1956) and recently Harl (1996) 208ff.
[238] Hill (1970) 2-5.
[239] Carson (1956).

originated from the fact that the central mint employed different *officinae* (workshops), some for gold and silver, and others for bronze issues.

There is little evidence for the administrative officials in charge of coinage in the early empire. The Republican magistrates *tresviri aere argento auro flando feriundo* continued for a short time to sign the Augustan coinage of Rome and are last attested on aes in 4 B.C. Under the empire responsibility soon passed to the emperor's *a rationibus* and certainly by the reign of Trajan the head of the mint is attested as an equestrian, the *procurator monetae*[240]. The probability of an office of "curator" for the Roman mint has been suggested in the case of Caius Iulius Quadratus Bassus. The information comes from a Greek inscription of 118 from Pergamos[241]. The text records the erection of a funerary monument for Quadratus ordered by Hadrian. The first part of the text lists the offices held by Quadratus, among them that of the "curator of bronze, gold and silver coinage" (ἐπιμελη[τὴν χαλκοῦ] χρυσοῦ ἀργύρου χαράγματος, ll. A.12-13).

A number of inscriptions from the reign of Trajan give us a glimpse into the workings of the mint. This series of dedications from Rome records the officials who were in charge of the coinage production. The most senior among them was a freedman named Felix who appears on three inscriptions, on one occasion as the sole dedicator with the titles "*optio et exactor auri argenti et aeris*[242]"; next in rank was his second in command, the freedman Albanus, an *optio* with whom 25 *officinatores monetae aurariae argentariae* are associated in the second inscription [243]; the third inscription records the official *optio et exactor* again, together with the craftsmen

[240] *CIL* 6.1607; 1625.
[241] *IvP* III.21.
[242] *CIL* 6.42.
[243] *CIL* 6.43.

(*signatores suppostores malliatores monetae Caesaris nostri*), some of them being *liberti* and others being *servi*[244].

It does seem that in these three texts certain distinctions of rank were drawn and the mint was organized on quasi-military lines. Felix, the *optio et exactor,* appears alone, then in conjunction with the *optio* and the *officinatores*, and, lastly, together with the craftsmen. The *optio et exactor* was, presumably, the technical head of the whole mint with an *optio* as a deputy in charge of the precious-metal section, divided into a number of *officinae* or workshops whose heads, the *officinatores*, joined also in this dedication. The craftsmen of the third inscription formed yet another grade.

It seems that there was a distinction between the *officinae* for gold and silver, and those for aes. A funerary inscription of uncertain date (probably of the second century) attests a Publius Calvius Iustus, *manceps officinarum aerariarum quinque, item flaturariae argentariae*[245]. This *manceps* may be the equivalent for the aes coinage to Albanus, the *optio monetae aurariae argentariae*.

Therefore, we see that the mint itself was divided into *officinae*, some in charge of precious metals and others of bronze. The heads of these units were the *officinatores*. Some system of central control of the more important obverse dies in the mint could account for the occasional die-linkage between *officinae.*

Some further remarks on the control of the *officinae* are appropriate here. These will set the tone for the discussion of the control over the selection of legends and scenes on the coinage.

In the second century, the emperor normally controlled all the *officinae* of the mint and had coins struck not only for himself but also on behalf of members of his

[244] *CIL* 6.44; for the titles of other craftsmen see Carson (1956) 235, note 1.
[245] *CIL* 6.8455; cf. *CIL* 14.3642.

family, normally for substantive issues, though a few special types appeared from time to time. Occasionally one or two *officinae* were handed over to members of his family. The acquisition by members of the imperial family of their own share of the mint was marked by a change of the legend, as, for example, from *Sabina Augusta Hadriani Aug(usti) P(atris) P(atriae)* to *Sabina Augusta* in 134[246].

Trajan kept all the *officinae* in his own hands, as did Hadrian until 133, when the new obverse formula on Sabina's gold and silver seems to betoken her acquisition of one *officina*[247]. This was apparently increased to 2 in 136. After her death they were handed over to Lucius Aelius Verus, then adopted by Hadrian. Antoninus retained the *officinae* until some time in 139 when one was given to his wife Faustina. When she died in 141, it reverted to the emperor, to be given to Marcus Aurelius in 147. This distribution among the members of the imperial family seems to have meant in practice that, if the empress or Caesar did not participate in an issue, the emperor would not use their *officinae* for his own types.

Thus we may conclude that the emperor and his family were the "superintendents" of the mint in the second century. However, we cannot pinpoint with accuracy the degree of control that they exercised over the iconographical types. This is something I will attempt to answer later in this chapter. Now, I will turn my attention to the mechanisms of coin production in the Roman Greek East and its relations with the central government.

---

[246] Compare, for example, *BMCRE* III.353, 894 and 358, 929.

[247] Hill (1970) 3 provides an account of the *officinae* operating in the second century. According to this account, 5 *officinae* operated from the ascension of Trajan to his currency reform (98-107), 7 during the period of the reform (107-108), 5 again from 109-128, 6 from 129 onwards until 189, when the number was reduced by Commodus to 5, the sixth being restored on the elevation of Caracalla to the Caesarship seven years later.

4.3 Greek Mints and Central Authority

We saw that our understanding of the administration of the central mint is still imperfect. Similar is the state of our knowledge of mint organization in the Greek East during the empire and its relations with the central authority, whether this was the emperor, his court, or the Roman officials of a province. However, the discussion of this subject here will be useful, since it will not only contribute to the identification of those individuals or groups who were responsible for the selection of the legends and the images, but it will also help us comprehend better the significance of the messages they carried, as these will be presented in the second part of this chapter.

4.3.1 Organization

In contrast to the regular production of coins at Rome and the imperial mints, the local issues are characterized by irregularity. According to Howgego, this phenomenon explains the absence of any standard magistracy throughout the Greek world of which sole responsibility was to strike coins[248]. A few inscriptions and a number of coins provide some evidence of the mechanisms of coin production.

The motion to strike coins would have been put to the local council, the *boule* or the *gerousia*. It is possible that the undertaking of the issue of coinage was an *epimeleia*. A number of coin legends reveal that certain individuals were in charge (ἐπιμελεῖσθαι) of an issue[249]. These individuals were either local officials, or prominent citizens who brought the matter to attention and undertook the whole

[248] Howgego (1985) 85.

[249] So the formula ἐπιμεληθέντος is found, for example, on a Trajanic coin from Miletopolis, *BMC* XIV Miletopolis 92, or a coin from Attuda of the Severan period, *BMC* XIX Attuda 67. In one instance, the production was undertaken by a woman, as the legend ἐπιμεληθείσης reveals (see *BMC* XXV Eukarpeia, 203; 206 on coins carrying the portrait of Sabina). The legend parallels the Latin *curante* to describe individuals in charge of production in the West (for example, from the city of Clypea from Zeugitana in North Africa in imperial times (Müstenberg (1973) 3).

expense. If that was the case, that individual might record the fact on his coins. So a high priest of Asia Minor had introduced a proposal (εἰσανγείλαντος) at Eumeneia[250] in the reign of Domitian, and an asiarch, perhaps by his own forethought (προνοηθέντος), provided an issue for the Koinon of Ionia in Antoninus' times[251]. At Stratonikeia in Caria, in the second century A.D., Flavius Diomedes put the matter to vote (ψηφισαμένου)[252]. At Mylasa, in the reign of Domitian, Claudius Melas called for vote and undertook the cost (ψηφισάμενος Κλαύδιος Μέλας ἀνέθηκεν- I will return to the significance of the verb ἀνέθηκεν later)[253]. Another interesting piece of information comes from Tripolis in Lydia. A certain Theodoros proclaimed on his coins that he had struck them: Θεόδωρος β′ ἐχάραξεν[254]. Finally, the inscription on a statue base of Antoninus at Lounda in Phrygia, infrorms us that the strategos Apollodotos, son of Diodoros, struck coins, κόψας κ̣αὶ ν̣[ομ]ίσμ̣α̣τ̣[α][255]. The same person appears on coins from Hyrgaleis in Phrygia as the magistrate in charge of coin issues, ἐπὶ Ἀπολλοδότου [στρ]α(τηγοῦ)[256]. It is possible that the preposition ἐπὶ on the coin denotes that Apollodotos, as a magistrate, was indeed in charge of the coin production at Hyrgaleis[257]. When an individual undertook the expense, the act was viewed as a *philotimia*, a private contribution to the welfare of the state. This idea is found in an inscription from Magnesia ad Maeandrum of the imperial period[258]. The city honored

[250] *BMC* XXV Eumeneia 218.
[251] *BMC* XVI Ionian Koinon 16.
[252] *BMC* XIX Stratonikeia 153.
[253] Imhoof-Blumel (1901-1902) 144, 4.
[254] *BMC* XXII Tripolis 373.
[255] *IGR* IV.769, ll.10-11.
[256] Howgego (1985) 87.
[257] So Howgego (1985) 87, and Butcher (1988) 25.
[258] *IMagnesia* 164.

Moschion, son of Moschion, on account of his benefactions to the city, among them the production of bronze coin[259].

A few comments can be added here regarding a formula that appears on coins quite frequently and from Hadrian's time becomes regular. As we saw above, Claudius Melas put to vote and undertook the cost of the issue (ψηφισάμενος, ἀνέθηκεν). The verb ἀνέθηκεν is used of issues dedicated by an individual (an individual could finance the issue) to his fellow citizens, although in some cases the benefaction may not have been the striking of the coin itself but, for example, a statue depicted on the coin. Perhaps in some cases the formula referred both to a benefaction (e.g. a statue) and to the coin recording it. Thus, the issue becomes the result of an act of euergetism[260]. However, the euergetic initiatives were not the norm; rather, as a rule, the responsibility for coinage was attached to particular offices. Finally, no matter who would have endowed the issue, there must have been a discussion within official bodies, in particular the *boule*[261].

The process is generally the same for the provincial bronze in the west during the late republic and early empire and for the Roman *coloniae* in the east. The decision to strike was taken by the local senate (*decreto decurionum* or *senatus consulto*). Individuals, perhaps usually magistrates, were put in charge (*curante, faciendum curavit, -verunt*); they might be those who had proposed the motion (*ex s(ententia)*.

---

[259] ll. 12-14: καταστα̣θεὶς δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς χαράξεως τοῦ λεπτοῦ/χαλκοῦ, καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς δὲ φιλοτειμίας τελιάσαντα ἀγνῶς καὶ/ἀμέμπτως. See also the inscription of Apollodotos, line 9.

[260] Weiss (2005) 61 underlines the fact that not only the coins of the Greek cities were the result of euergetism, but it is possible that this phenomenon shared by the cities of the West too. For a discussion of other formulas appearing on coins see Howgego (1985) 86ff, and Weiss (2005) 61ff.

[261] See for example the legend on a Trajanic coin from Ephesos: ὁ νεω(κόρος) Ἐφε(σίων) δῆ(μος) ἐπεχάρ(αξεν) *BMC* XVI Ephesos p. 76; *SNGAulock* 1884. Also a late second century B.C. inscription from Sestos (*IKSestos* 1, ll. 43-44: τοῦ τε δήμου προελομέ/νου νομίσματι χαλκίνῳ χρῆσθαι ἰδίωι….).

Such is the overall picture of the mechanisms of coin production in the Greek East during the empire. The next step, which will help us better understand the messages of the coins, is to investigate the relations between local mints and Roman authorities.

4.3.2 Mints and Rome

How free were the cities of the Greek East to strike coins during the Roman Empire? Did city councils request permission from local Roman officials to strike coins? Most scholars seem to agree that there was actually a degree of central control over the striking of coins and (as we will later see) the images and legends on them. As to the striking of coins, the body of evidence on which they base this theory is a passage from the famous fictitious speech of Maecenas to Augustus in Dio Cassius and certain formulas on coins.

The passage from Dio has been extensively studied and it suffices to present here the main conclusions drawn from it[262]. Of the advice that Dio makes Maecenas give the future emperor a great deal is directed at restricting the privileges that could be given to cities. Among them a recommendation regarding coinage: "no city should have its own coins or weights or measures, but all of them should use ours."[263] Here, the author, an official of the Severan period, implies that striking one's own coinage required permission or acquiescence by the emperor, which could be revoked. Since weights and measures are also mentioned, it is clear that Dio is thinking not of the

[262] See for example, Burnett (2005) 173-174 and Weiss (2005) 58.
[263] Dio Cassius 52.30.9: μήτε δὲ νομίσματα ἢ καὶ σταθμὰ ἢ μέτρα ἰδίᾳ τις αὐτῶν ἐχέτω, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἡμετέροις καὶ ἐκεῖνοι πάντες χρήσθωσαν·

municipia and *coloniae*, but of the mass of peregrine cities, that is, primarily of the Greek cities, from which he came himself[264].

Additional evidence comes from the coins. The vast majority of the examples, though, come from the Latin West, mainly from *municipia* and *coloniae*, and most of them are dated to Augustus' and Tiberius' reigns. However, their examination here can illuminate the workings of the eastern mints. From these legends it becomes evident that sometimes permission to coin was sought from the Roman authorities. Therefore, legends such as *permissu Augusti* are recorded on issues under Augustus and Tiberius in Spain, Africa, and Syria; the colony of Berytus in Syria also presents a *permissu* legend with the name of a consular *legati Augusti*[265]. Later, under Domitian, a few coins appear in Achaea, again in colonies: Patrae[266] records an *Indulgentia Aug(usti) Moneta Inpetrata* and Corinth a *perm(issu) imp(eratoris)*[267]. Weiss interprets the legends on the Achaean coinages as resulting from a possible Domitianic lifting of the ban placed on such issues by Vespasian, supposedly following the revocation of Nero's grant of *libertas* to Achaea[268].

The attestation of the *permissu* formula in the West has led scholars to seek an analogous formula in the East. Accordingly, Louis Robert argued that a similar mechanism is hidden behind the legend αἰτησαμένου followed by a person's name on coins from Asia Minor[269]. Robert saw in this form an embassy to Roman authorities to request permission to coin in the name of a city[270]. He brought forth a number of numismatic examples of this formula as well as epigraphic testimony. With this he

[264] It has been suggested that what Dio has in mind here is Septimius Severus' confiscation of the right to coin from the Syrian Antioch, after its unfortunate choice of sides in the war against Pescennius Niger in 193-194.
[265] Weiss (2005) 59.
[266] The example from Patrae is attributed to the reign of Caligula by Howgego (1985) 88.
[267] Weiss (2005) 59.
[268] Weiss (2005) 59.
[269] See *Robert, Hellenica* 11/12.56ff for examples.
[270] *Robert, Hellenica* 11/12.53-62; also Robert (1967) 53, note 6; 54.

also linked a curious passage from Lucian, where the "false prophet" Alexander of Abonuteichos asked (αἰτῆσαι) from the emperor Marcus Aurelius a permission to change the name of the city to Ionopolis and to cut new coin and carve on it images of himself and the human-headed serpent Glycon[271]. Both forms, αἰτῆσαι and αἰτησαμένου, Robert argues, refer to a petition to the emperor or the Roman authorities. Weiss refuted Robert's argument and saw in the form αἰτησαμένου a petition by the person in question to local, indigenous, authorities: "we therefore have to do with proceedings within the city."[272]

After carefully examining Robert's evidence and argumentation, I believe that Robert was correct in his assumption and Weiss misread the evidence provided by the French scholar. In my opinion the most compelling evidence is Robert's remark that the formula αἰτησαμένου appears either at the beginning of a city's issues during the empire or after an interruption of a considerable period of time[273]. The formula designates the citizen who went on an embassy to the Roman authorities to obtain permission to cut new coinage. Even Lucian's passage points in this direction. Alexander submits his request for new coinage at the very same moment that he asks for permission to change the name of the city, in other words to re-found the city. For a new city, as Ionopolis would be, the striking of new coinage was among its priorities. This remark is in accordance with Robert's statement that the form appears at the beginning of a city's issues. As to the iconography of Alexander's new coinage, I believe that certainly, as I will show later, Roman authorities had to approve.

---

[271] Lucian, *Alexander or Pseudomantis* 58: Ἐκεῖνο δὲ πῶς οὐ μέγα ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις τὸ τόλμημα τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου, τὸ αἰτῆσαι παρὰ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος μετονομασθῆναι τὸ τοῦ Ἀβώνου τεῖχος καὶ Ἰωνόπολιν κληθῆναι, καὶ νόμισμα καινὸν κόψαι ἐγκεχαραγμένον τῇ μὲν τοῦ Γλύκωνος, κατὰ θάτερα δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου, στέμματά τε τοῦ πάππου Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ τὴν ἅρπην ἐκείνην τοῦ πατρομήτορος Περσέως ἔχοντος.
[272] Weiss (2005) 59.
[273] *Robert, Hellenica* 11/12.61: *il resort clairement de ces observations que la formula αἰτησαμένου apparaît soit au début d'un monnayage de l'époque impériale, soit après une interruption d'une durée considérable.*

Roman authorities were definitely responsible for the cutting of new coinage. Their control should lie behind the very fact that the cities produced small change in bronze, whereas silver was produced within definite traditional systems, certainly under the governor's control (cistophori in Asia; coins in Alexandria, Caesarea, Antioch in Syria). Roman administration was possibly also responsible for the fact that cities in a certain region coined, in bronze, only at a particular time and not otherwise, such as the Peloponnesian cities under Septimius Severus and the Lycian cities under Gordian III[274]. Scholars also see central control over production behind the frequent lack of an ethnic on coins from the Greek cities[275].

The production of money was so sensitive an area that it seems unthinkable that in this matter every provincial city acted as it saw fit without any reference to the Roman authorities. Some form of central control over the striking of coinage surely demanded, at the very least, imperial acquiescence. As Howgego says, "The right of local coinage was part of the delicate balance between local autonomy and centralized authority which had been worked out in the Hellenistic period and taken over by the Romans."[276] I think it is possible that the fact that Rome allowed local mints to continue is related to the importance it assigned to the existing urban framework as a means of securing the efficient government of the eastern provinces, and consequently it is prudent to assume that Roman authorities maintained an involvement, sometimes discreet, other times more authoritative, in the coin production of the cities.

In the preceding pages, I examined the mechanisms of the mint production both in Rome and the Greek East. We saw that the production at the central mint was

[274] So Weiss (2005) 59-60.
[275] See for example, Butcher (1988) 98 and Metcalf (1980) 127.
[276] Howgego (1985) 88.

well organized into offices, the *officinae*, manned by a number of officials. At the head of the mint was the emperor. Production in the Greek East seems to have been in the hands of local magistrates or rich individuals who could undertake the task. They always consulted the Roman officials and even the emperor on matters related to coin production. So both Greek and Roman authorities were involved in the coinage of the cities during the Empire. We must keep these remarks in mind as we turn now to discuss how messages on Hadrianic coins contributed to the advertisement of Hadrian's program.

4.4 Hadrian's policy as reflected on coinage

Having outlined the mechanisms of coin production, I now turn to the examination of certain iconographical types that reveal the connection between Hadrian, his program, and the reaction of the Greek provincials. It is useful at this point to summarize the basic characteristics of coin production in the reign of Hadrian with respect to style and iconography.

On account of Hadrian's imperial policy peace prevailed and the economy recovered across the empire, first and foremost in the East. His reign influenced numismatic production and iconography a lot. The evidence from coins confirms that many more cities were producing coins, with a wide variety of coin types, particularly in Achaea, Asia Minor, Alexandria in Egypt, and Syria.

The types are still of the same character as before but of greater variety and more widespread: foundation and colonial themes as regards the colonies; Roman themes, ranging from representations of Roma, the Senate, the emperor (current and predecessors) and his family, to Latin divinities; themes of local interest and traditions such as temples, mythical heroes and founders, great men of the past, and Greek gods

and goddesses. In general, the Greek cities adopted themes that acknowledged the Roman presence, but at the same time favored those that promoted their culture and interests.

As usual, the portrait of the emperor is found on the obverse. It normally shows the head or bust of the reigning emperor laureate, or radiate. The bare head, perhaps a sign of "*civilitas*", is common for Hadrian throughout his coinage from about the middle of his reign. In terms of other attributes, Hadrian begins with the draped and cuirassed busts of his predecessor, but passes on later to the use of bare back or busts with slight indication of drapery. In his later years a very wide variety of representation is employed[277].

As to the characteristics of Hadrian's numismatic portraits, the first remark that must be made is that they imitate his statues and are characterized by a conscious return to pure Hellenic models, as opposed to Roman ones, which marks a turning point in the history of the imperial portrait[278]. His love for everything Greek and the great revival of interest in classical Greece that characterizes the second century naturally invaded the coinage too, slowly at first, but in full power from about A.D. 126 onwards. This process culminated in the very large heads of his middle years, reminiscent of those of the Hellenistic kings. In his last seven years his portraiture settled down to an unchanged idealism: gracious, noble, grandly conceived, touched with poetry and imagination, even with romance. His portraits are in marked contrast to that of his successor, Antoninus. As Philip Hill remarks, Antoninus' period was uncomplicated, rather dull both in types and portraiture. It was realistic and changed

[277] On the symbolism of attributes, such as *aegis, paludamentum* see *BMCRE* III.xxiii.
[278] On Hadrian's numismatic portraits see Moser (1974). See also, *BMCRE* III.cxxi-cxxiv and Hill (1970) 13-17. For studies on Hadrian's portraiture, in particular in sculpture, see Wegner (1956) and, more recently, Evers (1994).

little, "a reaction by an Italian country gentleman to the Philhellenism of his predecessor."[279]

In terms of titulature, a variety of titles accompany Hadrian's image on the coinage, such as *Caesar, Augustus Imperator, Pater Patriae, Pontifex Maximus*, even the military titles of his predecessors *Optimus* included, at least early in his reign. The Latin forms as well as their Greek counterparts are found on the coins of the Greek mints too, always followed, in both cases, by the indication of his *Tribunicia Potestas* and his consulship. Of the titles the most striking, as we will see later, is, of course, the legend *Hadrianus Augustus* (reflecting the simple form *Caesar Augustus*), which Hadrian adopted sometime between 123 and 128.

With these remarks in mind, we can now proceed to the examination of certain iconographical types that help us understand better Hadrian's program.

4.4.1 Hadrian, the son of Trajan

As Hadrian's adoption was somewhat doubted, the emperor hastened to first emphasize his kinship with Trajan. A rare issue of 117 was clearly the accession issue and the first in Hadrian's time. There are two types, in silver and gold, both depicting Trajan and Hadrian, one having the additional legend of *Adoptio* in the exergue. The first type presents Hadrian laureate on the obverse, followed by the title *[Imp Caes Divi] Traian Aug F Traian [Hadrian Opt Aug Ger]*[280]. On the reverse, Hadrian and Trajan are presented wearing the toga. Trajan hands the globe over to Hadrian. The legend *Dac [Parthico P M] Tr P Cos PP, SC* continues the legend of the obverse and surrounds the scene.

[279] Hill (1970) 22.
[280] *BMCRE* III.397, 1101.

The other type is even more explicit in its message. Again, a laureate Hadrian appears on the obverse, followed by the title *Imp Caes Traian Hadriano Opt [Aug Ger Dac]*[281]. On the reverse, former and current emperors, standing, clasp hands. The scene is accompanied by the title *Parthic Divi Trian Aug F P M Tr P [Cos PP],* and by the legend *Adoptio* in the exergue. The message implied in the first type is clearly expressed here: Hadrian was nominated emperor by Trajan himself, who first adopted him and then entrusted the *imperium* of the world to him.

Paul Strack doubts the theory that the Roman mint was responsible for the *Adoptio* issue and attributes it to the imperial mint of Antioch, Syria[282]. I believe that this theory has a certain plausibility given that Hadrian at the time of his adoption was in that area[283].

It is interesting that the coins of his early reign included the title of *P(ater) P(atriae)* in Hadrian's titulature, while it is omitted from subsequent issues and does not reappear until 128. It is probable that during the new emperor's absence, mint officials placed the title on the coinage without Hadrian's consent. Trajan had accepted it in the year following his accession, but Hadrian delayed his consent for 11 years, until he finally accepted the title in 128.

Interesting, though not unexpected in the titulature of Roman emperors, is the fact that on the early Hadrianic issues Hadrian's title includes all of Trajan's epithets (*Optimus, Germanicus, Dacicus and Parthicus*). Hill argues that the occurrence of these titles is due to the engravers' errors in titulature, who at first transferred them to his successor and afterwards corrected their mistakes only in the consecration

[281] *BMCRE* III.372, 1021.
[282] Strack (1933) 195-196. Mattingly considers an Eastern origin too (*BMCRE* III.372, 1021).
[283] See for example Dio Cassius 69.2.1.

issues[284]. This seems hardly to be the case, as the frequent adoption of a predecessor's titles by his successor, widely attested in inscriptions, refute Hill's theory[285]. Hadrian bore, by transference, the military titles of Trajan in the first issue of 117- never later- and he adopted none of his own. Like the military titles of Trajan, *Optimus* was abandoned by Hadrian after a short use in 117. Moreover, Hadrian is only *Divi Traiani F(ilius)* on these first issues of 117. In contrast to Trajan, who maintained some reference to Nerva throughout his reign on his coinage, Hadrian never once mentioned Trajan in his numismatic titulature after ca. 125, though he piously honored his adoptive father with a consecration issue in that year and an issue that possibly alludes to the dedication of the temple of Trajan[286].

4.4.2 Hadrian and *Saeculum Aureum*

Three types from the early years of Hadrian's reign, specifically from the period of 117-121, connect Trajan and Hadrian's new era with myth. The mythical bird Phoenix features on the reverse of these coins, two of which come from the mint of Rome and the third from the mint of Alexandria[287].

The first of them, an aureus, depicts Trajan's bust, laureate and cuirassed, on the obverse, with the legend *Divo Traiano Parth Aug Patri*. The anepigraphic reverse

---

[284] Hill (1970) 49.

[285] See for example, a miliarium from Berytus, in Syria: *Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) divi T[r]aiani / Parthici fi<l=I>(io) divi Nervae / nepo ti Traiano Hadriano / {V} Aug(usto) Germ(anico) Dacico Parthic(o) / p(ontifici) m(aximo) trib(unicia) pot(estate) p(atri) p(atriae) / mil<l=P>(ia) pass(uum) / II* (*AnnEp* 1896.121); also a dedication of Trajan's statue by Hadrian in Cyprus from 129: Αὐτοκ[ρ]ά<τωρ> [Καῖσαρ Τραϊανὸς]/<Ἁδρ>ιανὸς Σεβαστὸς Γ[ερ]μανικὸς [Δακικὸς Παρθικός],/[θεοῦ Νέρουα Τ]ραϊα<ν>[οῦ] Καίσαρος υἱ[ός, θεοῦ]/[Νέρουα υἱωνός, θ]<ε>ὸν Τραϊανὸν τὸ[ν πατέρα] (*IKourion* 85).

[286] *BMCRE* III.xxvi.

[287] For a discussion of these types see Martin (1974), Castritius (1964) and briefly Hill (1970) 51-52. Birley (1997) 83 notes the fact that Claudius had already produced a phoenix to symbolize and authenticate his new *saeculum*. cf. Martin (1974) 328, who maintains "il s'agit de l'apparition, pour la première fois à Rome, de l' image e l' oiseau fabuleux, le Phénix, sur une série de revers monétaires".

depicts the mythical bird with radiate nimbus standing on a branch[288]. The second, an aureus too, presents Hadrian's laureate bust with the legend *Imp Caes Traian Hadrianus Aug*[289]. On the reverse, a standing male figure holds in the left hand a globe, on top of which stands Phoenix. The legend is particularly revealing: *P(ontifex) M(aximus) Tr(ibunicia) P(otestas) Co(n)sul III, Saec(ulum) Aur(eum)*. Hadrian's reign was a golden era.

The third example, a tetradrachm from Alexandria, depicts Hadrian's laureate head on the obverse with the legend Αὐτ Καίσ Τρα Ἁδριανὸς Σεβ[290]. On the reverse, a standing female figure, identified by the inscription as Pronoia, wears a chiton and peplos and holds a garland. In her right hand she holds a radiate Phoenix, and in the left a scepter.

It is possible that there is an allusion to the consecration of Trajan on the iconography of the first coin. The legend *Divus* and the Phoenix symbolize the eternity of Trajan's name. The solar aspects of the bird and its mystic-religious symbolism as well as the legend *Divus,* which clearly points to the divine status of the deceased emperor, argue for the consecration of Trajan. However, I believe that the political message is the one that prevails here. By issuing coins with the bird, Hadrian affirms his affiliation with the dead emperor. The association of Trajan with a phoenix on coins is a way to preserve the memory of the *imperium* of Trajan and to show the will of Hadrian to be seen as the son of Trajan and follow in the foot-steps of his predecessor as a good emperor.

[288] *BMCRE* III.245, 48-49.
[289] *BMCRE* III.278, 312.
[290] *SNG Denmark* 41.414-415.

The male figure of the second type has been identified either as the Genius of the Golden Age (Mattingly in *BMCRE*) or even as Trajan himself[291]. Martin sees here the dead emperor who holds the globe and looks at his own image, his successor, Hadrian. This theory apparently attempts to show the connection between this type and the aforementioned one, on which Trajan entrusts the globe to Hadrian. Although his theory cannot be proved, it still has some plausibility. By the use of three types-the one mentioned before, on which Trajan presents Hadrian the globe; the second, where Hadrian as Phoenix rests on the globe handed to him by Trajan; and the Divus Traianus type with the radiate Phoenix- Hadrian appears as the continuator of Trajan rather than the inaugurator of a new era. Given the issue date, Hadrian had still to prove himself as the legitimate successor of Trajan. Furthermore, it was in his interest to reassure the people of Rome, first of all the Senate, about his intentions. He was the new Phoenix, born from the ashes of his father, and continued a golden age, a *saeculum aureum*.

Martin suggests that the inspiration for the design of the Alexandrian type came from official circles, "impulsions venues d'en haut", without connecting it directly to Hadrian himself[292]. Pronoia's presence with Phoenix on the reverse is justified, since Pronoia permitted Trajan to give himself a successor, who is depicted on the obverse. Pronoia presents an *aeternum imperium*, symbolized by the globe and the Phoenix, to Hadrian. She also guarantees the continuity of Trajan's reign and the greatness of the new era.

Thus, these types embody fundamental ideas which preside at the beginning of the new reign: affiliation of the new emperor with Trajan and continuation of a

[291] Martin (1974) 336.
[292] Martin (1974) 337.

program which created the conditions of a golden age. The general idea, expressed by the phoenix, was known to all: Hadrian was a new Trajan, the son who came to continue what his father accomplished. It was the essential point of the propaganda of Hadrian in a period when he still had to affirm the legitimacy of his *imperium*.

4.4.3 Hadrian and the Roman Past

This continuity had to be extended far beyond Trajan, back to the first princeps, Augustus. Therefore, it is not surprising that his image is often found along with that of Hadrian on the coinage of the period. Sources provide plenty of information about the devotion that Hadrian showed to Augustus. Suetonius, in the life of Augustus, reveals that Augustus, while in childhood, was named Thurinus. The author claimed that he had a proof of this. In his possession, there was a bronze statuette of Augustus, depicting him as a boy and carrying the inscribed name Thurinus. This statuette, he continues, he presented to Hadrian, who placed it among his *Lares* in his bedroom[293].

When the *Fratres Arvales* received a written communication from Hadrian in 118 they opened the tablets which were sealed with the *signum* impressed by a head of Augustus: *tabulae aperta[e si]gno [signatae, quod] exprimit kaput Augusti*[294]. In other words, Hadrian had a portrait of the first princeps on his signet-ring.

The imperial coinage at about this time drastically abbreviates Hadrian's titulature. Instead of being styled "*Imperator Caesar Traianus Hadrianus Augustus*", he was soon presented simply as "*Hadrianus Augustus*", a form which was not carried on the coinage of his predecessor. The message conveyed is clear enough: he wanted

[293] Suetonius, *Augustus* 7: *Thurinum cognominatum satis certa probatione tradiderim, nactus puerilem imagunculam eius aeream veterem, ferreis et paene iam exolescentibus litteris hoc nomine inscriptam, quae dono a me principi data inter cubiculi Lares colitur.*
[294] Scheid (1998) 203, 68, ll. 30-31.

to be seen as a new Augustus. He wished to model himself on the first Princeps, emulate his *saeculum aureum*, and return to the Augustan policy of non-expansion[295]. Suetonius' praise of Augustus' non-expansion policy seems to allude to Hadrian[296].

In this atmosphere, the mints were eager to address the interest of the emperor in Augustus. The mint of Nicopolis, in Epeiros, provides two interesting pieces. The first carries the laureate and cuirassed bust of Hadrian on the obverse[297]. The legend reads Ἀδριανὸς Καῖσαρ. The reverse depicts a ship, on the prow of which a male figure is standing. Karamesine-Oikonomidou correctly suggested that the figure is that of the founder of the city, Octavian. The legend confirms this: Αὔγουστος.

The second coin from Nicopolis presents the same iconography and legend on the obverse as the first[298]. On the reverse, Octavian rides a horse which gallops to the right. The legend again reads Αὔγουστος.

The coin that has attracted the most attention is a silver cistophorus from Asia Minor. Metcalf in his study on the cistophori attributes the type to an unidentified mint that was in operation as early as 129[299]. The coin depicts the bare head of Augustus on the obverse followed by the title *Imp Caesar Augustus*. On the reverse, Hadrian, togate, is shown standing. In his right hand he holds a grain stalk and wraps the left one in toga. The legend is unusual: *Hadrianus Augustus PP Ren*.
The restoration of the last word is problematic, and various theories have been suggested.

Metcalf proposed "*renovavit"* and argued that Hadrian "renewed" the coinage in a very literal sense by re-striking it and equally gave it new form through the

[295] Suetonius, *Divus Augustus* 21.2
[296] Birley (1997) 96.
[297] Karamesine-Oikonomidou (1975) 82, 10.
[298] Karamesine-Oikonomidou (1975) 84, 24.
[299] Metcalf (1980) 89-90.

employment of local types[300]. This interpretation, he continues, is consistent with the use of Augustus' portrait, which can be seen as an idealization of some of the portraits of his (Augustus') own cistophori; "Augustus had, after all, taken the final steps in the Romanization of the cistophori." Thus the coin, he claims, commemorates both the founder and the renewer of the cistophoric series; Hadrian holding grain on the reverse is a generalized symbol of well-being and prosperity. Moreover, his re-coining of the cistophori eliminated financial abuses in the province of Asia. In other words, the legend reflects Hadrian's coinage policy in the province.

Mattingly proposed instead *ren(atus),* a reading which has gained popularity among scholars[301]. According to this interpretation, the legend is connected with Hadrian's initiation into the Eleusinian Mysteries. In September 128, five years after his initiation into the first grade, Hadrian took part in the mysteries again. The grain stalk held by the emperor symbolizes the connection of the Mysteries with Demeter. Hadrian received initiation at Eleusis and was reborn to the eternal life of the faithful "mystic". The portrait of Augustus on the obverse takes on greater significance since the first princeps was the only emperor before Hadrian to have been initiated. He had likewise advertised the fact on the Asian cistophori with a reverse depicting ears of corn. Accordingly, the legend "*renatus*" refers not only to Hadrian's religious rebirth at Eleusis, but more generally to his rebirth as a second Augustus. Recollection of their common religious experience symbolized the spiritual kinship of Hadrian and Augustus.

Kevin Clinton accepts the Eleusinian connection and argues that the person depicted on the reverse is Ploutos with the features of Hadrian[302]. The legend

[300] Metcalf (1980) 90.
[301] *BMCRE* III.clx; Grant (1950) 102; Kienast (1959-1960); Birley (1997) 215.
[302] Clinton (1989) 57-58.

"*renatus*", he argues, refers to the rejuvenation experienced in the Mysteries, and in Hadrian's case, to his new life as the young god Ploutos. Ploutos, celebrated in the Mysteries, he continues, was the prosperity that comes to men from the two goddesses. As a consequence, the scene on the reverse is a symbolism of prosperity that Hadrian brought to people.

I believe that the Eleusinian connection is somewhat unclear as it is uncertain whether the Asians paid particular attention to Hadrian's initiation. The arguments on which this theory is based are Augustus' portrait, the grain stalk and the ambiguous abbreviation "*REN*". I do not see why all three elements have to be connected with the Mysteries. In my opinion there might be other ways to explain their occurrence on this coin. Therefore, here I would like to advance a different theory. I believe that the depiction of Hadrian holding grain on the reverse reflects the expression of an Asian city's gratitude for an actual benefaction, either food supply or other. Although the grain stalk could be perceived as a symbol of civilization, I think there is a great possibility that it actually symbolizes what it is: grain supply. According to our sources two cities of Asia Minor had received permission from Hadrian to import grain from Egypt. The first was Ephesos in 129 and the second Tralleis some time between 127 and 129[303]. Based on stylistic arguments Metcalf has excluded Ephesos as the mint that produced our cistophorus. Besides, Ephesos' mint had already been identified[304]. Tralleis, on the other hand, is a strong candidate. The city was given permission to import grain from Egypt, something that was a major benefaction to a city, and perhaps could explain the title *ktistes* attributed to Hadrian on the city's

[303] Ephesos: *IEphesos* 274; Tralleis: *ITralleis* 80.
[304] Metcalf (1980) 88.

coins, as we will later see[305]. If indeed the scene of the reverse mirrors Hadrian's benefaction, how do we explain the image of Augustus on the obverse? Augustus had been a major benefactor to the city as well. In about 27-26 BC the city was hit by an earthquake. The poet Chaeremon traveled to the emperor, then in Spain, to appeal for help for Tralleis. Augustus indeed gave money to the city, which in gratitude took the name Caesarea[306]. It seems then that Hadrian's grain supply was viewed as a benefaction equal to that by Augustus, and Hadrian was viewed as a second Augustus, a fact which compels us to read "*REN*" as "*renatus*" and not "*renovavit*". "*Renovavit*" seems to be a little far-fetched interpretation and I doubt people were able to understand it, unless of course they had access to coin production. Moreover, nothing on the coin, legend or scene, can relate (in people's mind) to the "renovation" idea. On the contrary, I believe that Augustus's portrait, grain stalk and the abbreviation can be explained in the way I have suggested here. It is interesting that Hadrian's secretary, Phlegon, was from this city and perhaps he had something to do with it, since he had personal knowledge of the emperor's affection for the first princeps. Perhaps the occasion of the striking of the coin was Hadrian's visit to the city in 129. It is also interesting that Tralleis is not accounted among the known cistophoric mints and stylistic parallels compel me to think of the city as a very strong candidate for the issuing of the coin[307].

As second Augustus, Hadrian inherited the first princeps' role of new Romulus. Hence the type of Romulus advancing with spear and trophy on sestertii-

[305] Only five cities were granted this "gift" by Hadrian: Ephesos, Tralleis, Cyrene, Athens, and possibly Sparta.
[306] See Millar (1977) 423, note 16 for a list of ancient sources.
[307] See the togate figure of Britannicus holding ears of corn on a Claudian coin from the city in *RPC* I.2654.

size medallions, a type shared with aurei and denarii[308]. On the obverse of this type, Hadrian, laureate or bare headed, with the legend *Hadrianus Augustus Cos III PP*. On the reverse, as mentioned, Romulus, bare headed, advances in military dress and carries a spear in his right hand and a trophy over his shoulder in his left hand. The legend reads *Romulo Conditori*. The dedication to '*Romulo Conditori*" is essentially homage to Hadrian, the new founder of Rome.

The type originates from the mint of Rome, but as for its date there is a disagreement among scholars. It seems to date from 134-138 and perhaps to be issued at the consecration of the temple of Venus and Roma in 136 or 137[309]. However, regarding the aurei of this type, Hill argues that it was actually issued after Hadrian's death by his successor, as a means to force the Senate to agree to Hadrian's deification and ratification of his acts[310].

Particularly popular in the numismatic iconography of both Rome and the Greek East was the theme of the she-wolf nourishing the twins[311]. For example, an aureus from Rome, of the period of 125-128, depicts the laureate bust of the emperor on the obverse and the she-wolf suckling the twins on the reverse[312]. Medallions issued on the 150th anniversary of the Principate also adopted the theme[313]. The type was picked up by local mints such as that of the city of Apollonia in Mysia, which displays the same iconography as that from Rome[314]. An aes, issued by the city of

---

[308] On medallions see Gnecchi, *Medaglioni* III.18.84; on aurei see *BMCRE* III.306, 528; on silver denarius, *BMCRE* III.329, 709.
[309] Rothman (1978) 127, note 55.
[310] Hill (1966) 179. Hill is not clear as to whether this date should be applied to the same type struck on silver and medallions.
[311] In this context see the Hellenistic honorific decree for an unknown individual from Chios (Graf (1985) 456, I.Ch. 78). The city honored an unknown benefactor, who, among other things, set up a votive offering that depicted the birth of the twins (ll. 22-27). The she-wolf and the twins were clearly among the symbols of Rome and its power in the Greek East (ll. 27-29).
[312] *BMCRE* III.295, 444.
[313] Rothman (1978) 127, note 55.
[314] Imhoof-Blumel (1913) 228-229.

Cydonia in Crete, portrays, as usually, Hadrian's portrait on the obverse and on the reverse the she-wolf nourishing only one child[315]. An interesting piece comes from Bithynia. The aes was issued by the Bithynian Koinon during Hadrian's reign. The bronze depicts Hadrian's bust on the obverse, while on the reverse an octastyle temple dominates the scene. Inside the temple the she-wolf suckles the twins. The legend reads Κοινὸν Βειθυνίας. The temple is surely an allusion to the imperial cult.

The design was very common in Asia Minor and we find an interesting combination of images on a bronze from Ilion, which was struck throughout the second century AD. The coin depicts the she-wolf suckling the twins not on the reverse, but on the obverse, while Hector, holding spear and shield, is shown on the reverse[316]. The point is very clear: both cities share the same past, the same legends. The ties between the two cities and Ilion's continuity in Rome are messages that were understood by everyone. Preeminence is given to Rome, as the she-wolf is selected to dominate the obverse. The "metropolis" recognizes the superiority of the daughter-city and pays homage to her.

Hector appears again on a bronze from Ilion. The hero is depicted on the reverse as before with the legend Ἰλι Ἕκτωρ. The obverse is dominated by the laureate bust of Hadrian[317]. It is noteworthy that the Trojan hero makes his appearance on the coins of the city in the reign of Hadrian. We know that the emperor had visited the area in 124 and restored the tomb of Ajax[318]. It is also possible that he wrote an

[315] Mionnet 2.275,139.
[316] Sear (1982) 4922.
[317] Sear (1982) 1159.
[318] Philostratus, *Heroicus* 137 (I use the page numbers from volume 2 of C.L. Kayser's Teubner edition in 1871).

epigram on Hector's tomb[319]. I believe that the appearance of Hector on the coinage is a local response to the emperor's personal interest[320].

The close ties between Rome and Ilion are demonstrated again on a coin from the same city dated to Hadrian's reign[321]. It depicts Hadrian's crowned bust on the obverse with the legend Αὐτ Καίσ Τρα Ἀδριανὸς. The reverse combines scenes that most explicitly demonstrate the continuity of history: Aeneas carries Anchises and holds Ascanius's hand; next to them, the she-wolf with the twins. The legend reads Ἰλιέων. The iconography of Aeneas was popular in Rome and Asia Minor[322] as attested by another Hadrianic from the same city that portrays the head of Athena on the obverse and Aeneas carrying his father and leading Ascanius on the reverse[323]. The coins of Apameia, in Bithynia, from the time of Hadrian onwards, also carry the design[324].

In this context of Hadrian's association with Roman history and myths, we must place the coins that depict Hadrian in association with Aeneas' and Rome's mother, Venus Genetrix. A couple of examples from Rome and the provinces will suffice to prove the point. In the first example, an aureus from Rome dated to 128-138, Hadrian is shown on the obverse, while on the reverse Venus, holding Victory, rests on a shield. A scepter leans against her left arm, and the legend leaves no doubt regarding her identity: *Veneri Genetrici*[325]. On a silver denarius from the same mint, Hadrian's wife, Sabina, is shown on the obverse, while on the reverse Venus holds an

---

[319] *Anth. Graeca* 9.387. Cf. *Anth. Latina* 708.
[320] Cf. Erskine (2001) 253 who argues that Hector's appearance was due to the city's need to reassert its Trojan identity in light of the Hellenocentric policy of the emperor as that was reflected in the Panhellenion.
[321] *SNG Aulock* 1533.
[322] On Aeneas on coins see Duncan (1948).
[323] *SNG England* VI.II.1328.
[324] Sear (1982) 1144.
[325] *BMCRE* III.307, 529. Hill, as in the case of the aureus with the *Romulo Conditori* legend, identifies this as a posthumous issue edited by Antoninus-Hill (1966) 179.

apple. The legend again reads *Veneri Genetrici*[326]. An example from the East is found on a coin from an unidentified mint with the legend *Hadrianus Augustus* accompanying Hadrian's bust on the obverse. On the reverse, Venus stands and raises both hands. The legend is the same as on the previous examples[327].

So far I have examined types that advertise Hadrian's association with great figures of Rome and myths of the city. Now I will discuss numismatic iconography that connects Hadrian with the traditions and myths of the Greek East.

4.4.4 Hadrian and Greece: past and present

We saw that the Greek mints were eager to publicize Hadrian's association with the legendary past and history of Rome. Even more frequent is the numismatic portrayal of the emperor with figures from the past and traditions of the Greek world. Given the Philhellenic feelings of the emperor and the interest in classical tradition in the second century this is not a surprise. The frequent travels of the emperor in the area, his benefactions to the Greek cities, in particular Athens, Smyrna and Ephesos, as well as the atmosphere that led to the foundation of the Panhellenion, all these factors facilitated those iconographical choices that exposed Hadrian's relationship with the Greek world.

One of the most important developments that we can observe in the numismatic iconography of this period- which also echoes the emperor's attitude to Hellenism- is the appearance of unambiguously Greek themes on coins of Rome itself. These issues associate in an amazing way the Greek past with its Roman present and Hadrian's philhellenism. Representations of Poseidon with dolphin and

[326] *BMCRE* III.360, 944
[327] *BMCRE* III.379,12.

trident, for example, or of Artemis and Pegasus are indicative of a growing re-approch between the Greek and Roman traditions in his reign. A bronze dupondius of 119-121 from Rome depicts Hadrian on the obverse and the winged horse Pegasus on the reverse[328]. This motif was very popular in Corinth, with whose king, Bellerophon, Pegasus was closely associated.

The horse was depicted on the city's coinage already from Archaic times and continued even when the city was re-founded as a Roman colony. A Corinthian bronze depicts Hadrian on the obverse and Pegasus on the reverse[329]. Another example from the same city presents Hadrian followed by the legend *Imp Caes Tra Hadrian Aug*; on the reverse, Bellerophon on Pegasus strikes at the Chimaera, while the accompanying legend reads *Col L (Iul Co)r*[330]. Perhaps the Corinthian types reflect Corinth's acknowledgment of Hadrian's role in the prosperity of the city. We know that the emperor provided the city with baths as well as a new aqueduct which brought water from lake Stymphalos. The emperor also improved access to the city from Attica by widening the road over the Skironian cliffs between Corinth and Megara. It is no accident, and is certainly related to Hadrian's benefactions to the city, that an increase in coin production occurred in his reign and continued during the Antonine period[331].

An interesting coin comes from the city of Aegeai in Cilicia[332]. It is a silver tridrachm of 117 that depicts a laureate bust of Hadrian on the reverse followed by the legend Αὐτοκρ Καῖσ Τραιανὸς Ἁδριανὸς Σεβ. The reverse depicts the bust of a male figure with a diadem and below him a goat recumbent, the symbol of the city. The

[328] *Cat. Ossolinski* 3.423.
[329] *SNG Denmark* 15.283.
[330] *SNG Denmark* 15.284.
[331] So Engels (1990) 53.
[332] *SNG Denmark* 33.35.

legend helps date the coin: ἔτους δξρ′ Αἰγεαίων (= 164 of the Ceasarian era, that is 117). The editors of the coin identified the figure on the reverse as Alexander the Great. Hadrian's predecessor was anxious to imitate Alexander's advance to the East[333], but of Hadrian's interest in Alexander there is not much evidence. We know that in 122 a part of the Sixth Legion arrived at Tyne, at the east end of Hadrian's British wall. The legion dedicated two altars, one to Neptune, the other to Oceanus. Alexander the Great had sacrificed to the same deities at the river Hydaspes (a branch of the Indus river). Hadrian's friend Arrianus describes the scene[334]. This act had marked the end of the Indian campaign. Did Hadrian imitate the great king, whom Trajan wished to emulate? Did he reach his western counterpart to Alexander's at Indus? Also, when Alexander's horse Bucephalus died in India, the king allegedly founded a city at the spot. Hadrian showed himself prone to gestures of this kind- when his favorite steed, Borysthenes, died, Hadrian honored his horse by preparing a tomb upon which he placed an inscription[335].

Hadrian's intellectual interests were well known to contemporaries. Some cities of the East underlined this by depicting him on their coinage along with famous local figures. So a bronze from Halicarnassos depicts Hadrian, laureate, on the obverse, and a bald and bearded bust of Herodotos on the reverse accompanied by the legend, Ἁλικαρνασσέων Ἡρόδοτος[336]. The figure of the historian appears now for the first time on the coinage of the city and certainly reflects not only the contemporary interest in classical Greece but also the literary pursuits of the emperor[337]. Along the same lines, the city of Priene issued a bronze with Hadrian's laureate head on the

[333] Dio Cassius 68.29.1; 30.1.
[334] *Historia Indica* 18.11.
[335] Dio Cassius 69.10.2; *Historia Augusta* 20.12-13. The inscription is published in the *CIL* 12.1122.
[336] *SNG England* I.II.294.
[337] Herodotus appeared again on the city's coins under Gordian III.

obverse and the philosopher Bias standing on the reverse[338]. The philosopher was a citizen of the city and one of the Seven Sages of Greece. Certainly, such a selection of iconography flattered the emperor.

Hadrian's benefactions to the cities as well as his (re)foundation of a number of them did not go unnoticed by local mints. A large number of coins honor Hadrian as *ktistes*, which referred either to a major benefaction to the city by the emperor in the form of building or even a (re)foundation of a city. For example, a bronze from Tralleis depicts on the obverse laureate Hadrian accompanied by the legend Αὐ Καί Τρα Ἀδριανὸς Κτίστης[339]. The reverse depicts Zeus Larasios seated and holding Nike and scepter. Before him stands Ephesian Artemis flanked by stags. As I stated above, the epithet *ktistes* could be related to Hadrian's permission to the city to import grain from Egypt. If, on the other hand, we must associate the scene of the obverse with that of the reverse, perhaps the epithet "*ktistes*" reflects an unknown major benefaction of the emperor to the temple of the god. Though I find the first explanation more satisfactory, I believe that the second is possible too.

Two issues from Argos in Peloponnesos allude to the emperor's visit and works there, perhaps in 124/125. The first, a bronze, depicts a laureate Hadrian with the legend Αὐτ Ἀδριανὸς Κτίστης, while the reverse carries an image of Zeus with scepter[340]. The second, a bronze again, carries the same obverse, while the reverse depicts Apollo holding lyre and plectrum, followed by the inscription Ἀργείων[341]. We know that the emperor had built a new aqueduct for the city with perhaps a nymphaeum at its termination, probably before 124[342]. Hadrian also dedicated a gold

[338] *SNG England* VI.II.1497.
[339] Sear (1982) 1189.
[340] *SNG Deutschland-Herzog* 893.
[341] *SNG Denmark* 17.86.
[342] Boatwright (2000) 112; 134 with note 95.

and bejeweled statue of a peacock at the Heraion[343]. Perhaps the building of the new aqueduct can justify the epithet *ktistes*.

Our next example is a bronze from Stratonikeia-Hadrianopolis in Mysia[344]. The city had been visited by the emperor in 123. The obverse portrays laureate Hadrian accompanied by the title Ἁδριανὸς Κτίστης, while the reverse depicts Zeus. The epithet clearly refers to the re-foundation of the city, which now bore the double name Stratonikeia-Hadrianopolis. Hadrian reconstituted as a polis an earlier sympoliteia of two communities, Stratonikeia and Indeipedion[345]. A letter from the emperor to the city in 127 refers to the recent foundation of the city under its double name[346].

The last example comes from a Roman colony, though originally it was founded by Greeks. The city of Parion in Mysia was founded by colonists from the island of Paros but under Augustus became a colony, *Pariana Iulia Augusta*[347]. The obverse of this bronze depicts Hadrian with the legend *Hadrianus Aug PP*. On the reverse, a male figure, identified as a colony founder, is ploughing. The legend reads *C(olonia) G(emella) I(ulia) H(Adriana) P(ariana)* a reference to the second re-foundation of the city as colony by Hadrian.

4.4.5 Hadrian Olympios

Hadrian's hearty reception among the Greeks found its greatest numismatic expression in the depiction of the emperor as Olympios. The use of the epithet Olympios for Hadrian is attested for the first time in 128 but becomes regular after

[343] Pausanias 2.17.6.
[344] *Weber Coll.* 6567.
[345] See discussion in Boatwright (2000) 184ff, who treats with skepticism the idea that the re-foundation was the result of the earthquake of 120 (186, note 67).
[346] Oliver (1989) 201, 79, ll. 8-9: δίκαια ἀξιοῦν μοι δοκεῖτε καὶ ἀναγκαῖα ἄ[ρ]/τι γεινομένη πόλει.
[347] *SNG Tübungen* 4.3252.

131/2, the year in which the Olympieion was finished, the statue of Olympios Zeus was dedicated in it, and the Panhellenion was founded by Hadrian. By addressing the emperor as Olympios the cities clearly identified him with the head of the gods. Now Hadrian becomes not the god of a single Greek city but of the entire Greek world. As we will see in the next chapter, Hadrian paid special attention to his reception as the earthly counterpart of Zeus. Certainly the coins presented below, as well as numerous inscriptions that honored him as Olympios, reflect this atmosphere.

According to current numismatic evidence, nine cities named Hadrian *Olympios* on their coins: the Roman colony of Dion in Achaea, the city of Cos, and from Asia Minor, Cyzicus, Ephesos, Eumeneia, Hydrela, Kame, Sagalassos, and Tarsos.

Despite the extensive evidence for the epithet on statue bases from the provinces of Achaea and Macedonia, the epithet only shows up on coins from the colony of Dion. The coins from Dion have the laureate bust of the emperor on the obverse and the inscription *Imp Caes Hadriano Aug Olympio*. All coins with the image of Hadrian from this city carry the epithet Olympios. On the reverse, we have either Athena, accompanied by the owl and snake and pouring a libation[348], or a standing Zeus[349], leaning with his left hand on a scepter and with his right holding a *phiale*; he too is pouring a libation. An eagle is shown at his feet. The legend reads *Col Iul Aug Diensis*. It is noteworthy that the image of Zeus on the coins of the city was introduced in Hadrian's reign. The issue of *Olympios* is dated to 132 or shortly after, according to Kremmyde-Sicilianou (51).

[348] Kremmyde-Sicilianou (1996) 184-186, nrs 1-14.
[349] Kremmyde-Sicilianou (1996) 186, nr 15.

A Latin inscription from the same period helps date it. The text comes from the temenos of Zeus Olympios in Athens and belongs to the vast number of statue bases that were erected in honor of Hadrian at and after the completion of the Olympieion and the inauguration of the Panhellenion. The statue in question was erected by the city of Dion in 132[350]. The dative case (*Hadriano Olympio*) that occurs both on the coin and the inscription testifies to the fact that in both instances we have a dedication to Olympios Hadrian, a clear reference to the divine status of the emperor. This remarkable double dedication is an unprecedented honor for an emperor by the city of Dion.

As the issue of the coin came shortly after the foundation of the Panhellenion, it has been suggested that the issue could mark either the request of Dion for admission to the Panhellenion or its membership[351]. Although Dion's membership is not attested, it is noteworthy that the epithet Olympios is not frequent in Macedonia: only the colonies of Philippi and Dion attributed it to Hadrian, and only to him. This is even more striking since no city in Achaea attributed the epithet Olympios to Hadrian on coinage, in contrast to the cities of Asia Minor where numerous coin issues carry the title.

Karamesine-Oikonomidou, in her work on the coinage of Nicopolis, states that she was unable to find a coin that bore the legend *Panellenios*, referring to Hadrian, as earlier scholars had argued[352]. This unique type was eventually located in the collection of the city of Winterthur in Switzerland[353]. This bronze of 130-138 depicts

---

[350] *CIL* 3.548B; 7281: *[I]mp(eratori) Caes(ari) divi Traiani Par/thici fil(io) divi Nervae nepo/ti Traiano Hadriano Aug(usto) / [p(ontifici)] m(aximo) tr(ibunicia) pot(estate) XVI co(n)s(uli) III p(atri) p(atriae) / Olympio / colonia Iulia Augusta / Diensium per legatum / G(aium) Memmium Lycum* / Διεστῶν.
[351] So Kremmyde-Sicilianou (1996) 51 and Papaefthymiou (2001) 72.
[352] Karamesine-Oikonomidou (1975) 31.
[353] Bloesch (1987) 1781.

Hadrian's bust on the obverse with the legend Καῖσ Πανελλ[ή]νιος. The reverse displays a crescent and star followed by the inscription Νεικόπολις. It is unknown whether the city had applied for admission to the Panhellenion and chose to advertise this by the type. No other known coin from the Greek East carries this title with respect to Hadrian, but we cannot exclude the probability that cities could have done so, imitating inscriptions as they did with the title Olympios.

Of particular importance for the view of the emperor as Olympios is the coinage of Ephesos. The city was one of the several Asian cities that cut this issue. Two types, on bronze, carry the image of laureate Hadrian on the obverse followed by the legend (Ἀ)δριανὸς Καῖσαρ Ὀλύμπ(ιος) . The first[354] depicts the temple of Ephesian Artemis within which stands her statue, and the second[355] portrays the statue itself. However, the most expressive piece is a silver cistophorus of 129[356]. It depicts Hadrian on the obverse with the legend *Hadrianus Augustus Cos. III. PP*, while on the reverse, Zeus sitting on a throne, holds a scepter in his left hand and, in his outstretched right hand, an image of the Ephesian Artemis. The legend reads *Iovis Olympius Ephesi.*

The image of Zeus Olympios holding the small statue of Artemis and his identification with the emperor (here and in a number of inscriptions) epitomize the close relationship of the emperor with the city. Hadrian's love for Ephesos was well known in antiquity. Among other things, the emperor had granted the city a second neokorate, and permitted the Ephesians to import grain from Egypt. An inscription of 129 on a statue base for Hadrian set up by the *boule* and the *demos* of Ephesos honors Hadrian, their founder and savior, for his benefactions to the city and most of all for

[354] *SNG Denmark* 22.387.
[355] *SNG Denmark* 22.388.
[356] Metcalf (1980) 281-283.

his unsurpassable gifts to Artemis[357]. In light of these facts, I suggest that this last piece reflects not any other benefaction to Ephesos, but the specific grant to the cult of Artemis. The god's holding the cult statue symbolizes Hadrian's gifts to the temple of the goddess and consequently strengthens Hadrian's bonds not only with the citizens of Ephesos, but all Asia Minor, of which Artemis was a chief deity.

Among other cities that issued an *Olympios* type in Asia Minor it will suffice to mention here Eumeneia in Phrygia and Sagalassos in Pisidia[358]. The first depicts laureate Hadrian on the obverse accompanied by the legend Ἀδριανὸς Καῖσαρ Ὀλύμπιος. On the reverse, a standing Nike holds a crown in her right hand and a palm-branch. The legend reads Εὐμενέων Ἀχαιῶν [359]. The bronze examples from Sagalassos carry on the obverse the laureate image of the emperor and the legend Ἀδριανὸς Καῖσαρ Ὀλύμπιος. The reverse presents two distinct types. The first depicts the Dioskouroi[360], while the other a male figure identified as a representation of *Lacedaimon nikephoros*[361]. It is obvious that both cities attempted to establish close relations with the Greek mainland by claiming direct descent. Eumeneia invoked its Greek origins by the general term Achaeans, Sagalassos by claiming Spartan origin. We should place such attempts in the atmosphere of establishing links with old Greece that is so characteristic of the second century and in particular of the period of the foundation of the Panhellenion.

So far I have examined types originating from the central mint and the Greek East that allude to Hadrian's relations with his predecessor, the traditions of Rome

---

[357] *IEphesos* 274.
[358] For other examples see *SNG Schweiz* 1.999-1001 from Tarsos; *SNG France* 638 and 640 (bearing the eponymous hero on the reverse) from Cyzicus; *SNG Deutschland-Herzog* 1111 from Cos; *Imhoof-Blumel (1913)* 612-613 from Kame in Mysia; *Sear (1982)* 1200 from Hydrela.
[359] *SNG Österreich* 2.1538.
[360] *SNG France* 3.1763.
[361] *SNG France* 3.1764-1765.

and Greece alike, and his portrayal as the new god of the Greeks under the epithet Olympios. I will now turn to the discussion of certain types (mostly originating from the mint of Rome, although provincial examples will be included) that give a picture of the imperial principles of the new emperor and also help us understand how he envisaged his relations with the provinces. I will start with the so-called "Virtues" Series.

4.4.6 Hadrian's "Virtues" Series[362]

The accession of a new emperor often created hopes for a better age. Each emperor made public on his coinage the principles by which he would reign. In this context we can examine the numismatic issues that display the virtues of the emperor as well as these principles[363]. This discussion will help us understand better Hadrian's program.

The period from the civil wars of 68/69 to Antoninus was the apogee of the personification of virtues and non-virtues on coinage. Not only are the goddesses found in unprecedented numbers, but a new pattern of repetition and continuation emerged. Once one emperor has introduced a new type, it is notable when his successors do not continue it. Wallace-Hadrill attributes this increase to a competition among the opponents of the civil wars of 68/69 to advertise their hopes and ideals on coinage[364]. This increase reached its climax under Hadrian and Antoninus[365].

---

[362] "Virtues" is a conventional term that has been widely used in modern scholarship. I will employ it here, though, as I will show, not all the personifications under discussion are virtues per se.
[363] Wallace-Hadrill (1981) 308ff expresses concern whether the "term" virtues is correct and points out that among the 40 or so personifications on the imperial coinage, only a dozen are virtues. See Wallace-Hadrill (1981) and Charlesworth (1937) for discussion of the virtues of the Roman emperor.
[364] Wallace-Hadrill (1981) 311.
[365] Wallace-Hadrill (1981) 312-313 places the surge of interest in virtues during Hadrian's reign in the atmosphere of the early second century as it was reflected in Pliny's *Panegyric* and Suetonius's *The Twelve Caesars*.

Hadrian showed a deep interest in virtues and his addition to the series is outstanding: all his innovations are virtues: *Liberalitas, Indulgentia, Patientia, Pudicitia, Tranquillitas*; or quasi-virtues, *Hilaritas* and *Disciplina*. What is most remarkable is the series issued in 128, which is responsible for most of the new virtues. In this year appeared in parallel *Clementia, Indulgentia, Iustitia, Liberalitas, Patientia* and *Tranquilitas*. The impression is of a ruler possessed of endless virtues.

Of a total of 27 personifications that show up on Hadrian's coinage, 12 are virtues[366]. The Greek names of two of these twelve virtues appear on coins from the Greek East: Δικαιοσύνη/*Iustitia* from Ephesos, Iconion in Lycaonia, and Alexandria[367]; and Εὐσέβεια/*Pietas* from Alexandria[368]. Five of them are found in Latin form on coins that were issued in the Greek East: *Aequitas*, from Asia Minor and Antioch[369]; *Clementia*, from Asia (without further indication)[370]; *Liberalitas*, from Asia Minor[371]; *Pietas*, probably from Asia without any further indication[372]; *Pudicitia*, from an eastern mint without further indication[373]; *Virtus*, from Asia without further indication[374].

In addition, the following personifications are attested in the mints of the East in Greek legends: Εὐθηνία, from Alexandria[375]; Ὁμόνοια from Magnesia ad Sipylum in Lydia[376]; Εἰρήνη from Kilbianoi in Lydia and Alexandria[377]; and Ἐλπὶς from

---

[366] *Aequitas, Clementia, Disciplina, Indulgentia, Iustitia, Liberalitas, Patientia, Pietas, Providentia, Pudicitia, Tranquilitas* and *Virtus*.
[367] Ephesos: Mionnet *Suppl*. 6.138,397; Iconion: *Lindgren Collection* I.A1379A; Alexandria: *SNG Denmark* 41.281.
[368] *SNG Denmark* 41.329.
[369] Asia Minor: *BMCRE* III.375, 1034; Antioch: *BMCRE* III.378,3.
[370] *BMCRE* III.380,34.
[371] *BMCRE* III.376, 1041.
[372] *BMCRE* III.381,35.
[373] *BMCRE* III.291, 405note. In the catalog the coin was arranged under the Roman mint by Mattingly. However, Hill (1966a) after re-examing Mattingly's arrangement he sees more probable the issue of the coin by an eastern mint (Appendix I.2).
[374] *BMCRE* III.380,25.
[375] *SNG Denmark* 41.298.
[376] *SNG Denmark* 27.260 (the obverse carries Sabina's image).

Alexandria[378]. The following personifications occur in Latin legends in the East: *Aeternitas*, probably from Antioch[379]; *Felicitas*, from Asia without further indication[380]; *Libertas*, from Asia Minor[381]; *Pax*, probably from Antioch[382]; *Securitas*, from an eastern mint without further indication[383]; and *Victoria*, from Antioch and Asia without further indication[384].

For the purposes of this study it will suffice to look at specific examples. The first is a silver denarius from Rome, of the period 134-138, that is, between Hadrian's return from his last journey to the East and his death[385]. The obverse depicts the bust of the emperor, while the reverse carries the personification of *Providentia*, who points at the globe on the ground and holds a scepter. The image is accompanied by the legend *Providentia Aug*. The message is clear: the emperor has cast his eyes upon the world, which he rules, and has the necessary forethought to anticipate its needs.

Another allusion to Hadrian's domination of the world, this time emphasizing his military skills, is found on a silver denarius from Rome[386]. The obverse depicts a laureate bust of Hadrian while another image of the emperor is seen on the reverse. Here the emperor is presented bare-headed, in military dress, holding a rudder on a globe in his right hand and a spear reversed in his left. The image of the emperor who seems to rest rather than being in preparation for a battle, and the symbol of leadership, the rudder, resting on the globe, speak of his rule over the world, achieved by military skill.

---

[377] Kilbianoi: *SNG Österreich* 1.1010; Alexandria: *SNG Denmark* 41.313.
[378] *SNG Denmark* 41.314.
[379] *BMCRE* III.378,7.
[380] *BMCRE* III.381,39.
[381] *BMCRE* III.374, 1027.
[382] *BMCRE* III.378,2.
[383] *BMCRE* III.313, 570-572, attributed to the mint of Rome by Mattingly, but Hill (1966a) sees more probable the issue of the coin by an eastern mint (Appendix I.4).
[384] Antioch: *BMCRE* III.378,4; Asia: *BMCRE* III.380,24.
[385] *BMCRE* III.327,694.
[386] *BMCRE* III.269, 238.

A remarkable coin that links Hadrian to Fortuna in a unique way is a silver cistophoric tetradrachm from an unidentified mint (Metcalf's Mint A) in Asia Minor[387]. On the obverse, a laureate bust of Hadrian is accompanied by the title *Augustus Hadrianus*. On the reverse, a veiled figure, seated, holds a rudder and transverse scepter. The type of the reverse is that of *Fortuna*, but the figure is clearly bearded. The portrayal of the emperor as *Fortuna*, although without precise parallel, is obvious enough, since the *fors* of the empire was intimately bound up with that of the emperor; this is implicit in the many *Fortuna Aug* types struck at Rome. The transfer of Fortuna's attributes to Hadrian results in the emperor appearing veiled; this is rare in the imperial coinage except when the emperor is shown sacrificing. Yet the type has been modified in other respects: a scepter is substituted for the more common *cornucopiae*, and Hadrian is seated on a *sella* rather than the throne normally occupied by *Fortuna*. The fortune of the emperor secures the well-being and the prosperity of the world.

The positive impact of Hadrian's rule upon the world is further portrayed by three coins from different places. The first is a silver denarius of 128-132 from Asia Minor[388]. The obverse carries the laureate head of Hadrian and the title *Hadrianus Augustus PP*. On the reverse, *Felicitas*, draped and wearing a *polos* on her head, stands holding a *caduceus* in her right hand and *cornucopiae* in her left. She rests her right foot on a globe. The other example comes from Rome and is dated to 119-121[389]. It is a bronze dupondius that depicts Hadrian on the obverse and on the reverse a female figure, holding a *patera* and a rudder and setting her foot on a globe. The legend identifies her as *Salus Publica*. The safety of the ruler, *Salus Aug*, which is

[387] Metcalf (1980) 74, 61.
[388] *BMCRE* III.375, 1036.
[389] *BMCRE* III.421,1237.

seen on other coins, becomes the saving power that flows from him, and guarantees the safety of the world.

The last piece comes from the Roman colony of Corinth[390]. This coin, although it carries no personification on the reverse, sends a very clear message about the emperor's hopes for prosperity. The customary portrait of the emperor on the obverse is accompanied by the *cornucopiae* with the globe on the reverse. A very simple scene, limited to two symbols, which complement each other.

Focusing on a number of personifications that could be termed "Virtues" and adding the principles by which the emperor ruled, the series presents Hadrian as he wished to be portrayed and the long-lasting effects of his program (at least, what he hoped for them to be). The people who used the coins knew what the symbolism meant. They were aware that the personification on the reverse referred to the person depicted on the obverse, the emperor. The personification was therefore in the power of, or an aspect of the emperor on the other side. The image transferred the quality of the virtue to the emperor and identified the emperor as a "charismatic" one. As a result, by invoking virtues and imperial principles the emperor legitimized his position. What, in my opinion, is more important, however, is that this series was a constant reminder to the people that the emperor, however far he might be, cared for them, pitied them, could not be deceived, and always exerted, to quote the phrase of one of Hadrian's soldiers, "a care that never tires, with which he watches unrestingly over the good of mankind (*infatigabili cura, per quam adsidue pro humanis utilitatibus excubat*)[391]. This care for the welfare of the entire empire is also shown in

[390] Papageorgiadou-Bani (2004) 110.
[391] *CIL* 8.26416, ll. 13-16.

the series of the Provinces, which in my opinion demonstrated better than any other issue his deep, sincere interest in the prosperity of the empire, Rome and provinces alike.

4.4.7 The Series of the Provinces[392]

The series is dated to the period from 134/135 to 136, certainly after Hadrian's return from his last tour, and is attributed to the mint of Rome. This series depicts a number of Roman provinces (and even cities or regions) personified as women carrying local attributes. Four distinct types of the series have been identified: the *Adventus*, the *Exercitus*, the *Restitutor*, and the *Province* types. Some of the provinces are depicted on either gold and silver coins or bronze or both, but in general they are far better represented on bronze[393]. Here I will deal with the coins that present personifications of provinces or cities of the Greek mainland and Asia Minor.

4.4.7.1 The *Adventus* Type

We examined in the second chapter the circumstances in which an imperial visit took place and the impact it had on the provincial cities as well as its significance for the local populations. The mint of Rome picked up the theme and paid tribute to Hadrian's visits to the provinces. The coins of this type are all bronze sestertii. The

[392] Although it does not accurately represent the scenes depicted here, "Provinces Series" is a conventional term in scholarship and as such it will be used here.
[393] Gold and silver: *Adventus*: Africa, Alexandria (representing Egypt), Egypt, Hispania; *Restitutor*: Achaea, Africa, Gallia, Hispania, Macedonia, and possibly Italia; *Province*: same as the *Adventus* with the addition of Asia and Germania. There is no *Exercitus* type struck in gold or silver.
Bronze: *Adventus*: Africa, Arabia, Asia, Bithynia, Britannia, Cilicia, Gallia, Hispania, Italia, Judaea, Macedonia, Mauretania, Moesia, Noricum, Phrygia, Sicilia and Thracia. Alexandria is the only city honored with the record of a visit; *Restitutor*: Achaea, Africa, Arabia, Asia, Bithynia, Gallia, Hispania, Italia, Libya, Macedonia, Phrygia, Sicilia. Nicomedeia is the only city thus honored; *Province*:Africa, Britannia, Cappadocia, Dacia, Egypt, Hispania, Judaea, Mauretania and Sicilia; *Exercitus*: Britannia, Cappadocia, Dacia, Dalmatia, Germania, Hispania, Mauretania, Moesia, Noricum, Raetia, Syria and Thracia.

obverse carries a laureate image of Hadrian (except for "Macedonia", where the emperor's head is bare). On the reverse there is one simple pattern which is only varied in details. Hadrian is represented standing right, facing the province, raising his right hand to dictate the prayer, while the province pours a libation from a *patera* over an altar, behind which stands a bull. Hadrian is usually togate- he arrives as princeps not as imperator. The avoidance of military dress is remarkable because it signifies the peaceful intentions of the emperor and the harmonious relations that he wishes to establish with the provinces.

In the first example, Asia wears a crown of towers and holds a scepter[394]. A bull is shown behind the altar. The legend is explicit: *Adventui Aug Asiae, SC*. Bithynia is towered, and holds a rudder upright in her left hand. A bull is shown by the altar and the legend reads *Adventui Aug Bithyniae, SC*[395]. Cilicia wears a helmet and holds a *vexillum* in her left hand. The legend reads *Adventui Aug Ciliciae, SC*[396]. Macedonia wears a short tunic and holds a whip in her left hand. A bull is behind the altar and the inscription reads *Adventui Aug Macedoniae, SC*[397]. Phrygia wears the characteristic Phrygian cap and holds a *pedum* (shepherd's crook) in her left hand. Behind the altar stands a bull. The legend reads *Adventui Aug Phrygiae, SC*[398]. Finally, Thrace wears a short tunic without any attribute in her hand. A bull is depicted behind the altar. The legend reads *Adventui Aug Thraciae, SC*[399]. I think it is possible that the fact that Thrace bears no distinguishing attribute indicates that the province has no local talent that claims recognition or little significance for the overall affairs of the empire or, as Larry Kreitzer suggests, "this lack of identifiable features

[394] *BMCRE* III.490, 1638.
[395] *BMCRE* III.490, 1639-1640.
[396] *BMCRE* III.490, 1640.
[397] *BMCRE* III.494, 1662-1663.
[398] *BMCRE* III.495, 1669.
[399] *BMCRE* III.496, 1671.

may reflect the fact that Thracia had only recently been elevated to provincial status by Trajan and had yet to make its contribution to the empire's diversity in a way recognizable by a visual symbol."[400]

4.4.7.2 The *Restitutor* Type

The examples of this series are either on bronze sestertii, dupondii, asses; or in both bronze and silver denarius (Macedonia); or in bronze, silver denarius, and aureus (Achaea). The obverse bears the bare or laureate head of the emperor. On the reverse, the emperor is shown standing in the act of raising up a province that kneels before him. Although each case must be individually examined in its historical context, it is certain that the posture of a province in general emphasizes Hadrian's role in the development of a province. Hadrian appears as the mighty and merciful ruler who delivers and raises the suppliant province to her feet.

The first Greek province to be examined here is Achaea. She is depicted kneeling before the togate emperor, who extends his hand to raise her and holds a roll in the other one. In the center, we see a vase with a palm, a Panathenaic amphora. The legend reads *Restitutori Achaeae, SC*[401]. Achaea is represented as a typical Greek goddess and is unmarked by any attribute. Clearly the emperor wanted to advertise on the coinage his unparalleled benefactions to and feelings towards the people of the province. The Panathenaic vase alludes to the centrality of Athens in his program.

Asia, wearing a crown of towers and holding a scepter is shown in a similar posture before the emperor, who has the same attributes. The legend reads *Restitutori Asiae, SC*[402]. Needless to say the frequent travels of the emperor there and his huge

[400] Kreitzer (1996) 185.
[401] *BMCRE* III.349, 868-869; 517-518, 1781-1785.
[402] *BMCRE* III.519-520, 1798-1799.

benefactions to many Asian cities are witnesses of his interest in the development of the province.

Bithynia holds an *acrostolium* or rudder and rests her foot on a prow. The seaboard of the North Aegean and Hellespont appears in its full importance. Posture and Hadrian's position are as above. The legend reads *Restitutori Bithyniae, SC*[403]. The region was important for its geographical position and received the aid of the emperor after the earthquake of 120. In terms of coin production the emperor "restored" the coinage of the province as the Bithynian Koinon issued silver cistophori for the first and last time during his reign.

Nicomedeia, the capital of Bithynia, shares with Alexandria the honor of appearing as a city among provinces; she is shown, like Bithynia, towered, and holding a rudder (even for an inland city the sea is all important). Her posture and Hadrian's position are as above. The legend reads *Restitutori Nicomedeiae, SC*[404]. I believe the city was included in the series because it and its rival Nicaea were severely damaged by the earthquake of 120, shortly before the emperor's visit there. Hadrian took major part in the funding of the rebuilding of the city. The fact that Nicomedeia of all cities that Hadrian helped restore after an earthquake (for example, Cyzicus) appears on the official coinage certainly reveals the high esteem in which the emperor held the city (Nicomedeia, among others, was the capital city of Antinoos' home province). It is also possible that Arrian, a native of the city, played a role.

Macedonia, the other Greek province that has issues in both precious and cheap metals, is shown in the same posture, wearing a *kausia* on head and holding a

[403] *BMCRE* III.520-521, 1800-1805.
[404] *BMCRE* III.524, 1827.

whip in left hand (bronze coins) before the emperor who bears the same attributes. The legend reads *Restitutori Macedoniae SC*[405]. No major benefaction of Hadrian in the province is attested. It is unclear whether the emperor wished to pay tribute to Alexander the Great or to include Macedonia along with Achaea as a group of Greek provinces of the mainland. Thus the reason why the province was "restored" remains unknown[406].

Finally, Phrygia, wearing the Phrygian cap and a short tunic, and holding a *pedum*, kneels before the emperor who bears the same attributes. The legend *is Restitutori Phrygiae, SC*[407]. It is unknown what kind of "restoration" is implied here. We know that Hadrian was at Apameia in 129 and probably inspected the quarries of marble around Synnada and Docimium (columns were made of this marble for his Library at Athens), but the information is too scanty to answer our question.

4.4.7.3 The *Exercitus* Type

The only example referring to the Greek East is that of Cappadocia[408]. On the obverse, the bare head of the emperor is shown. On the reverse, the scene is that of an *adlocutio*. Hadrian, on horseback, harangues three soldiers: the first holds a legionary eagle, the other two standards. The accompanying legend reads *Exer Cappadocicus, SC*[409]. The coin emphasizes the Roman military presence within the province. Cappadocia's geographical position was strategic and legions were stationed there. It was located to the west of unstable Armenia and the Parthian kingdom. Dio reports

[405] *BMCRE* III.352, 891 (silver); 524, 1826-1826A.
[406] See Papaefthymiou (2001) on Hadrian's relations with the province.
[407] *BMCRE* III.525, 1828-1830.
[408] *BMCRE* III.498, 1673.
[409] *BMCRE* III.498, 1673*.

how Arrian brought to an end a regional war that involved Cappadocia in 136[410]. Hadrian had appointed Arrian as imperial legate in the region from 131 to 137. The scene on the coin certainly commemorates the speeches of the emperor to the legions when he visited the region in 123 and 129.

Paul Strack has observed that the provinces of the *Exercitus* type are in the main represented as armed figures in the "Province" type[411]. He has also observed that the *Restitutor* type tends to match the fully pacified provinces- the provinces of the Senate and the more orderly of the imperial[412]. In only one case, that of Hadrian's own province of Hispania, does a province have both types, *Exercitus* and *Restitutor*. In all other cases the choice is made- provinces encouraged in the art of peace (*Restitutor*), provinces protected by the discipline of the armies (*Exercitus*).

4.4.7.4 The *Province* Type

This type provides us with two examples related to the Greek East. The first one is a silver denarius[413]. As is customary, the obverse displays the bust of the emperor, either bare-headed or laureate. On the reverse, the personification of the province of Asia is shown draped and standing. She rests her right foot on prow and holds up a hook in right hand and a rudder in her left hand. Asia is again regarded from the point of view of her sea-board- she is the great province of ports and sea-trade. The legend reads *Asia*, but one example reads *Asia Aug*[414], perhaps an allusion to the close relationship of the province with the emperor.

[410] Dio Cassius 69.15.1.
[411] Strack (1933) 148ff.
[412] Strack (1933) 155ff.
[413] *BMCRE* III.344-345, 829-836.
[414] *BMCRE* III.345, 836.

The second example is on bronze, either sestertius or dupondius or as[415]. The emperor appears either laureate or with bare head on the obverse, while on the reverse Cappadocia is shown towered, wearing sleeveless tunic, cloak over shoulders, and high boots. In her right hand she holds a miniature of Mt Argaeus and in her left a vertical *vexillum*. The legend reads *Cappadocia, SC*. The military importance of the province is indicated by the *vexillum.* Why the emperor chose to include Cappadocia in the "Province" type is unknown. Perhaps it happened after a request of Arrian, then legate at the province, or was conceived as recognition of Arrian's work in the region. Both suggestions are possible, though not proven.

The Province type epitomizes this series. The major difference from the other types is the absence of the emperor from the reverse. The personification of the province dominates this side. On the other side, the obverse, the bust of the emperor is a reminder of his role in the history of the provinces. However, the focus is on the provinces now. The other three types honored mostly Hadrian; this one honors the provinces. This type reveals more than the other three Hadrian's wish to take seriously the interests of the provinces and invite them to be active members of the empire. It is no accident that no *Capta* type was struck during his reign. The ruler is the emperor of all and extends his welcoming hand to the people of the empire. This series reveals his keen interest in the well-being of the entire empire, his universal role. In association with this role we may examine the following issues.

[415] *BMCRE* III.508-509, 1725-1734.

4.4.8 The "Universal" series[416]

Of particular importance for Hadrian's imperial program are a number of issues from Rome that refer to the welfare not of a single province or Rome but the entire world, and as such it is appropriate to examine them after the "Provinces" Series.

The first of them, dated to 119-120 or 121, is a bronze sestertius from Rome. It carries the laureate image of the emperor on the obverse[417]. On the reverse we see the familiar motif of the *Restitutor*. Hadrian togate, holding roll in left hand, extends his right hand to raise up a woman, towered, kneeling, and holding a globe in her left hand. The legend gives us the identity of the figure, *Restitutori Orbis terrarum, SC*. It is a dedication, as all the *Restitutor* types are, to Hadrian who restored the entire world. The coin surely advertises Hadrian's wish to be seen as the benefactor of all humanity.

Of particular interest is a type that dates to 134-138, thus coinciding with the great "Provinces" series. In one example, on silver denarii, the emperor appears on the obverse either laureate or with bare head[418]. On the reverse, a female figure is shown standing, wearing a tunic and holding a plough-handle in the right hand and a rake upwards in the left. The legend reads *Tellus Stabil(is)*, identifying, thus, the figure as Tellus. It is noteworthy that the goddess Tellus appears on the official coinage for the first time now.

[416] Although no such title has been given in scholarship I believe that the types to be discussed here can fit under this general heading.
[417] *BMCRE* III.418, 1211-1214; 421, 1236*.
[418] *BMCRE* III.332-333, 737-747.

Another example, a silver of the same period, depicts the bare head of the emperor on the obverse[419]. On the reverse, Tellus, reclining on the ground, rests her elbow on a basket of fruits, her right hand on her knee, and holds a vine-branch in left hand. The legend reads *Tellus Stabil(is)*. A bronze example carries the same images, with a slight, but important, difference[420]. On the reverse, Tellus is shown as above, but her left hand rests on a globe. The legend reads *Tellus Stabil(is), SC*. The order and prosperity of the world achieved under the good administration of the emperor are messages that were easily understood.

Medallions of the period picked up the theme and added more features to it. A bronze medallion portrays on the obverse Hadrian's head covered with a lion-skin and followed by the title *Hadrianus Augustus*[421]. The reverse, similar to the previous examples, depicts Tellus reclining on the ground, and resting her right hand on a globe. Around Tellus stand four boys representing the 4 seasons. The legend reads *Tellus Stabil(is)*. The obverse definitely relates the labors of Hadrian to those of Heracles, and their happy outcome is of course *tellus stabilis*.

I will conclude the discussion of the "universal" types of Hadrian with two more examples. The first is a bronze sestertius from Rome, dated to 119-124/125[422]. On the obverse, we see the laureate head of Hadrian. The scene of the reverse is much crowded: Hadrian is togate, seated on a platform, and extends his right hand. In front of him, to his right, *Liberalitas* is ready to empty the *cornucopiae*, held in both hands. Below, we see two togati citizens. Could these figures be interpreted as Senators or members of the aristocracy? In the context of relations that Hadrian wanted to

[419] *BMCRE* III.333, 748. Mattingly attributed this type to the mint of Rome, but Hill attributes it to an Eastern mint (Hill (1966) Appendix 1.5).
[420] *BMCRE* III.514, 1765-1767; 486-487, 1625-1627.
[421] Gnecchi, *Medaglioni* III.19.90.
[422] *BMCRE* III.415, 1193-1194.

establish with these groups, it is very possible. However, the legend informs us that the audience must be understood as a wider one: *Locupletatori orbis terrarum, SC*. The whole empire is to share in his benefactions.

We may say that the final example complements the above types (*Tellus Stabil(is)*, *Restitutor Orbis Terrarum*) and chronologically comes as the result and conclusion of these two. It appears both on bronze sestertii and bronze medallions of 137-138[423]. The obverse depicts the laureate bust of the emperor accompanied by the title *Hadrianus Augustus Cos III PP*. On the reverse, four boys, symbolizing the four seasons, are shown at play. The legend reads *Temporum Felicitas*. Hadrian's rule has led to the stability of the world and the prosperity of his subjects. Now, the world rejoices at his reign. The legend, I believe, sums up Hadrian's vision for the entire empire, not just Rome.

4.5 Scene and Legend Selection

We saw that a number of individuals and civic bodies were involved in the production of coinage in the Greek cities of the empire: the emperor, his court, Roman officials, local archons and individuals. We also showed, by the examination of a number of coins, that the emperor was interested in associating himself and his reign with Trajan, Augustus, the myths and traditions of Rome and Greek East and in advertising his imperial principles and personal virtues as well as his concern for the welfare of the provinces and the entire empire. The questions that arise are to what degree was the emperor responsible for the iconographical types and legends; what dictated the selection of a certain type instead of another?

[423] Sestertius: *BMCRE* III.478, 1567*; medallion: Gnecchi, *Medaglioni* III.19.91.

Unfortunately, ancient sources reveal little about who bore the responsibility for the choice of numismatic types, either at Rome or in the provinces. The few references in the literature of imperial times can give us a glimpse into the mechanisms of selection, but not the whole picture[424].

As to the central mint, some passages talk of the emperor's direct control over the iconography of the coinage of the capital. Suetonius, for example, when he talks of Augustus' stay at Apollonia, reports that after he had visited the astrologer Theogenes he struck a silver coin stamped with Capricorn, the zodiac sign under which he was born[425]. The same author, narrating Nero's victorious entry into Rome after his Greek tour, reports that among others the emperor had coins struck depicting him as *citharoedos*[426]. Also, whether an emperor kept or destroyed coins with the features of his predecessors was taken to be his decision. So Vitellius, as Dio informs us, maintained the coinage struck by Nero, Galba, and Otho and refrained from anger over their portraits on them[427].

Among modern scholars there is disagreement regarding the influence of the emperor and some of them treat the literary evidence with skepticism. Among them, Barbara Levick, focusing on the central mint, rejects the idea that the emperor himself was responsible for the selection of iconographical types and legends and argues that the responsibility of iconography-selection rested with certain officials, at the head of which was the *a rationibus*[428]. These, after making the initial choice, at some stage would have submitted it to higher authority for scrutiny and advice; perhaps even to

---

[424] The scarce evidence has been gathered by Price (1979) 277-278. Here only a selected number of them are presented.
[425] Suetonius, *Augustus* 94.12: *tantam mox fiduciam fati Augustus habuit, ut thema suum vulgaverit nummumque argenteum nota sideris Capricorni, quo natus est, percusserit*.
[426] Suetonius, *Nero* 25.2: *sacras coronas in cubiculis circum lectos posuit, item statuas suas citharoedico habitu, qua nota etiam nummum percussit*.
[427] Dio Cassius 65.6.1: τό τε γὰρ ἐπὶ Νέρωνος καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ Γάλβου τοῦ τε Ὄθωνος κοπὲν νόμισμα ἐτήρησεν, οὐκ ἀγανακτῶν ταῖς εἰκόσιν αὐτῶν· cf. Dio Cassius 60.22.3; 77.12.6.
[428] Levick (1982) 107ff.

the princeps himself for final approval. Levick believes that the mint officials proposed types and legends that they believed would gratify the princeps; they presented him on the coinage as he wished to see himself. The types were intended to appeal not to the public but to the emperor, whose portrait, as a rule, occupied the obverse of the coins. She further argues that the rare mention of coins in ancient authors and the prolonged absence of an emperor from Rome (surprisingly, she provides the example of Vespasian and neglects to comment on Hadrian's unparalleled absence from the capital) are proofs that the coinage officials at Rome influenced the choice of particular types and not the emperor.

I believe Levick's theory is not convincing for two main reasons. First, she credits too much the freedom enjoyed by officials in selecting iconographical types and assigns the emperor a secondary role in doing so. To a certain degree these officials had their own suggestions and ideas but these were not the only ones. It seems more plausible that the emperor suggested themes and legends as he was concerned with the way he was represented and the messages conveyed to his subjects[429]. Numismatic iconography was important to him as it mirrored his reign, even more so as this emanated from the central mint.

Levick's argument of the lengthy absences of the emperor is also weak. To use Hadrian's example, it is interesting that while Hadrian was actually engaged in his tours of the empire, the mint of Rome showed no concern for his enterprise. There is no sign that any one at Rome shared in the emperor's ambition, enthusiasm, and plans that sent Hadrian on the move. On his return from his last foreign journey, Hadrian decided to tell Rome and the world what he had hoped, planned, and accomplished;

[429] See for example the unauthorized inclusion of the *P(ater) P(atriae)* legend in the 117/118 issues, which the emperor stopped on his return as emperor to Rome in the summer of 118.

and he did so by issuing, among others, the Provinces Series. The sudden burst of interest of the Roman mint in Hadrian's travels after 134 can only be explained by the personal intervention of the emperor. Therefore, I believe that the emperor was much involved in the iconography of the imperial coinage, although it is right to say that often mint officials presented their ideas to him.

As far as the provincial coinage is concerned the situation might have been somewhat different. It is hardly likely that strict central control existed for provincial issues[430]. Here, a variety of types existed (as we saw above), sometimes on the model of Rome's coins, sometimes focused on the emperor and his family, or other times with an emphasis on local subjects. Papageorgiadou-Bani argues that in the Greek provinces the responsibility had shifted onto some sort of high-ranking local official who would have possessed the ability and perceptiveness required to coordinate the various manifestations of Roman politics and local tradition. She identifies this official with the local governor or someone from his immediate environment. This official might also have enjoyed the emperor's authorization, which would thus provide a satisfying explanation of the close connections that exist among the types produced in the mints of neighboring areas.

Recently Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert and Kevin Butcher associated the selection of types and messages with the ruling elites and their desire to publicize their identity through coinage[431]. According to these authors, the cities and their magistrates had a considerable degree of freedom which enabled them to choose coin designs. Therefore, the explicit representations on the coinage, and the identities

[430] So Papageorgiadou-Bani (2004) 40ff.
[431] Howgego (2005) 16ff, Heuchert (2005) 40ff, and Butcher (2005) 145ff.

implicit in the patterning of the iconography and in the structure of the coinage belonged to those who controlled the coinage, the elite.

I believe that this approach is one-dimensional as the authors disregard both the power of the entire community and the influence of the Roman authorities. How do we know that the identities (if of course we can call them "identities") expressed on the coinage are not those of the community as well? The fact that local aristocrats were able, as we saw, to fund an issue does not mean that the coinage of a city in general expresses their identity. We may accept that a number of scenes reflect the interests of the elites, but we cannot rule out the possibility that some of them might also express the ideology of the entire community, or that others are selected by local Roman officials[432]. Certainly, the subject of identity is one that cannot be adequately dealt with here, but the above approach is exclusive as it limits the power over the selection of iconographical themes to local elites. At the same time it generalizes the information that a certain issue may provide. Besides, the authors are making a serious mistake by claiming that the elites controlled the coinage. This might have been true (although far from certain) for the past when Greek cities had political freedom. But now, this can hardly have been the case.

[432] Heuchert (2005) 41 provides a number of examples that argue this. Some of them should be mentioned here. The issue of the Koinon of Ionia in the name of its chief priest Claudius Fronton reveals a Sardian influence on the choice of reverse designs, displaying for example the Kore of Sardeis, despite the fact that the Lydian city of Sardeis was not part of the Koinon. This influence clearly derives from Fronton himself, as he was strategos at Sardeis, and issued a series of coins in that capacity. Probably the most obvious case of a magistrate influencing the choice of reverse design is a series of coins from Smyrna in the name of the sophist Claudius Attalos. The inscription makes it clear that they were dedicated by him to his hometowns Smyrna and Laodiceia jointly (Ἄτταλος σοφιστὴς ταῖς πατρίσιν Σμύρνῃ Λαοδικείᾳ). The reverses display the Nemeses of Smyrna and Zeus of Laodiceia representing their cities. Not only C. Attalos but also his father, the sophist Polemon issued coins at Smyrna (e.g. *SNG Aulock* 2210: Πολέμων στρατηγῶν ἀνέθηκε Σμυρ(ναίοις), on a coin that depicts Hadrian laureate on the obverse; and *SNG Denmark* 22.1366: Πολέμων ἀνέθηκε Σμυρ(ναίοις), on a coin of 134/135 that carries the bust of Sabina on the obverse).

In light of these remarks, here I would like to synthesize these theories and provide my own. I believe that local magistrates, Roman officials and the emperor (at least in the case of Hadrian) were all involved in the iconography of coins in the Greek East. Thus we can explain the co-existence of local traditional themes and Roman ones. Local magistrates and prominent individuals could suggest a theme to Roman officials (as the forms ἀνέθηκεν and αἰτησαμένου suggest). The latter could also be responsible, for example, on receiving orders from Rome to do so, or because they wanted to honor the emperor who visited the area (as the Ephesian cistophori of 129 that honored Hadrian for his benefactions to the city). They all had to take into account, among others, the personal aspirations of the emperor (as for example the tetradrachm with the depiction of Phoenix from Alexandria), political, ideological and religious components of the official program (as the personification of Omonoia from Magnesia ad Sipylum), and the traditions of the local population (as in the *Hadrian Olympios* scenes). Moreover, as coinage was one aspect of the self-administration of Greek cities, Roman officials and local authorities had to make sure that no image or legend would cause the Roman authorities to annul this privilege.

In Hadrian's case an important factor that has not been emphasized by scholars is his travels. The emperor's journeys throughout the Roman world affected coin production. First, the cities had to strike more coinage in order to meet the needs of the Roman officials as well as of visitors who came to the region either on business or embassies or to attend festivals and games held in honor of the emperor. Second, it is possible that Hadrian wanted to inspect the striking of new coins as well as the selection of images carved on them while in the province. It is possible that local and Roman officials came to him suggesting the striking of new coins, and proposed

themes, both local and Roman, which the emperor approved or modified according to his tastes; or simply the emperor suggested a theme himself.

Thus a number of individuals were involved in the selection of the iconographical themes, from local magistrates to Roman officials and the emperor. The displayed messages echoed not only local traditions and Roman ideology but to a certain degree personal tastes (as Hadrian's association with Bias and Herodotus). It is hazardous to believe that the populations did not recognize the symbolism of these scenes. As Papageorgiadou-Bani argues, "even if the language was not understood, it was hard to miss the symbolism."[433] Especially among populations such as the Greek, which had a long tradition of symbolic representations on their coinage, the visual depiction of a given idea remained much the same, whether this was, for example, the emperor's virtues, or the beneficence he displayed toward a particular city or province. The coded coin legends, in conjunction with easily understood images, would have been reasonably understandable even to the least educated.

4.6 Summary

In the previous pages I showed how iconography and legends on coins of the Hadrianic period contributed to the advertisement of the emperor's plans for the Greek East and the empire in general. Although my main interest was the numismatic evidence from the mints of the Greek East, I think it would have been unproductive to examine this evidence without cross-references to issues from the central mint.

In the first part of the chapter, I examined matters related to the administration of the central mint at Rome and the mints of the cities of the Greek East. In light of the evidence and modern scholarship that I discussed we can now conclude that a

[433] Papageorgiadou-Bani (2004) 33.

number of persons were involved in coin production as well as selection of iconographical themes and legends, as I later showed. I believe that the product of a mint reflected among other things imperial ideology, personal tastes of the emperor, local traditions and expectations, and concerns of local Roman officials. All were in position to suggest the cutting of new coinage and the selection of particular iconographical themes and legends.

In the second part I brought forth types and legends from Rome and the Greek East. I showed that the emperor was interested in associating himself and his reign with Trajan, Augustus, and the myths and traditions of Rome. We also saw his appreciation for the Greek East as well as the local reaction to it in a number of themes that commemorated historical figures of Greece and its myths. The *Olympios* legend demonstrated how Hadrian presented himself as the earthly counterpart of Olympios Zeus, something that was immediately accepted by the cities as the numismatic evidence and numerous inscriptions show. Then I surveyed the "Virtues" series and showed how it was in his immediate plans to advertise his personal virtues and the principles by which he would rule.

Finally, I dealt with the "Provinces" series which summed up Hadrian's plans for the provinces and the entire empire. It is my argument that this series was a major innovation in the imperial coinage. The series did not simply honor the provinces. More importantly, I believe, it brought for the first time the provinces to Rome, not as slaves, or delegates, or even senators, but as unique entities associated with the emperor, and, thus, with Rome. It was now to be made clear to every Roman that the empire was not a mere system of dependencies, but rather an organism alive in all its members, each one contributing to its prosperity and survival and enjoying the personal interest and care of the emperor. Is it a surprise that no "*provincia capta*"

type- not even rebel Judaea (in contrast to Domitian's *Judaea Capta*, and Trajan's *Dacia Capta*)- finds a place in the series? The fact that the personifications of the provinces are adorned with their own peculiar attributes in such detail is proof of Hadrian's sincere interest in them, the Greek ones in particular. The Greek provinces that appear are those that had special importance for Hadrian and the accomplishment of his vision for the Greek East and the empire: Asia Minor in general, Achaea, Macedonia, all presented as *provinciae pacatae*, in harmonious relations with the ruler. It is not surprising that only one "Greek" province appears in the *Exercitus* series, Cappadocia, and this is due to the importance of the region on account of its proximity to the Parthians.

The legends and the images of the coinage of the Greek mints, in conjunction with those from the central mint, displayed the emperor's concern for the welfare of the Greek East and the entire empire. They reminded the Greek people of his intentions and vision for them and also revealed the positive reaction to him by the cities. In the next chapter we will see how religious themes were used in a similar way.

CHAPTER 5

THE LANGUAGE OF RELIGION IN HADRIAN'S POLITICS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will discuss the role of religion in the promotion of Hadrian's program and vision for the Greek East in the region. The center of his religious program was the imperial cult, which focused on the emperor but also on the imperial house, especially his wife Sabina, and outside of it on his young lover Antinoos. However, here I will not talk about the mechanisms of the cult and the individuals involved. This has been amply treated in modern scholarship[434]. Instead, I will discuss aspects of his religious program that have not received the attention they deserve so far.

The first subject that I will discuss is Hadrian's claim to divine election. Very early in his reign Hadrian attempted to silence the rumors regarding his adoption. Numismatic and other evidence advertised the emperor's adoption by Trajan as planned by the gods. It was by the providence of Jupiter that the new emperor was selected. Trajan was the one that implemented the divine will. Thus Hadrian legitimized his accession by invoking both earthly and divine commands. By claiming divine election through the medium of Trajan Hadrian was following established Roman practice in imperial times.

[434] See the general account in Price (1984); also Birley (1997) and Burrell (2004). Still, a monograph on the cult of Hadrian is needed in modern scholarship.

Next I will examine the religious language employed by the Greeks in addressing the emperor as this is evidenced in public monuments, private dedications and literary sources. Hadrian received more divine honors in the Greek East than any of his predecessors. These honors, among them the unprecedented erection of statues, his worship in shrines, and close association with many Greek divinities, strengthened his relationship with the region and placed him in the heart of religion and the Greek pantheon. In honoring him the Greeks identified Hadrian with major divinities of their pantheon. Hadrian became the manifestation of Zeus, Apollo and other gods on earth, and a number of epithets were used to address him as a god. I will show that these epithets were mostly local initiatives which Hadrian by his interest in the Greek world encouraged and accepted. They were part of a political dialogue based on local traditions which were much respected by Hadrian.

The next subject that I will talk about reveals more of Hadrian's personality and even more of his relationship with the culture of the Greeks. According to Dio, the emperor was most curious and used divinations and incantations of all kinds[435]. He was also versed in astrology[436], as this is evidenced in his knowledge of Aelius Verus' horoscope, and he reportedly gave oracles and predicted the future[437]. I will explain what is religious in these behaviors and in the language used to describe them, and I will suggest that Hadrian's association with superhuman, almost divine powers was part of that religious language and themes that were familiar to the Greek populations in the East, and consequently facilitated the approval of the emperor and his plans by the Greeks.

[435] Dio Cassius 69.11.3.
[436] *HA Aelius* III.8, III.9.
[437] *HA Hadrian* XIV.7.

Another theme that I will approach is the cult of Roma. This cult received new emphasis in the reign of Hadrian. It has been suggested that the cult and the erection of the temple of Venus and Roma at Rome reveal the Romano-centricity of the emperor[438]. I would like to dispute this theory and suggest that the new emphasis the cult received mainly in the Latin West but also in the East is indicative of Hadrian's desire to highlight the importance of the cult as unifier of the empire, in other words it represents an empire-wide focus. As I will show, his goal was not to Romanize the empire by means of Roma's cult (the empire was already in its most part Roman in political terms) but to bridge the past and present of the empire and bring closer West and East.

Along with Roma's cult I will examine Hadrian's promotion of the cult of Zeus in the East and his own assimilation with the Greek god. Hadrian was hailed by the Greeks in an unprecedented association with Zeus and was viewed by them as the new Olympian who would preside over their councils and lead them. I would like to suggest that this emphasis on both cults reflects Hadrian's desire to underline, first, the two main cultural components of the empire: Roman and Greek, and second, their crucial role in the stability of the empire.

This discussion will help us understand better Hadrian's personality and program for the Greek East. It will show that Hadrian had genuine interests in espousing local traditions and sentiments and conversing with the Greeks in religious terms. Genuine was also the Greeks' reaction to the emperor and the use of religious language in addressing him. It was part of a long tradition, mythical and historical and was employed systematically in dealing with politics and individuals. At the same time these religious language and themes were used intentionally by each side for its

[438] So Mols (2003).

own goals: the emperor to legitimize his power, warm even more his relations with the locals and ease the promotion of his program for the region and the unity of the empire; the locals to receive the attention and benefactions of the emperor. Religion in the service of politics had been for long a standard practice.

5.2 Hadrian and Divine Election

A papyrus of the 2nd century from Egypt preserves a fragment of a dramatic performance in honor of Hadrian's accession[439]. The performance took place at Heptakomia, the metropolis of the nome Apollonopolites. The persons participating in the scene are the god Apollo and the Demos of the city. Apollo brings a divine message. He informs Demos that it is he, Apollo, who rides the chariot (dragged by white horses) and rises as Helios to the sky (συνανατείλας) with Trajan. Furthermore, he introduces the new king Hadrian to the audience: ἥκω….. ἄνακτα καινὸν Ἀδριανὸν ἀγγελῶν. The god assures his audience that everything shall be subject to him, Hadrian, on account of both his virtue and the τύχη of his adoptive father[440]. Before the text breaks up, the Demos expresses its joyfulness and thanks Apollonios, the *strategos* of the nome for organizing the festivities in honor of Hadrian (ll. 6-14).

Two points must be stressed out here. The first relates to the occasion of the poem. The poem was certainly composed on account of Hadrian's accession shortly

---

[439] *PGiessen* 3. See discussion in Boer, den (1975) with previous bibliography.

[440] ll. 1-9

<? Φοῖβος> Ἄρματι λευκοπώλῳ
ἄρτι Τραιαν[ῷ]
συνανατείλας
ἥκω σοι,
ὦ Δῆμ[ε,]
οὐκ ἄγνωστος Φοῖβος θεός
ἄνακτα καινὸν Ἀδριανὸν ἀγγελῶν,
ᾧ πάντα δοῦλα [δι'] ἀρετήν
καὶ πατρὸς τύχην θεοῦ.

after this took place on August 11th, 117[441]. We know that a number of festivities took place in Egypt to celebrate Hadrian's accession. A papyrus from Oxyrynchus dated to 24th or 25th August 117, that is 15 days after Hadrian's accession, preserves a letter by the prefect of Egypt Q. Rammius Martialis to the *strategoi* of the nomes of middle Egypt (Heptanomia)[442]. The prefect announces Hadrian's accession (ll. 4-10) and instructs the *strategoi* to declare festivities (ll. 14-17). One of them as we mentioned above, Apollonios, organized the festivities at Heptakomia. We know that Q. Rammius Martialis was in the East with Hadrian in early August and was sent to Egypt to replace the current prefect Rutilius Lupus[443]. Under these circumstances I suggest that either Martialis gave instructions not only regarding the organization but also the content (as the text discussed here) of the festivities, or that the poem offers a glimpse of one way that local authorities viewed Hadrian's accession.

Evidence in the poem itself supports the idea that the occasion of the poem was Hadrian's accession. The god clearly states that he comes to announce the new emperor, Hadrian. Trajan appears to be already deified since he rises along with Apollo, who came to announce the new emperor, not to lift Trajan to the heavens. Hadrian is praised both on account of his virtue and the τύχη of his god father. His father is already a god, and his τύχη, which is a reason for praising Hadrian here, can be nothing else but his deification, a sign of Hadrian's respect and of good fortune. The composition of such a poem makes even more sense if we think that the legitimacy of Hadrian's accession was much disputed and Hadrian needed to advertise that he was the successor Trajan had in mind. The fact that Apollo was the messenger is not a coincidence either. At the time of Trajan's death at Selinus,

[441] Antony Birley (1997) 82 suggests that the author might have been a certain Orion whose Panegyric on Hadrian was still extant in Byzantine times (*Suda, Lexicon* s.v.).
[442] *P.Oxy* 55 3781.
[443] For Q. Ruffius Martialis' career see Bureth (1988) 483. See also discussion in Birley (1997) 79.

Hadrian was in command of the legions in Syria. Apollo, the Helios who rises in the East, serves as an allusion to the circumstances of his accession. Apollo's appearance can also be explained as the product of Egyptian imperial ideology. Apollo as Helios is the Egyptian god Ra who is the protector and father of the Pharaoh. The Pharaoh himself is Ra's manifestation on earth and son. Hadrian announced by Apollo/Ra is the new Pharaoh of Egypt.

These remarks set the tone for the second point to be made here. The central religious idea of the poem is that of divine election. Hadrian is announced to his subjects by a god, while his adoptive father consents by being in the company of that god. The idea of divine election has been extensively discussed by J. Rufus Fears in his *Princeps a deis electus* (henceforth, Fears 1977) and here it will suffice to limit our discussion to Hadrian's divine election.

The text on the Giessen papyrus is not the only example where Hadrian claims divine election (if Martialis instructed it) and the phenomenon is not limited to the East. During the early years of his reign, the central mint of Rome issued coin types that channeled Hadrian's claim to divine election. The first of these types is a bronze sestertius dated to 119-121[444]. The laureate bust of Hadrian on the obverse is accompanied by a reverse which depicts the emperor again. Here, he raises his hand towards a flying eagle, which bears a scepter in his claws. Hadrian holds a roll on the other hand. The legend reads *Providentia Deorum*, while the abbreviation *S(enatus) C(onsultum)* legitimizes the issue. The flying eagle is a clear allusion to Jupiter, who hands the scepter of the world to Hadrian. The legend *Providentia Deorum* is particularly important since in the period of the adoptive emperors the providence of

[444] *BMCRE* III.417, 1203.

the gods and of a good emperor becomes especially crucial in preserving the welfare of the empire and removing the risk of a civil war.

The message becomes clearer in the next type dated to 119-122[445]. The golden aureus depicts Hadrian's laureate bust on the obverse. On the reverse, Hadrian, standing, receives the globe from Jupiter, who holds a thunderbolt. Between them appears the symbol of Jupiter's power, the eagle. Thus, early in his reign, Hadrian wanted to state his divine election publicly. J. Rufus Fears, who discussed these two issues, argued that the message carried here was that it was not by the foresight of mortal men or even a mortal now deified, but by the foresight and the care which the gods exercised for the Roman commonwealth that Jupiter sent his messenger, the eagle, to grant Hadrian the ruling of the world. He further argued that "Hadrian used the coinage to minimize the role of his predecessor in his elevation. Hadrian had good reason to disassociate his claim to the purple from Trajan and the senate. His adoption was doubtful; he was repudiating the expansionist policy of Trajan; his relations with the senate had been permanently poisoned"[446].

I believe that this last statement should be re-examined. It seems very improbable that Hadrian desired to disassociate himself and his accession from his adoptive father: the fact that he abandoned the expansionist policy of his predecessor can hardly be related to the mechanisms of divine election; his damaged relations with the Senate would certainly only worsen if he officially and in a recognizable manner denounced Trajan; and certainly the very fact that his adoption was disputed was the main motive to associate his reign with Trajan and not the opposite. In addition, the numismatic evidence contests Fears' theory. A bronze sestertius of 117 depicts the

[445] *BMCRE* III.269, 242
[446] Fears (1977) 245-246.

laureate bust of Hadrian on the obverse, while on the reverse the emperor and his adoptive father are depicted standing[447]. Their gesture is of particular significance: Trajan delivers the globe to Hadrian who receives it on his extended right hand, an allusion to nothing else but Trajan's share of *imperium* with Hadrian and the election of the latter.

Trajan's consent can be in fact suggested in the first two coins discussed above. First, in the *Providentia* type, where his role is implied by the fact that it was him, guided by the foresight of the gods, who made the best choice in selecting a successor who would guarantee the welfare of the empire. It can also be suggested in the other type, if we consider the fact that Trajan was most often identified with Jupiter, as for example in Pliny's *Panegyric*[448].

It is in the same speech that we should look for the most recent inspiration for Hadrian's divine election idea on coinage and literature alike. Divine election is the central concept around which Pliny builds his *Panegyric.* From the very beginning of the speech Pliny sets the record straight: if it were ever doubted whether Rome's rulers were appointed by chance or by the gods, it is now clear that the present *princeps* owes his position to the will of the gods; not by dark processes of fate, but clearly and openly by Jupiter himself[449].

Although it is to the gods and not to Nerva that Trajan truly owes his principate (*ad te imperii summam, et quum omnium rerum, tum etiam tui potestatem dii transtulerunt*, 56.3), it was through Nerva that the *Providentia* of the gods secured

---

[447] *BMCRE* III.397, 1101.

[448] Pliny, *Panegyricus* 88.8: *Ideoque ille parens hominum deorumque Optimi prius, deinde Maximi nomine colitur. Quo praeclarior laus tua, quem non minus constat optimum esse, quam maximum.* See also 5.4.

[449] 1.4-5: *Ac si adhuc dubium fuisset, forte casuque rectores terris, an aliquo numine darentur: principem tamen nostrum liqueret divinitus constitutum. Non enim occulta potestate fatorum, sed ab Iove ipso coram ac palam repertus, electus est.* Marcel Durry in his edition of *The Panegyric* (1938) discusses at length the debt of Pliny to authors such as Cicero, Nepos and Seneca.

a good heir to the throne. Nerva avoided the error of choosing an heir from the confines of his own family. He did not consult men, but instead he made the gods his advisors. It was not in the marriage chamber, but in the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and before his altars that the adoption of Trajan took place[450]. Trajan was elected by the gods, but it was through Nerva that Trajan's accession was implemented and maintained its legitimacy.

Hadrianic imperial ideology followed closely this model of divine election and human mediation as we saw on the *Providentia* type of Hadrian. Hadrian is elected by the gods who gave Trajan the necessary providence to name Hadrian his successor. This model was promoted both in Rome and the East, among the Greek populations, and it is the latter that contributed the most to the encouragement and perpetuation of this religious language when they referred to Hadrian as a god as we will now see.

5.3 The 13th God of Greece

In his *Antilogy* about Julian to the sophist Libanius, the church historian Socrates of Constantinople scoffs at the tendency of the Greeks to immortalize the dead. One of the examples he brings forth is that of the city of Cyzicus. The people of Cyzicus, he writes, declared Hadrian the 13th god. Hadrian himself, he continues, consecrated Antinoos, his lover (Κυζικηνοὶ δὲ τρισκαιδέκατον θεὸν Ἀδριανὸν ἀνηγόρευσαν· αὐτός τε Ἀδριανὸς Ἀντίνοον τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἐρώμενον ἀπεθέωσε.)[451] The author, who lived and wrote in the 5th century, refers without any doubt to the benefactions of the emperor to the city but especially the temple that Hadrian allowed the people of Cyzicus to build for his cult, thus Cyzicus becoming his neokoros. What concerns me

[450] 8.1: *Itaque non in cubiculo, sed in templo; nec ante genialem torum, sed ante pulvinar Iovis optimi maximi, adoptio peracta est*.
[451] Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 3.23.170ff.

in this passage is not Hadrian's temple and worship in Cyzicus. This is something that modern scholarship has dealt with[452]. What interests me here, and in this section in general, is the use of a particular religious language to refer to and/or address Hadrian in the Greek world. Socrates lived more than 300 years after Hadrian's reign and the consecration of his temple. But still his testimony preserves the feeling of the people of Cyzicus in Hadrian's reign. It is unknown whether Hadrian was worshipped alone in the temple at Cyzicus as the 13th god, as Barbara Burrell argues in her works, or as a σύνναος god with Zeus[453] or even the Olympian gods (if we interpret the τρισκαιδέκατος literally and given the scanty information about the temple itself). What is more important here is that the emperor himself made such an impact upon the Greeks of the 2nd century and of the time of Socrates that such epithets were often associated with him.

Such epithets will be my subject in this section. These epithets speak of the long tradition of the Greeks to identify rulers with their gods and goddesses and confer on them the honors given to their gods. At the same time they reveal the multiple ways by which the Greeks perceived a ruler: liberator, benefactor, restorer, founder, religious leader, political authority and others. All these roles were much acceptable among the Greeks (and Romans) and the religious epithets by which they addressed the emperor helped them familiarize themselves with him and "absorb" the impact of his adventus better[454].

I will demonstrate that many of these epithets (such as *despotes*) were used for the first time widely now and became a norm afterwards in the address to the

[452] Burrell (2004) and especially (2002/2003).
[453] Boatwright (2000) 160.
[454] So Price (1984), who has shown in the context of the imperial cult that the Greeks in the imperial cult found a way to conceptualize their world and to place the emperor within the framework of traditional cults of the gods.

emperor, a fact that proves the deep and lasting influence that Hadrian's presence had on his Greeks. Other epithets (e.g. *eleutherios*) were associated with previous Roman emperors (Augustus, for example) who had been benevolent to the Greeks, thus placing Hadrian in the company of these men.

5.3.1 Hadrian as a Neos Theos

Philostratus in the Life of the sophist Polemon pays special attention to the benefits that the sophist received both from Hadrian and his adoptive father: *ateleia* in traveling, free food provisions at the Museum of Alexandria, grants and other gifts to Smyrna, and a most honored duty, that of delivering the inauguration speech at the consecration of the Olympieion at Athens in 131/132[455]. Moreover, the emperor's adoptive son Antoninus was made a friend of the sophist when he received the *imperium* from Hadrian who on his death became a god[456].

The concept of an emperor becoming a god on his death (in the Latin West) and being a living god (in the Greek East) was not a new one in the second century, and, simply, Hadrian's characterization as θεὸς was part of the religious language employed to address the Roman emperors and the Hellenistic kings before them[457]. What is more interesting in Hadrian's case is his presentation as the new manifestation of a deity. The best way for the Greeks to describe this quality was the use of the epithet νέος followed by the name of the divinity[458].

The divinity most often associated with Hadrian was of course the father of the gods, Zeus. As we saw above the emperor was the earthly counterpart to

[455] *Lives of the Sophists* 532-533.
[456] *Lives of the Sophists* 533-534: διήλλαξε δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ παῖδα Ἀντωνῖνον ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ ἐν τῇ τοῦ σκήπτρου παραδόσει θεὸς ἐκ θνητοῦ γιγνόμενος.
[457] For a general discussion of the Greek language of the Imperial cult see Price (1984a).
[458] For a discussion of the *neos*-terminology see Nock (1928) 148ff.

Zeus/Jupiter and was appointed on earth to rule in the way that the father of the gods was ruling in the heavens[459]. However, as I will suggest in the last section of this chapter, where I will discuss in detail Zeus' worship as well as that of Roma, Hadrian's association with Zeus in the Greek world was not only an expression of a religious-political attitude that viewed the lord of men as a manifestation of the lord of the gods; it was rather, and more evidently, a part of Hadrian's plan to promote his vision for the Greek East through the promotion of the cult of its major divinity. Moreover, as I will argue, Hadrian/Zeus equation in the Greek East was a response to and supplemented the Trajan/Jupiter equation in the Latin West. At the present, let us turn our attention to the epithets that equated Hadrian with Zeus.

With regard to Hadrian neos Zeus, the epithets are mostly related to the emperor's actions and benefactions to a city or a province, which in the eyes of his subjects raised him to the status of a divinity. The epithet most often used in association with Zeus was of course Olympios. The epithet is attested in a vast number of inscriptions and coins not only from the Greek cities but also, and this emphasizes more Hadrian's image as Zeus, the Roman colonies of the Greek East and even the city of Rome[460]. The use of the epithet Olympios for Hadrian is attested for the first time in 128, but becomes regular after 131/2, the year in which the

[459] See Fears (1977). For a discussion of the imperial cult and the intellectuals of the period see Bowersock (1983). See also the still useful articles by Kenneth Scott on Plutarch's and Elder and Younger Pliny's views on the imperial cult in Scott (1929) and Scott (1932) respectively.

[460] Hadrian as (Zeus) Olympios occurs in the following cities: Abdera, Aidepsos, Aigina, Amphipolis, Andros, Athens, Cephallenia, Chios, Corinth, Cos, Delos, Delphi, Haliartos, Lappa, Megara, Mytilene, Nikopolis, Perinthos-Herakleia, Philippi, Rhamnous, Selinus, Skiathos, Syros, Tegea, Tenos, Thasos, Thebai,Tomis, Akalesos, Akmonia, Alexandria at Troas, Anazarbos?, Aphrodisias, Apollonia ad Rhyndacum, Attaleia, Cyzicus, Didyma, Elaia-Kaikos, Ephesos, Eumeneia, Flavia Philadelphia, Stratonikeia-Hadrianopolis, Halicarnassos, Herakleia Salbake, Hydrela, Iasos, Kame, Kerameis, Klaros, Koropissos of Kios, Klazomenia, Korydallos, Kyme, Letoion, Lysimacheia, Magnesia ad Meandrum, Metropolis, Miletopolis?, Miletos, Myrina, Nicaea, Nikomedeia, Patara, Paegamos, Perge, Phokaia, Pogla, Pompeiopolis, Phaselis, Prusias ad Hypium, Sagalassos, Sebastopolis at Pontus, Sestos, Skamandros, Smyrna, Tarsos, Teos, Termessos, Thyateira, Xanthos, Koinon of Cyprus, Apollonia at Cyrene, Abydos, Caesarea Antiocheia, Dium, Iulia of Laodiceia, Iulia Parium, Nikopolis, Patra, Priapus, Rome.

Olympieion was finished, the statue of Olympios Zeus was dedicated in it, and the Panhellenion was founded by Hadrian. The vast number of dedications and other inscriptions that address Hadrian as Olympios is unprecedented. No emperor, with the exception of the first princeps, has been so called, and the latter only on a small number of dedications, mainly to Tiberius or Germanicus, son of Ζεὺς Ὀλύμπιος Καίσαρ, from Lesbos[461].

One of the epithets exclusively associated with Hadrian is Panhellenios, an epithet that Hadrian received after the foundation of the Panhellenic Council in 131/132. In what concerns us here, Hadrian appears as Zeus Panhellenios in two inscriptions: the first, the decree of the city of Thyateira, is already discussed in chapter 2; the second is a dedication to Artemis Astias, Hadrian, and the city of Iasos by a certain Diọnysios, son of Theophilos, on the architrave of the Eastern Portico of the Roman agora at Iasos[462]. Pending a further discovery of a public document, decree or other, from Iasos, it seems that the formula Hadrian Zeus Panellenios reflects Dionysios' initiative, which, nonetheless, would find the local authorities in agreement. It is worth mentioning that Zeus Panhellenios by himself appears in two very fragmentary dedications (one of which is certainly of Hadrianic date), a fact that makes it uncertain whether Zeus Panhellenios or Hadrian Zeus Panhellenios is the recipient of these dedications[463]. A third inscription from Ephesos is a list of priests dated by the prytanes G. Iulius Epagathos to 180-192. Among others, Epagathos was also the priest of Dionysos Propator, Zeus Panhellenios (restored), and Hephaistos[464]. It is unknown when the cult of Zeus Panhellenios appeared in the city and if it was influenced by a "Panhellenic" ideology such as that of the Panhellenion.

[461] *IG* XII, 2 206;209;540;656, *Suppl.* 42;59.
[462] Thyateira: Jones (1999) and Follet and Peppas- Delmouzou (1997); Iasos: *SEG* 36.987A.
[463] *IG* IV(2) 1 525 from Epidauros of Hadrianic date, and *IG* IV 1551 from Aigina.
[464] *IEph* 1600.

A number of Hadrian-as-Zeus epithets are related to local traditions and events that occurred during a visit of the emperor. Most characteristic are that of Hadrian Zeus Dodonaios on a number of almost identical dedications to the emperor from Nikopolis, all dated after 128 on account of the epithet Olympios[465]; also that of Hadrian Zeus Kynegesios on a statue base erected by the city of Stratonikeia-Hadrianopolis in Mysia sometime between 130 and 138[466]. The emperor had traveled through the upper Kaikos valley on his journey of 124 and he probably stayed at the city, to which he also granted the name Hadrianopolis. Obviously, while in the region, the emperor indulged his passion for hunting. Not surprisingly, during the same journey, he founded to the north of Stratonikeia a city called Hadrianotherai on account of a successful hunting there, during which he killed a bear[467].

Another inscription from Cilicia is important on account of the information it gives us about the locals' perception of Hadrian. This statue base was found at the city of Corycos, which lies at the mouth of the river Calycadnos in southern Cilicia. The inscription calls Hadrian father of the homeland, Zeus Epikarpios, and lord of everything, before it breaks off: π(ατέρα) π(ατρίδος), Δ̣ία Ἐπικ[άρ]/πιον τὸν ἁ̣πά[ντων]/κύριον εκ[—] (ll. 6-8)[468]. Evidently, the inscription refers to a benefaction to the city by the emperor during one of his visits. The epithet Ἐπικάρπιος suggests that this beneficence had to do with food provisions. The city was the main port of Seleucia and it is possible that the imperial fleet landed there. The existence of the

[465] *SEG* 35.674; 37.521; 39.528; 43.343.
[466] *SEG* 27.809: *vac.* Δία Κυνηγέσιον. vac./[Αὐ]τοκράτορα Καίσαρα/[Τρ]αιανὸν Ἀδριανὸν Ὀ/[λ]ύμπιον ὁ δῆμος ὁ Στ[ρα]/[τ]ονεικέων Ἀδριανοπ[ο]/[λε]ιτῶν τὸν ἴδιον κτίστη[ν]/[καὶ] οἰκιστὴν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίω[ν]/[ἐπι]μεληθ[έ]ντ[ο]ς Ἀπολλο/[δώ]ρου τοῦ β′ Κέλσου [.3-4.]/[κα]ὶ(?) ὑπὲρ Φουρίου ὑ[ι?]ωνο[ῦ]/[ἐπ]ὶ στρατηγοῦ τὸ β′ Τι. [Κλ.]/[*vac.1-2?*] Κανδίδαυ *vac./ vacat.*
[467] *HA Hadrian*, 20.13: *oppidum Hadrianotheras in quodam loco, quod illic et feliciter esset venatus et ursam occidisset aliquando, constituit*; also Dio Cassius 69.10.2.
[468] *CIG* 4433.

cult of Zeus Epikarpios in the region is only attested by a dedication to him from the same area, dated to 105/106[469]. Hadrian's arrival and gifts to the region were an opportunity to equate him to the local deity. All of the last three epithets (Dodonaios, Kynegesios, Epikarpios) have been exclusively attested with reference to Hadrian and this testifies to the special place that Hadrian had among his subjects.

In concluding the discussion of the epithets that associate Hadrian with Zeus I would like to talk about one more epithet. The emperor is called the son of Zeus Eleutherios on the fragment of an inscribed statue-base from the Athenian Acropolis[470]. Anthony Raubitschek, after joining this fragment with two more, restored the text and showed that in reality Zeus Eleutherios was part of the nomenclature of the emperor Trajan. Therefore, Hadrian appears as the son of Trajan Zeus Eleutherios[471]. Raubitschek argues that as Zeus Eleutherios was worshipped as the liberator of the city from the Persian attack, it may well be that Trajan, who fought against the descendants of the old Persians, the Parthians, received the *epiklesis* Zeus Eleutherios after his victories over the Parthians (130-131). Moreover, he correctly argues that, by association, Hadrian would be the brother of the goddess Athena in the pantheon of Athens (130). The presence of his statue in the Parthenon (Pausanias 1.24.7) would not only reinforce the connection with Athena, but also constitute an exceptionally and unmistakably bold stroke which further associated him with the heart of the religious life of classical Athens.

At any rate, it is worth noting that Hadrian did not receive this epithet in Athens. On the contrary, instances of him addressed Eleutherios are numerous in Mytilene, where a number of 11 almost identical dedicatory inscriptions have been

[469] *IGR* 3.128.
[470] *IG* II(2) 3322.
[471] Raubitschek (1945).

found, while two more, one from Perinthos-Herakleia and one from Tomis, are the only instances from the mainland[472]. Tomis was granted the status of free city sometime after 129[473]. It is also possible that Hadrian conferred a similar privilege to the cities of Mytilene and Perinthos-Herakleia although there is not yet such evidence[474]. It must be pointed out that Hadrian was not the first emperor honored with the epithet Eleutherios. Domitian was honored as such at Delphi and Athens, Nero at Akraiphia, whereas Augustus was not only Eleutherios, but, in addition, he was called "the son of Zeus Eleutherios" in a number of inscriptions from Egypt[475].

Another divinity with whom Hadrian is often associated is Dionysos. On the front seat of the theater of Dionysus in Athens, Hadrian received the epithet Eleutheraios in an inscription that reads "(seat) of the priest of Hadrian Eleutheraios"[476]. This is the only example of a Roman emperor receiving this epithet in association with Dionysus[477]. The reservation of a seat for the priest of Hadrian Eleutheraios in the theatre of Dionysos is not surprising. Hadrian had already been honored with the erection of his statue in the same theatre in 112/113 when he served as the eponymos archon of the city[478]. Furthermore, the emperor had presided as agonothetes at the Great Dionysia in 125 and probably in 132. It was during the visit of 125 that the council of Areopagos, the council of the 600, and the demos honored Hadrian with a series of twelve statues erected in the theatre of Dionysos as well[479]. It

[472] Lesbos: *IG* XII,2 183;185;191-198, *Suppl.* 53. Tomis: *IScM* II 47; Perinthos-Herakleia: *Perinthos-Herakleia* 37.
[473] Suceveanu (1975).
[474] So Birley (1997) 168 and Weber (1907) 136 (Mytilene).
[475] It is interesting that both Augustus and Hadrian appear as "Eleutherios" and "son of Zeus Eleutherios".
[476] *IG* II (2) 5035.
[477] Hadrian Eleuthereos is attested in two inscriptions from Athens (*IG* II(2) 3687;5022).
[478] *IG* II (2) 3286.
[479] Geagan (1979) 392.

should be noted here that Arja Karivieri, who discusses Hadrian's association with Dionysos in general terms, convincingly argues that the reliefs of the *scaenae frons* of the theatre, built by Hadrian, associated him and Sabina with Dionysos and Ariadne respectively and eventually functioned as a means to promote an image of the emperor as a *neos* Dionysos[480].

Hadrian's epiphany as *neos* Dionysos was witnessed throughout the Greek world[481]. His close relationship with the universal *synodos* of the Dionysiac technitai played an important role in the development of this phenomenon. Since Trajan fused all the different Dionysiac colleges into one universal college or *synodos*, the emperor became the patron of the college and took, in a sense, the place of Dionysos. Hadrian reaffirmed the privileges of the synod of Dionysiac artists, and in addition he allowed the "synod of athletes and sacred victors", as the two athletic guilds were known after their conflation in Trajan's times, to establish their headquarters in Rome in 134[482]. The synod honored the emperor and added him in its title, which now announced itself "universal synod of Dionysos and Hadrian Neos Dionysos". Furthermore, the emperor allowed the same synod to found a *mystikos agon* at Ancyra. An honorific

[480] Karivieri (2002) 44ff. The author also points out to the emperor's connection with the mythical founder of Athens Theseus (45ff). One of the reliefs from the *scaenae frons* depicts the enthronement of Dionysos and Ariadne, both identified with the imperial couple. To their right a sitting figure is Theseus. Theseus on his way to Athens, after he left Crete, abandoned Ariadne on the island of Naxos where Dionysos found her and took her as his spouse. By association Hadrian and his wife are connected to the mythical past of Athens and to the founder of the city. By taking Ariadne/Sabina Hadrian in a sense replaces Theseus. Hadrian underscored this association as for example by the inscriptions on his arch at Athens: αἵδ' εἴσ' Ἀθῆναι Θησέως ἡ πρὶν πόλις (east side), αἵδ' εἴσ' Ἀδριανοῦ καὶ οὐχὶ Θησέως πόλις (west side) (*IG* II(2) 5185). If the correct reading of the first text is "this is Athens the former city of Theseus", Hadrian appears again (in conjunction with the text of the other side) not only as the second founder of Athens, which replaces that of Theseus, but also as replacing Theseus.

[481] Hadrian *Neos* Dionysos is evidenced at Athens, Chios, Cos, Ancyra, Aphrodisias, Ephesos, Flavia Philadelpia, Pergamos?, Sardeis, and Nemausus.

[482] *IG* XIV 1054.

decree of the synod, dated to 128-129, included Hadrian as *neos* Dionysos in the ceremonies there jointly with the god[483].

To a lesser degree, Hadrian is considered the new manifestation of or is associated with Apollo, Asclepios, and Helios. Hadrian's association with Apollo is mostly evidenced in the use of the epithet Pythios. Hadrian is so labeled in a fragmentary dedication from Tegea[484], and in a number of dedications from Megara, where he was honored as "Πύθιος Πανελλήνιος κτίστης νομοθέτης τροφέας."[485] The emperor had clearly implemented reforms (he created a new *phyle*, named Hadrianis) and widened Megara's Scironian road[486]. However, in this case, the epithet Pythios must be interpreted in the light of Hadrian's completion of the Megarian temple of Apollo Pythios from 124-136, an event reported by Pausanias[487]. Perhaps these benefactions to the city can also account for the epithet *ktistes*, as there is no evidence of Hadrian's changing Megara's civic status or reconstructing the city[488].

The emperor as Pythios is more closely connected with the oracle of Delphi. Hadrian contributed a lot to the revival and welfare of the oracle and was especially interested in it since he desired to transform the Delphic Amphictyony itself into a common assembly of all Greeks, an abortive plan though which finally led to the creation of the Panhellenion[489]. Therefore, in a letter to the emperor in 132, the archons, council and the demos of the city expressed their joyfulness on Hadrian

---

[483] *IGR* 3.209.
[484] *IG* VI,2 127.
[485] *IG* VII 70-72; 3491.
[486] Pausanias 1.44.6.
[487] Pausanias 1.42.5: τοῦ δὲ Ἀπόλλωνος πλίνθου μὲν ἦν ὁ ἀρχαῖος ναός· ὕστερον δὲ βασιλεὺς ὠκοδόμησεν Ἀδριανὸς λίθου λευκοῦ. Hadrian, is reported, built another temple of Apollo at the small city of Abai in Phocis (Pausanias 10.35.4), and also dedicated the temple of Apollo Clarios at Claros (*SEG* 51.1598).
[488] So Boatwright (2000) 31-32.
[489] See for example Hadrian's letter to Delphi guaranteeing the oracle's freedom and autonomy, *FD* III 4:301.

celebrating the Eleusinian mysteries (l. 5, καὶ μυστήρια ἐπιτελοῦντ[ί σοι τὰ Ἐλευσίνια συγχαίρο]ντες), and addressed him as Olympios, Panhellenios, Pythios[490]. It is possible that the emperor in one of his visits to the city had met Plutarch, who was a priest of the god. It had been Plutarch who set up a statue at Delphi to celebrate Hadrian's accession[491].

On a number of occasions, Hadrian was the recipient of dedications along with Apollo[492]. He also accepted the honorary office of the prophet at the temple of Apollo at Didyma in a letter to the Milesians in 135[493].

There is little evidence of Hadrian's association with Asclepios. This is primarily numismatic and connects Hadrian and the empress with the god and members of his family such as Hygeia[494]. Two inscriptions from Pergamos point to Hadrian's relationship with the god. The first is an inscription recording the dedication of a *stoa* and the *propylon* of the Asklepieion to the gods, Asklepios, Hadrian and the city by a certain Polion[495]. We know that there was a room for the imperial cult in the sanctuary of the god, and certainly this inscription places Hadrian in it in the company of Asklepios. The other text probably comes from Asklepieion as

[490] *FD* III 4:308.
[491] *CID* 4.150
[492] So at Perge with Apollo Lyrboton (Merkelbach and Şahin (1988) 159,152), and at Miletos with Apollo Didymaeus (*SEG* 4.425) and with Apollo Didymaeus, Artemis Pythia, Leto, Zeus and the Demos of Miletos (*IDidyma* 58).
[493] Oliver (1989) 87.
[494] Coins from the Mysian city of Kame that bear Hadrian's bust on the obverse, depict Asclepios and/or Hygeia on the reverse (Imhoof-Blumel (1913) 613; 614); from the Thracian city of Bizya, Hadrian's bust on the obverse is accompanied by a doubtful scene on the reverse: a funerary table scene, with Asclepios reclining on a couch, Hygeia sitting on it, and a child and horse standing next to them (*Euelpidis Coll.* 1.907); Asclepios is also depicted on the reverse of Hadrianic coins from Cos and Pergamos (*SNG Herzog* 1111 and *SNG Denmark* 19.480 respectively); finally, Koronis, Asclepios' mother, is depicted on the reverse of a coin from Pergamos, on the obverse of which there is the bust of Sabina, Hadrian's wife (*SNG Denmark* 19.481).
[495] *IvP* III 64.

well and assimilates the emperor with the healing god[496]. The text dates to 129-138 on account of the epithet Olympios. The inscription is a dedication to Hadrian *soter Olympios*. The right part of the stone is missing and the inscription has been restored. If the restoration is correct, then the wording that follows is remarkable and requires extensive comment here. The language shifts from the dative case of the dedication on the first line of the text to the nominative, which is unusual. The text indicates that the base supported a statue of the emperor. Now the emperor is called lord of all men, king of all the lands, most manifest new Asklepios:

[Ἀδριανῶι σ]ωτῆρι Ὀλυμπίωι.
[πάντων ἀνθρώπ(?)]ων δεσπότης, βασιλεὺς
[τῶν τῆς γῆς χωρ(?)]ῶν, ἐπιφανέστατος
[νέ]ος Ἀσκληπιός.

In this text Hadrian is the ἐπιφανέστατος νέος Ἀσκληπιός. The positive degree of the adjective, ἐπιφανὴς, was a common component of the nomenclature of kings and emperors from the Hellenistic period onwards. As Simon Price in his paper on the Greek language of the imperial cult argued I believe that the word *epiphanes* was a word with a convenient width of meaning which could be cited in both religious and secular context, referring to both divine and non-divine, and therefore the epithet should be translated as "manifest" or "prominent" depending on each case[497]. Moreover I believe that in translating this epithet in inscriptions we must take into consideration the context, textual and historical, of each text. I suggest that when the epithet is accompanied by the name of a divinity or by the genitive "τῶν θεῶν" in the case of ἐπιφανέστατος or ἐμφανέστατος, the translation should be "manifest" or "most manifest" respectively. Accordingly, when the epithet is not accompanied by these elements, but simply predicates the emperor's name, or is even predicated itself by the

[496] *IvP* II 365.
[497] Price (1984a) 86ff.

word "god", it seems better to translate the adjective as "prominent" or "most prominent". In other words, the epithet by itself, if it is not further defined by a deity's name, does not necessarily allude to the emperor's new manifestation of a deity. Again, even in this case, the reading should pay attention to context.

Accordingly, in the inscription from Pergamos, a translation "most manifest new Asclepios" seems better. In general, the epithet does not automatically mean that the emperor had made a personal appearance in the city. Perhaps a visit by Hadrian was the cause for this dedication, although it could also be the expression of gratitude for a past benefaction which in the minds of the Pergamenes could be paralleled to the therapeutic powers of the god.

This is the only case where Hadrian is called ἐπιφανέστατος in the Greek East[498]. It is worth noting that with the exception of three of his predecessors who are so addressed once each[499], this form of the epithet occurs in large numbers in the third, and especially in the fourth centuries. A similar epithet, though, appears in two texts of Hadrianic date. The first of them is a document of 124 concerning the neokorate of Smyrna followed by a letter[500]. In lines 10-14, the author of the text is stressing the fact that the whole world sacrifices and prays for the well-being of the emperor and Rome. It seems to be an appropriate action in these most blessed times of Hadrian "the most manifest of the gods."[501] The emperor is both the most manifest of

[498] Hadrian *epiphanes* is attested only in two places: in a dedication from Nicomedeia (*TAM* IV, 1 401) and in an impressive number of 20 altars dedicated to the emperor at Samos (*IG* XII 6 1, 503-509; 511-512; 514-517; 519; 521-526).
[499] Gaius at Cyzicus (*MDAI(A)* 16 (1891) 141-144), Domitian at Delphi (*CID* 4 142), and Trajan at Didyma (*IDidyma* 407).
[500] *ISmyrna* 594.
[501] [— ἐν τοῖς/εὐτυ]χεστάτοις καιροῖς τοῦ θεῶ[ν ἐμφανεστάτου Αὐτοκρά/τορο]ς Τραιανοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρο[ς Σεβαστοῦ πᾶσα ἡ?/.4..υ οἰκουμένη θύει καὶ εὔχετ[αι ὑπὲρ τῆς αἰωνίου δια/μον]ῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνεικήτ[ου Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίας……].

the gods on account of his frequent visits there and certainly the most distinguished given the enormous gifts he has conferred upon the city.

We find the same idea in the second text. A decree of the city of Karystos, dated to 131/2-138, praises the emperor for the way he administers the world[502]. If there is anything in accordance with the divine will, a certain Iatrokles says, that Hadrian Panhellenios *archegetes* and *ktistes* of Karystos undertakes, he does so in the most distinguished manner in accordance with the plan of the gods, in order to rule the vast world in a worthily manner[503]. The emperor not only acts according to divine laws, but he also makes sure that everything will be accomplished in a way that will leave no doubt as to the will of the gods, whose plans he is the most adept to bring to conclusion[504].

The second epithet from the Pergamene inscription that requires some comments here is *despotes* (l. 2). This is an epithet that was frequently associated with a divinity in the Greek East, but not very often with a living emperor. In fact there are only three instances of rulers called *despotes* before Hadrian. The earliest is in a letter by an Athenian Dionysodoros, son of Athenadoros, to Ptolemy XII Philopator Philadelphos from the area of Euhemeria in Egypt, dated to 69/68 BC[505]. The letter concerns the *asylia* of the sanctuary of Ammon at Arsinoe. On line 10, the author of the letter addressed Ptolemy as lord and king, δέσποτα βασιλεῦ**.** The second example comes from Egypt too. A certain Katilios, son of Nikanor, dedicated an epigram on

---

[502] *IG* XII, *Suppl.* 527.

[503] ll. 5-10: εἶπεν· πᾶν μέν, εἴ τι κα[ὶ ἀκόλουθον ταῖς θείαις]/ὑπέρχεται διανοίαις πρά[ττειν—]/ Τραϊανὸν Ἀδριανὸν Κ[αίσαρα Σεβαστὸν Πα]/νελλήνιον ἀρχηγέ[την καὶ κτιστὴν Καρύσ]/του, θεῶν γνώμῃ ἐμ[φανέστατα συμπράττει]/ὅπως ἀξίως τὸν μέ[γαν διοικῇ κόσμον·….]

[504] In addition to Hadrian, the epithet is only attested in two fragmentary inscriptions: the first from Delphi, of Domitianic date, refers to the most blessed times of the most manifest of gods (the name of the emperor is missing): τῶν εὐ/[τυχ]εστ[ά]των καιρῶν τοῦ/[θεῶν ἐμφ]ανεστάτου Αὐτο/[κράτορος-] (ll. 15-18- *IEph* 449); the second, from Magnesia ad Maeandrum, is undated and seems to refer to an unknown emperor, most manifest god: [τοῦ]/ἐμφανεσ[τάτου θεοῦ] (ll.5-6- *IMagnesia* 157c).

[505] *Fayoum* 2.136.

the island of Philai in 7 BC[506]. The author of the epigram dedicated it to Augustus, who among others is addressed as the lord of the seas, ruler of the boundless earth, Zeus Eleutherios, son of Zeus, lord of Europe and Asia alike: Καίσαρι ποντομέδοντι καὶ ἀπείρων κρατέοντι/Ζανὶ τῶι ἐκ Ζανὸς πατρὸς Ἐλευθερίωι,/δεσπόται Εὐρώπας τε καὶ Ἀσίδος, ἄστρωι ἀπάσας,/Ἑλλάδος, ὃς σωτὴρ Ζεὺς ἀνέτειλε μέγας (ll. 1-4). The last example comes from Gorneae in Armenia[507]. This building inscription records the erection of fortifications by Tiridates in 77. The king is titled Helios Tiridates, great king of the great Armenia, *despotes*. All three examples came from the Eastern Mediterranean and the vocabulary used reflects the attachment to local traditions and old sentiments regarding absolute regimes and rulers.

Hadrian is called *despotes* in three other inscriptions in addition to the text from Pergamos. The first comes from the Cilician city of Iotape, and is a dedication of a statue of the emperor, lord of land and sea ([γ]ῆς/ καὶ θαλάσσης δ[ε]σ/πότην), by the demos[508]. The second example comes from Pantikapaion in the Tauric Chersonese[509]. Again, it is a dedication of a statue of Hadrian, lord of the world, (δεσπό/[την τῆ]ς οἰκουμέ[ν]ης) by a certain Eubios. The last one is a fragmentary letter to the emperor by the city and archons of Delphi[510].

It is noteworthy that starting with Hadrian the epithet *despotes* is frequently associated with Roman emperors. With the exception of Antoninus Pius, who is called *despotes* in only three instances[511], the epithet became a very common part of the emperor's nomenclature in the following years and well into the late Empire. The

[506] *IGR* I,5 1295- this is the only metrical text of the known examples. All others are in prose.
[507] *SEG* 40.1315.
[508] Paribeni and Romanelli (1914) 182,128.
[509] *CIRB* 48.
[510] *FD* III 4:304; cf. *SEG* 26.634.
[511] At Chersonesos in the Tauric Chersonese (*IosPE* I(2) 362); the Cilician Lamos (Paribeni and Romanelli (1914) 169,117); and at the Lydian Kamai (*TAM* V,2 1231).

epithet had negative connotations since already in Classical Greece it alluded to an absolute, non-free, regime[512]. This is also evident in Dio Cassius (55.12), according to whom, when Augustus was once called "master" by the people, he not only forbade it, but also took very good care to enforce his command (δεσπότης δέ ποτε ὁ Αὔγουστος ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ὀνομασθεὶς οὐχ ὅπως ἀπεῖτε μηδένα τούτῳ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν τῷ προσρήματι χρήσασθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάνυ διὰ φυλακῆς αὐτὸ ἐποιήσατο.) The ideology is clearly that of the Senatorial class, whose status was endangered by such absolutist behavior as that displayed by Commodus and Elagabalus, under whose rule Dio lived.

In light of these remarks, I would like to suggest that the Greek populations were comfortable with a view of Hadrian not simply as a passing-by Roman emperor but more as a kind of a Hellenistic ruler. Perhaps Hadrian himself was not reluctant to be seen as such. Fears, commenting on the imperial cult, has suggested that the new emphasis on divine election in the period from Domitian onwards was the result of the transformation of the principate to monarchy: "the emperor becomes the ultimate power; a centralized, enlightened autocracy replaced the Augustan ideal of the princeps as a special agent of the senate and Roman people; at the same time a broad imperial vision of empire superseded a more narrowly Romano-Italian outlook."[513] Although I agree with his idea of a broad imperial vision, I hesitate to view the principate evolving into an autocratic regime in the second century. I believe that both Trajan and Hadrian had to take the necessary steps to consolidate the empire and secure its longevity: the former mostly with respect to the priorities of the state at its borders, and the latter basically by improving the administration of the vast empire. A more centralized form of administration came as the natural consequence of these

[512] See for example, Herodotos 3.89, Thucydides 6.77, Plato, *Laws*, 859a, where *despotes* is associated with *tyrannos*.
[513] Fears (1977) 251.

efforts, and it is more obvious in the case of Hadrian, who brought to an end the further expansion of the empire and turned his attention mostly to its internal affairs.

Perhaps there is no better way to conclude this section of Hadrian's "*neos theos*" manifestations than with the most "manifest of all", Hadrian as *Neos* Helios. The first evidence is a very fragmentary text from Amastris in Paphlagonia, and is dated to 119[514]. The inscribed base carried the statue of the emperor, the benefactor of the world, *neos* Helios: εὐεργέτην τῆ̃[ς οἰ]/[κουμένη]ς, νέον Ἥ[λιον] (ll.9-10).

A later text comes from Klazomenai[515]. It is a dedication to Hadrian dated to 129-138. The dedication addresses Hadrian Olympios *neos* Helios *ktistes*: Ὀλυ[μ]/πίῳ, νέῳ/Ἡλίῳ, κτί[στῃ] (ll. 5-7) and, perhaps, alludes to an unknown cult of Hadrian as Helios there. The title was used for many Roman emperors. Fritz Graf comments on the symbolism of the epithet and argues that as in the inscription from Akraiphia, by which Nero granted freedom to Achaea[516], the emperor is hailed as new Helios, shining upon the Greeks, elected to benefit Greece (νέος Ἥλιος ἐπιλάμψας τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, προειρημέ/νος εὐεργετεῖν τὴν Ἑλ<λ>άδα, ll. 34-35), so an emperor's benefactions to his subjects parallel those of Helios to men[517]. It would be an appropriate connection for Hadrian, who first was introduced to his subjects by Apollo-Helios and now is assimilated with him.

So far, I have presented evidence on the intentional use of religious language in the Greeks' address to Hadrian. This language was already familiar to them in their dealings with Hellenistic monarchs and Roman emperors or officials alike. It shows the tendency of the Greek world to include the Roman authorities into their universe

[514] Marek (1993) 160, 9.
[515] *IErythra*i 513.
[516] *IG* VII 2713.
[517] Graf (1985) 396-397.

in their own linguistic terms. Hadrian's personality certainly encouraged the use of such language in an environment of competition among the cities, all of which vied with each other to draw the most benefits from him.

I have shown that his Greek subjects viewed Hadrian as the manifestation of the divine in an unprecedented way and extent. Some of the epithets are not only unattested before, but the use of a number of them sets the precedent for their inclusion in the titulature of Roman emperors from the 2nd century onwards. The epithets clearly reveal the association of Hadrian with Greek culture and his appropriation of local and Panhellenic myths. The emperor was the ἐμφανέστατος of all of his predecessors by his repeated journeys to the region.

The same stress on the use of familiar terms and language will be evidenced in a number of behaviors, with less religious connotations, but all with allusions to the superhuman, the supernatural and by consequence to the divine: idiosyncrasies of the emperor as these were projected by him or encouraged by the Greek populations and even invented by contemporary and later authors.

5.4 Hadrian and the Divine

An important factor that determined Hadrian's policy in the East was his personality. Among other things, the emperor was interested in divination and mystic cults, magic and superstitions, was skilled in astrology, knowledge of every science and art, and was even credited with healing powers[518]. Although this aspect of his personality is not directly connected with his cult in the region, it pertains to the divine, the superhuman and as such I deem it worthy of being examined here. Moreover, I believe that these interests of his facilitated his reception among the

[518] Cf. Suetonius, *Vespasian* 7.2 on the emperor as healer.

Greeks. They were part of the religion-colored language that the Greeks and the emperor used to communicate with each other.

In spite of the fact that this aspect of Hadrian's life was the subject of great interest in our sources, modern scholarship has underestimated the significant role that it played in the creation of his image in the East. Here I will closely discuss it and demonstrate by a number of examples that a) Hadrian's interests in the divine and superhuman fostered his relations with the populations of the Greek East, b) this particular attitude contributed to the damage that his reputation suffered among the Roman elites and Senators, and finally c) even if a number of them is plain fiction on the part of an author (as is sometimes the case in the biographies of the *Historia Augusta*), the tendency of the authors of the late empire and later centuries to confer these qualities on Hadrian reveals the desire of the Greeks to view that emperor of their past as en extraordinary person that was versed in the world of superhuman, of divine, and thus ready to converse with them in a familiar language.

5.4.1 Hadrian and Divine Knowledge

Our sources present Hadrian as desirous of knowledge both of the past and the future, and for this reason he often visited oracles and prophets. We know for example, that Hadrian was particular generous to the city and the oracle of Delphi. As we saw above among others he guaranteed the freedom, autonomy and other privileges conferred upon the city by previous emperors. The emperor visited Delphi in 125 and was elected for the second time archon of the city (the first time was in 120). On one of his visits he posed a question to Pythia: where was Homer from and who were his parents? The priestess answered in hexameters that Homer was from

Ithaca, son of Telamachus and Polycaste[519]. Such an inquiry would certainly fit in with Hadrian's interests. The emperor was famous for his often annoying curiosity. It is also probable that Hadrian, since he was in the area, might have visited the oracle of Trophonios, although there is no evidence of such a visit.

This is not the first time that Hadrian is associated with Apollo. We saw already that it was this god as Helios who announced Hadrian to the world. A strange event, but not at all in disagreement with Hadrian's character, is reported by the church historian of the 5th century Sozomenos in his *Historia Ecclesiastica* addressed to the emperor Theodosios II. In a long passage discussing the temple of Apollo at Daphne, just outside of Antioch, Sozomenos reports that the water of the Castalia fountain of the sanctuary had oracular powers. Even Hadrian, he continues, before his accession to the throne, consulted the oracle by dipping a leaf of laurel in the waters of the fountain. When he pulled it out, he says, knowledge of his future appeared on the leaf. After he received the throne Hadrian covered the fountain with soil so that no one should benefit from it[520]. Of course, all this, Sozomenos concludes, is nothing more than the words of tellers of tales: Ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μέν, οἷς τούτων μέλει, ἀκριβῶς μυθολογούντων. However, historical circumstances (Hadrian's known presence in the area before Trajan's death) and his character as is presented in the two main literary sources can add a degree of credibility to the story.

---

[519] *Anthologia Graeca* Book 14.102:
Ἄγνωστόν μ' ἐρέεις γενεῆς καὶ πατρίδος αἴης
ἀμβροσίου Σειρῆνος· ἔδος δ' Ἰθάκη τις Ὁμήρου·
Τηλέμαχος δὲ πατὴρ καὶ Νεστορέη Πολυκάστη
μήτηρ, ἥ μιν ἔτικτε, βροτῶν πολυπάνσοφον ἄλλων.
Cf. *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* 32-43.

[520] *Historia Ecclesiastica* Book 5.19.10-12: ἐπιστεύετο δὲ παρὰ τοῖς τάδε πρεσβεύουσι ῥεῖν αὐτόθι καὶ ὕδωρ μαντικὸν ἀπὸ Κασταλίας τῆς πηγῆς, ὁμοίως τῆς ἐν Δελφοῖς ἐνεργείας τε καὶ προσηγορίας λαχούσης. ἀμέλει τοι καὶ Ἀδριανῷ ἔτι ἰδιωτεύοντι τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐχοῦσιν ἐνθάδε προμηνυθῆναι. φασὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν φύλλον δάφνης ἐμβάψαντα τῇ πηγῇ ἀρύσασθαι τὴν τῶν ἐσομένων γνῶσιν ἐγγράφως ἐπὶ τοῦ φύλλου δηλωθεῖσαν. παρελθόντα δὲ εἰς τὴν ἡγεμονίαν καταχῶσαι τὴν πηγήν, ὥστε μὴ ἐξεῖναι καὶ ἄλλοις προμανθάνειν τὸ μέλλον.

The *Historia Augusta* stresses the fact that Hadrian was a frequent visitor of oracles. The author asserts that the emperor received at least two oracles prior to his enthronement: one from the Vergilian oracle or the Sibylline verses, the other from the temple of Zeus at Nikephorion (it is possible that the temple of Zeus Nikephorios at Nikephorion by the Euphrates is meant here)[521]. Both instances are in accordance with the emperor's character. The author even argues that oracles given by Antinoos were in reality composed by Hadrian *(et Graeci quidem volente Hadriano eum consecraverunt oracula per eum dari adserentes, quae Hadrianus ipse conposuisse iactatur*, *HA Hadrian* 14.7)[522].

Hadrian's desire for knowledge of the future is manifested in the repeated allusions of the *HA* to the emperor's interest in astrology[523]. Four passages, two in his *Vita*, and two in that of Aelius Verus, talk about the emperor's excellence in the art of astrology. The text very early treats Hadrian's interest when it is said that while in Lower Moesia, where he was appointed tribune of the Fifth Legion, the Macedonica, Hadrian heard from an astrologer the same prediction about him receiving the *imperium* which he had heard from his astrologer uncle[524]. Later, in a statement allegedly coming from Marius Maximus, the emperor appears so proficient in astrology that he could write on the calends of January all that would happen to him during the year to the point that he wrote down everything that he was going to do

---

[521] *HA Hadrian* II.8-9.
[522] In another case, Hadrian changed the name of the Thracian city Oresteias to Hadrianopolis after he received an oracle (*HA Elagabalus* VII.8). Antinoos was honored as Neos Pythios on the coinage of Delphi and Nikopolis, a fact which reveals a local desire to attribute oracular powers to the new deity.
[523] R.G. Lewis after examination of the literary sources and the extant fragments of Hadrian's autobiography argues that it is possible that Hadrian in his autobiography made use of astrological and perhaps other means of prophecy "in claiming not so much perhaps skill in the art as the sanction of Fate" (Lewis (1993) 702). On Hadrian's horoscope in Antigonos of Nicaea see the excellent study of Stephan Heilen, The Emperor Hadrian in the Horoscopes of Antigonos of Nicaea, in Oestmann G. et alii (edd.), *Horoscopes and Public Spheres. Essays on the History of Astrology*, Berlin 2005, 49-67. The author has announced the preparation of a much anticipated edition of the fragmentary work of Antigonos with translation and commentary.
[524] *HA Hadrian* II.4.

down to the very hour of his death[525]. The emperor also seems to have been acquainted with Aelius' horoscope: *fertur… Hadrianum Veri scisse genituram* (*HA Aelius* III.8.)[526]

5.4.2 The Art of the Occult

Hadrian reportedly employed divinations and magic arts of all kinds. The inherent curiosity of the emperor for everything strange and exotic is excellently portrayed in a magical papyrus now in Paris[527]. The text talks about a "spell of attraction" (Ἀγωγή) that attracts those who are uncontrollable, inflicts sickness excellently and kills powerfully, sends dreams beautifully, and accomplishes marvelous dream revelations (ll. 2437-2440). Then the text claims that Hadrian witnessed a demonstration by a prophet from Heliopolis called Pachrates. Pachrates revealed the power of the potion and his own art: "for he attracted within an hour, made someone sick within two hours, killed within seven hours, and even sent the emperor himself dreams, thus the emperor testing thoroughly the very truth of his magical powers[528]. The emperor so marveled at the prophet that he ordered double allowance to be given to him (ll. 2449-2451).

It is possible that the emperor met the prophet during his visit to Egypt in 130 that eventually led to Antinoos's death. Pachrates without doubt is that Pancrates who appears in Lucian's *Philopseudes* and also the poet who celebrated Hadrian's and Antinoos' successful lion-hunt as it is recorded by Athenaeus and on a fragmentary

[525] *HA Hadrian* XVI.7: *Mathesin sic scire sibi visus est, ut sero kalendis Ianuariis scripserit, quid ei toto anno posset evenire, ita ut eo anno, quo perit, usque ad illam horam, qua est mortuus, scripserit, quid acturus esset.* Cf. *HA Aelius Verus* III.9.
[526] See also *HA Aelius* IV.5 and VI.8.
[527] *Papyri Graeci Magici* IV.2436ff.
[528] δύναμιν τῆς θείας αὐτοῦ μαγείας. ἦξεν/γὰρ μονόωρον, κατέκλινεν ἐν ὥραις β′, ἀνεῖ/λεν ἐν ὥραις ζ′, ὀνειροπόμπησεν δὲ αὐτὸν/βασιλέα ἐκδο≤κ≥ιμ≤ά≥ζοντος αὐτοῦ τὴν ὅλην/ἀλήθειαν τῆς περὶ αὐτὸν μαγείας· (ll. 2444-2449).

papyrus[529]. It is likely that Hadrian was interested in meeting the prophet, for whatever purpose, but particularly because he was concerned about his own health.

Dio supports this idea when he discusses Antinoos' drowning in the Nile. The young man, Dio tells us, died either by falling into the river, as Hadrian writes, or, as the truth is, by being offered as a sacrificial victim (εἴτε καὶ ἱερουργηθείς, ὡς ἡ ἀλήθεια ἔχει.)[530] He justifies this allegation with the following statement: "for Hadrian in all things, as I said, was most superstitious, and used all kinds of divinations and magic arts" (ἔχει· τά τε γὰρ ἄλλα περιεργότατος Ἀδριανός, ὥσπερ εἶπον, ἐγένετο, καὶ μαντείαις μαγγανείαις τε παντοδαπαῖς ἐχρῆτο, 69.11.3). Indeed, he adds, Antinoos offered his life for Hadrian for "it was necessary that a life should be surrendered freely for the accomplishment of the ends Hadrian had in view."[531] It seems that Hadrian wanted to extend his own life, and when the magicians demanded a volunteer to substitute for him, Antinoos offered (or forced to) himself.

In fact this is the theory expressed in the writings of Aurelius Victor. In his *De Caesaribu*s, the author discusses the personality of the emperor and pays particular attention to his lasciviousness and affairs with men. As for the honors offered to Antinoos, he attempts to explain them by saying "some indeed maintain that this was

---

[529] *Philopseudes* 33ff; *Deipnosophistae* 15.21 (I follow G. Kaibel's division of books and paragraphs in the Teubner edition, 1887-1890); as for the papyrus, I follow D.L. Page's text in the Loeb's edition *Select Papyri III: Literary Papyri, Poetry*, Cambridge, Ma 1962, 516, 128. As Antony Birley (1997) argues, the difference between the different spellings "Pachrates" and "Pancrates" should not cause any problem. "The former is an adaptation of a purely Egyptian name which sounded slightly similar, the latter is a "corrected", more Hellenic version" (244).

[530] Dio Cassius 69.11.2. Cf. HA's comment regarding Antinoos's death, *Hadrian* 14.6: *de quo varia fama est aliis eum* ***devotum*** *pro Hadrian adserentibus, aliis, quod et forma eius ostentat et nimia voluptas Hadriani*.
A now lost cornaline supposedly alluded to Antinoos' sacrifice. Royston Lambert (1984) 47;53 cautiously discussed an engraved gem once reported to belong to a French collector. Allegedly, the scene showed Antinoos sitting contemplating his doom and holding a lyre, while a sick Hadrian and Aelius Caesar gaze at the goddess Hygeia and the snake of Asklepios. As Lambert himself suggests, there are certain problems with this scene. If, however, as he says, the gem was authentically Hadrianic and if the goddess, snake, Antinoos and Hadrian were identifiable on it, then it would point to a contemporary belief, if nothing more, that Antinoos sacrificed himself for the health of the ailing emperor. However, until the rediscovery of the gem, this source should be treated with caution.

[531] Dio Cassius 69.11.3: ἑκουσίου γὰρ ψυχῆς πρὸς ἃ ἔπραττεν ἐδεῖτο.

done because of piety or religion: for in fact, they say, Hadrian wanted to extend his own life-span, and when the magicians (magi) demanded a volunteer to die in his stead, everyone declined, but Antinoos offered himself."[532] Hadrian was gravely concerned about his health and the magi (could Pachrates be one of them?) suggested this solution.

A fourth century source even claims that the emperor traveled to Egypt for precisely this reason: to treat his illness. Epiphanius in his work *De mensuris et ponderibus* relates the story of how the Old Testament was gradually translated from Hebrew into Greek from the period of Ptolemy Philadelphos well into the Roman imperial times (l. 228ff). During his discussion of the role of Aquila of Sinope[533] as a translator of the sacred text, Epiphanius adds some remarks about Hadrian (l. 362ff). Surprisingly, the first thing that Epiphanius decides to tell his reader about Hadrian is his illness. Hadrian, he says, was seriously ill and for this he had summoned doctors from all over the empire. But Hadrian received no cure from them, and, Epiphanius concludes, on account of his persisting illness he went on a journey to the land of Egypt: Τῆς δὲ προκειμένης αὐτῷ νόσου ἕνεκα στέλλεται τὴν πορείαν ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων γῆν (ll. 367-368). Then Hadrian made his way to Jerusalem, where he rebuilt the city as Aelia Capitolina.

The fact that Epiphanius emphasized only Hadrian's illness in relation to his visit to Egypt, reveals two things: first, that the visit of the emperor had made a huge impact in the area and his illness was a subject much discussed there, and second, that the statement of the author that Hadrian concerned about his health made the trip to

[532] 14.8: *Quae quidem alii pia volunt religiosaque: quippe Hadriano cupiente fatum producere, cum voluntarium ad vicem magi poposcissent, cunctis retractantibus Antinoum obiecisse se referunt, hincque in eum officia supra dicta*.
[533] It is interesting that in Epiphanius's text Aquila was expelled from the Church on account of practicing astrology (l. 403ff).

Egypt seems to reflect an earlier oral, if not written, tradition regarding Antinoos' death as this was alluded to in Dio[534].

It is unclear whether Hadrian's health had been (temporarily) improved by his stay in Egypt. An issue from the mint of Rome may provide some insight into Hadrian's expectations[535]. The type, in both silver and bronze, depicts Hadrian's laureate bust on the obverse. On the reverse, Hadrian standing in military dress holds spear and *parazonium*. His left foot rests on a crocodile. The legend *S(enatus) C(onsultum)* completes the scene. According to Anthony Birley, it is possible that we have here a depiction of Hadrian as Horus and thus as "King of Egypt", the vanquisher of evil forces. He further argues that "it has also been pointed out that it had long been standard practice in Egypt for ill or afflicted persons to identify themselves with Horus and the demons that were causing them pain with scorpions, crocodiles and serpents. The identification, accompanied by spells, guaranteed a cure for the patient who had taken on the god's identity."[536] If this is the case here, then it is possible that Hadrian felt that his resort to divinations and magic finally paid off.

Perhaps we may interpret the hieroglyphics on Antinoos' obelisk, now at Rome, in the same light[537]. The obelisk was erected after Antinoos death and certainly while Sabina was still alive (AD 130-137/138) as we can infer by the lines of the north side: "Sabina, who lives…." The illustrations and hieroglyphics on the obelisk celebrate deified Antinoos, called Osirantinoos the Reborn and Ever-Living, and Hadrian. In what concerns us here, on the east side of the obelisk, Osirantinoos addresses a prayer to Re-Harachte. Among other things he asks the god to reward

[534] It seems improbable that Epiphanius who spent many years in Egypt was not aware of Antinoos' death. The omission here is perhaps due to his Christian sentiments: it is possible that the story was very offensive to him.
[535] *BMCRE* III. 1552-1553; 1617-1620.
[536] Birley (1997) 257ff.
[537] I follow Mary Boatwright' text here: Boatwright (1987) 239-260.

Hadrian, the beloved of the Nile and the Gods, "who lives, is safe and healthy, just like the Sun in a fresh, beautiful youthful age", and later on, "Sabina lives, is safe and healthy, Augusta, who lives forever".

The obelisk was certainly erected by Hadrian in Antinoopolis and in all probability the emperor was responsible for the composition of the text. The lines on the east side seem to express not so much Hadrian's conviction, but rather his hope that Antinoos's sacrifice brought the results he wished for and the *magi* promised him. Unfortunately, as we know, Hadrian never recovered from his illness. And when all doctors had failed to cure him, he then again resorted to occult arts, as Dio tells us: "Hadrian by certain charms and quack remedies was relieved for some time of his dropsy, but soon he was filled with water again."[538]

It is interesting that in Dio's *History* the use of charms, spells, and magic arts, is treated from a negative point of view. In his work, all three words, "μαγείαι", "μαγγανείαι", and "γοητείαι" are either the work of non-Romans (sometimes helping but usually resulting to endangering individuals)[539], or the constant occupation of evil and immoral individuals[540], who quite often are banned from Rome[541]. It is noteworthy that no emperor other than Hadrian is presented in his work as constantly employing such arts.

The negative position of Dio towards such practices is most clearly manifested in the famous fictitious speech of Maecenas to Augustus. In a part of the speech

---

[538] Dio Cassius 69.22.1: Ἀδριανὸς δὲ μαγγανείαις μέν τισι καὶ γοητείαις ἐκενοῦτό ποτε τοῦ ὑγροῦ, πάλιν δ' αὐτοῦ διὰ ταχέος ἐπίμπλατο.

[539] So a native of Mauretania performing in the presence of the ex-praetor Gnaeus Hosidius Geta (60.9.4); or an Egyptian magician, a companion of Marcus Aurelius, during the war against the Quadi (71.8.4). Xiphilinus doubts the authenticity of the incident (71.9.2-3), by emphatically claiming that Marcus was not finding pleasure in the company of magicians or in witchcraft: οὐδὲ γὰρ μάγων συνουσίαις καὶ γοητείαις ὁ Μάρκος χαίρειν ἱστόρηται.

[540] So Agrippina in order to seduce Claudius (61.11.3).

[541] As in the case of Agrippa who banished astrologers and magicians from Rome (49.43.5), and Tiberius, who acted in a similar manner (57.15.7-8).

Meacenas objected to the worship of the living emperor (52.35-36)[542]. The speaker asserts that there should be no formal worship of the emperor, no gold or silver images, and no temples. Only virtue brings its reward, including a close approximation to divinity, and no vote or formal institution can replace this. He further urges Augustus to be the guardian of the worship of the gods and punish those who introduce new religions, since this could lead to anomaly. Therefore, he adds, "do not permit anybody to be an atheist or a sorcerer (μήτ' οὖν ἀθέῳ τινὶ μήτε γόητι συγχωρήσῃς εἶναι-52.36.2-3). Soothsaying, he continues, is a necessary and good art, but there ought to be no workers in magic at all (τοὺς δὲ δὴ μαγευτὰς πάνυ οὐκ εἶναι προσήκει-52.36.3), for their sayings and deeds encourage rebellious actions.

Foreign divinities, magic arts, charms and spells not only undermine the position of the gods of the Roman pantheon, but above all are a continuous threat to the cohesion and stability of the imperial system. Apparently, the latter is what alarms Dio the most. Therefore, in his negative view of Hadrian's interest in these arts, the author does not merely act as an advocate of Roman religion, but rather as a defender of the entire structure of the empire. Without doubt, Dio's views reflect those of the Senatorial class, which perhaps considered itself the guardian of the state. Certainly the senators did not welcome such attitudes by a princeps, who, in Hadrian's case, seems to betray old Roman traditions by the adoption of such practices. Perhaps different was the situation in the East where people were probably more eager to accept a ruler who had interest in oracles, divinations and magic arts. Hadrian's familiarity with these arts and his apparent lack of fear to learn them and employ them demonstrates even more his desire for an empire that would not focus on the assimilation of non-Roman peoples but rather would be ready to accept foreign

[542] For a recent discussion of the subject of imperial cult in this speech see Fishwick (1990).

traditions and idiosyncrasies. In other words, an empire that would bring together all its distinct elements, mostly Roman and Greek, and would not fear to exploit them for its benefit.

This desire for accepting, improving and exploiting elements from both Greeks and Romans for the benefit of the empire was also much evident in Hadrian's promotion of the cult of Roma and attachment to that of Zeus to which I will now turn.

5.5 Consolidating Traditions

In this section I will discuss Hadrian's emphasis on the cult of Dea Roma in the West, and how this can be paralleled with the cult of Zeus in the East. Although modern scholars have discussed both phenomena, no one has placed them in the sphere of politics with regard to Hadrian's vision for the Empire.

By providing ancient evidence and discussing modern scholarship I will argue that a) the cult of Dea Roma was a crucial tool in Hadrian's plans for the Greek East and the empire; b) the promotion of the cult of Roma must not be interpreted as Romanocentric but rather as empire-focusing; by promoting her cult the emperor focused more on a unification of the empire's elements rather than their total Romanization; c) in his association with and assimilation to Zeus the emperor did not simply express the established belief that the emperor was the image of the father of gods on earth; I suggest that Hadrian had to reinvent himself as Zeus in the East as a response to Trajan's assimilation to Jupiter in the Latin West. Hadrian's association with Zeus is what helped him the most, in the sphere of religion, to promote his program among the Greek people; and finally, d) the cult of the two deities advanced

the idea of two cultural centers, one in the West, centered around Rome, and one in the East, centered around the great cities of the Greek mainland and Asia Minor.

5.5.1 The Cult of Dea Roma

The basic studies of the cult of Roma in the Greek World and its development in the West remain the two almost contemporary works by Ronald Mellor and Carla Fayer[543]. First I will summarize the evidence regarding the cult of the goddess from these two works and next I will turn to Hadrian's policy with regard to her cult.

Already from at least the end of the third century BC the Greek East had found in the idea of the goddess Roma a way to deal with the political reality of Roman power and the increasing presence of Rome in the area. However, the first official appearance of the cult did not occur until the early second century BC. It was the Smyrnaeans that first built a temple to the goddess. According to Tacitus, when the Koinon of Asia had been granted permission to build a temple to Tiberius, Livia, and the Senate, envoys from eleven cities came to Rome to plead for the privilege of constructing it[544]. The candidates were narrowed down to Smyrna and Sardeis. Presenting their case, the Smyrnaean ambassadors argued that among the many ties between their city and Rome was that they were the first to build a temple for the goddess Roma in the consulship of Marcus Porcius Cato (195)[545]. Eventually, the Senate granted Smyrna and not Sardeis the new temple.

For the next two centuries the cult centered on Roma as the personification and deification of the Roman state and its power. It is important that during that

---

[543] Mellor (1975) (see also (1981)) and Fayer (1976).
[544] *Annals* 4.55ff.
[545] *Annals* 4.56: *seque primos templum urbis Romae statuisse, M. Porcio consule, magnis quidem iam populi Romani rebus, nondum tamen ad summum elatis, stante adhuc Punica urbe et validis per Asiam regibus.*

period her cult was limited to the East only. It seems that Rome was not interesting in promoting a cult the object of which was herself. The advent of the empire changed the role of Roma. Now the worship of the princeps joined that of Roma. Already early in Augustus' reign the emperor received delegates from Asia and Bithynia who requested permission to establish cults and dedicate temples to him. The emperor exercised particular caution lest he seem to accept suspect honors and succumb to oriental excess. Therefore, he permitted two temples in each province: one dedicated to Roma and Augustus (at Pergamos and Nicomedeia) for the non-Roman populations, and the second dedicated to Roma and Divus Iulius (at Ephesos and Nicaea) for resident Romans[546]. Thus Augustus allowed himself to be linked to Roma in the East and later brought their joint worship to the West, even if not to Rome itself, an action which seems to have promoted loyalty and solidarity.

Augustus' successors did not pursue the cult of Roma. According to Mellor, there was no longer any political rationale for the inclusion of Roma in the imperial cult[547]. "If she remained," he continues, "it was usually out of inertia and religious conservatism". Through the reigns of Tiberius, Gaius, Claudius, and even for the first decade of Nero's rule, Roma disappeared from imperial coinage. Despite very sporadic and occasional mentions it was only after the civil wars of 69 that Roma reappeared on coins. Trajan, in turn, was interested in the promotion of her cult, but his reign did not bring Roma to the capital.

---

[546] Dio Cassius 51.20.6-7: Καῖσαρ δὲ ἐν τούτῳ τά τε ἄλλα ἐχρημάτιζε, καὶ τεμένη τῇ τε Ῥώμῃ καὶ τῷ πατρὶ τῷ Καίσαρι, ἥρωα αὐτὸν Ἰούλιον ὀνομάσας, ἔν τε Ἐφέσῳ καὶ ἐν Νικαίᾳ γενέσθαι ἐφῆκεν· αὗται γὰρ τότε αἱ πόλεις ἔν τε τῇ Ἀσίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Βιθυνίᾳ προετετίμηντο. καὶ τούτους μὲν τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις τοῖς παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐποικοῦσι τιμᾶν προσέταξε· τοῖς δὲ δὴ ξένοις, Ἕλληνάς σφας ἐπικαλέσας, ἑαυτῷ τινα, τοῖς μὲν Ἀσιανοῖς ἐν Περγάμῳ τοῖς δὲ Βιθυνοῖς ἐν Νικομηδείᾳ, τεμενίσαι ἐπέτρεψε. Also Tacitus, *Annals* 4.37.

[547] Mellor (1975) 26.

The turning point was Hadrian's desire to re-invest in the neglected cult. He expressed this desire in the most visible and impressive way: the construction of the Temple of Venus and Roma in Rome. Hadrian himself seems to have personally designed the temple, as Dio Cassius tells us[548]. The temple was consecrated in 121, on the April 21st of which Hadrian celebrated the Parilia under a new name, Rhomaia, that is, the Natalis Urbis Romae. Athenaeus, in *The Deipnosophistae*, remarks on the joyful and crowded celebrations of the Rhomaia for the Fortune of the city of Rome, to which the best and most accomplished-in-arts emperor Hadrian dedicated a temple[549]. Perhaps the temple was consecrated on the 21st of April too. However, construction did not begin until 125-6. As for the completion of the temple, there is disagreement among scholars and the date varies from 135-137[550], when it was dedicated, to early in Pius' reign[551].

Mary Boatwright has provided a detailed architectural description of the temple[552]. Here I will only focus on those elements that pertain to my discussion of Roma's cult in the empire. The temple was located at the far-east side of the Forum Romanum and clearly visible from it. It almost became a counterpoint to the temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline Hill at the other end of the Forum. Of all the buildings that Hadrian constructed in Rome, this was the most central one. The temple itself consisted of two main chambers, *cellae*, each housing a cult statue. The *cellae* were arranged symmetrically back-to-back. In the west *cella*, Roma Aeterna's statue was

[548] Dio Cassius 69.4.1ff.
[549] *Deipnosophistae* 8.63: τοιούτων οὖν ἔτι πολλῶν λεγομένων τότε ἐξάκουστος ἐγένετο κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν πόλιν αὐλῶν τε βόμβος καὶ κυμβάλων ἦχος ἔτι τε τυμπάνων κτύπος μετὰ ᾠδῆς ἅμα γινόμενος. ἔτυχεν δὲ οὖσα ἑορτὴ τὰ Παρίλια μὲν πάλαι καλουμένη, νῦν δὲ Ῥωμαῖα, τῇ τῆς πόλεως Τύχῃ ναοῦ καθιδρυμένου ὑπὸ τοῦ πάντα ἀρίστου καὶ μουσικωτάτου βασιλέως Ἀδριανοῦ· ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπίσημον ἄγουσι πάντες οἱ τὴν Ῥώμην κατοικοῦντες καὶ οἱ ἐνεπιδημοῦντες τῇ πόλει.
[550] So, Mols (2003) 462.
[551] As Boatwright (1987) 123 suggests.
[552] Boatwright (1987) 119-133.

looking out over the Forum, while in the east one, Venus Felix was looking out over the Colosseum.

As far as the cult statues are concerned, the Hadrianic coins that depict the statues make clear that they must have looked similar. Venus Felix sits in a throne, wearing a long robe and a diadem; in her outstretched right hand she holds a winged Amor, and in her raised left hand a vertical reversed spear[553]. Roma Aeterna sits on a curule chair, wears a long robe and a helmet. In her right hand she holds a winged Victoria or the Palladium, and in her left hand a vertical spear, but not reversed[554].

Hadrian's dedication of the temple to Venus Felix can hardly be a surprise. Hadrian's choice shows his pietas towards the *genetrix* of the ever-popular Julio-Claudian dynasty, especially Augustus[555]. This provided an important way to legitimize power in spatial terms by associating his reign with the Julio-Claudians - something Hadrian had partly taken care of by finishing Trajan's forum and dedicating it to his adoptive father[556]. The epithet Felix indicates that this Venus was especially a goddess of fecundity and prosperity.

The other dedicatee of the temple is what gives most value to it. The epithet Aeterna refers to a hopeful future, an everlasting *imperium*. As Stephan Mols correctly argued, the goddess' iconography, depicting her sitting on a *cella curulis* or on a throne, is clearly divergent from the goddess Roma as she was put forward by the Julio-Claudians, amongst others on the Ara Pacis, where she is shown sitting on a pile of weapons. She similarly differs from the Flavian Roma as depicted on, amongst

---

[553] See for example *BMCRE* III.334,751.
[554] See *BMCRE* III.329, 703 (Victory); 708 (Palladium).
[555] See in this context, the association of Venus Genetrix with the imperial family on Hadrianic coinage from Rome and the provinces: thus, Venus Genetrix appears on the reverses of an aureus and a silver denarius from Rome with Hadrian's and Sabina busts on the obverse respectively (*BMCRE* III.307, 529, and 360, 944), and on the reverse of a coin from Asia Minor, the obverse of which depicts Hadrian's bust (*BMCRE* III.379, 12).
[556] Mols (2003) 461.

others, the Cancelleria reliefs, helmeted and holding a shield with the *gorgonion*, therefore borrowing attributes from Athena, as it was often the case in the East[557].

As we saw, before Hadrian, no Roman emperor had been interested in establishing a cult for the goddess in the capital. Hadrian's initiative held a symbolism not only with regard to the cult of the goddess but also the city of Rome and the entire empire. As Jean Beaujeu stated in *La religion Romaine*: "l'installation du culte de Rome dans la Capitale de l'Empire, avec son contexte de l'Age d'or, est la plus grande entreprise religieuse du règne d'Hadrian, la plus importante sans doute depuis la mort du fondateur du régime imperial."[558] In what concerns the city of Rome, the introduction of her cult is certainly a remarkable initiative, but not an isolated manifestation of the emperor's reverence for and interest in the goddess.

We can see traces of the emperor's interest in the art of the period. Accordingly, in a relief now in the Palazzo dei Conservatori, Hadrian emphasized the role of the goddess in the line of succession and in the administration of the empire. A helmeted Roma stretches her hand forward to greet Hadrian and hand him the globe. These two figures dominate the foreground with the Genius populi Romani and the Genius Senatus standing just behind[559]. The scene on the relief is very similar, in the expressed idea, to Hadrianic *Adventus* issues which show the *dextrarum junctio* between Roma and the emperor[560], and also to issues from Rome of 134-138, where Roma is shown standing between Hadrian and the Genius Senatus[561]. The goddess draws the right hand of Hadrian towards that of the Genius.

---

[557] Mols (2003) 462.
[558] Beaujeu (1955) 160.
[559] Mellor (1981) 1014.
[560] e.g *BMCRE* III.316, 586 from Rome, dated to 134-138.
[561] *BMCRE* III.303, 506.

Hadrian's association with the goddess does not fade outside of Rome. The atelier of the Macedonian city Edessa reopened in 131/132. Actually, the city had not issued coins since the reign of Tiberius. Now, under Hadrian, the city issued a single series[562]. On the obverse we see the laureate bust of the emperor. The iconography of the reverse inaugurates a scene that would last until the closing of the atelier by Philip the Arab[563]. The goddess Roma, portrayed with the characteristics of Athena, is shown sitting on arms. Behind her, a woman, which is Edessa, crowns the goddess. It is noteworthy that the city in its single issue in almost hundred years honors not only the Philhellenic emperor, but also the personification of the Roman *imperium*, Roma. We know that the goddess was worshipped in Macedonia[564], but so far there is no evidence of her cult in the city. Therefore, this issue has special value for the image of the goddess in the region.

Hadrian is associated with Roma again on the coinage of the Bithynian Koinon. On the reverse of this bronze series, a large temple dominates the scene. Inside the temple, Hadrian, holding a scepter, is crowned by Roma who holds a palm[565]. Behind him, the personification of the province, Bithynia holds a scepter. The legend reads Κοινὸν Βειθυνίας[566]. The scene in all probability alludes to the addition of Hadrian's cult to the provincial temple of Roma and Augustus in Nicomedeia.

As I said above Roma entered the capital for the first time now, and her cult was served there by a new college of *duodecimviri* and in the provinces by *sacerdotes*. It is also interesting that after the Republic whenever Roma was included

[562] Papaefthymiou (2001) 72ff.
[563] Papaefthymiou (2001) 72ff.
[564] See the evidence gathered by Mellor (1975) 211.
[565] *BMC* XIII Bithynia 108,32.
[566] For a variation of the reverse see *SNG Denmark* 18.323.

in a provincial cult it was always in the company of the living emperor. Moreover, as Mary Boatwright states, the coupling of Venus and Roma was very rare until Hadrian[567]. What lies, then, behind this new promotion of the cult of Roma by Hadrian?

According to Mary Boatwright the temple documented that for Hadrian Rome was materially and ideally the center of the Roman world and substantiated Hadrian's claims to be a new founder of the city, another Romulus Conditor. The temple and its cult were more national than dynastic, breaking precedent with earlier imperial temples in and around the Forum by exalting the strength and origins of Rome and the Roman people above those of an individual family. As a result it would unite all Romans in a new state cult that reflected their glory and their origins. Yet, this national temple, she argues, epitomizes the Roman empire of Hadrian's day, since the temple, which was the largest in Rome, was strongly Greek in its general appearance[568].

Following along the same lines, Stephan Mols argues that the cult aimed first and foremost at the population of Rome. As an argument he brings forth the location of the cult statue of the goddess. As it is known, the statue was placed in the western *cella*, that is, on the Forum Romanum side of the temple, and thus at the side of the city center. Had Roma been intended as an empire-wide goddess from the very beginning, he argues, a position at the country- or east-side would have been far more appropriate[569]. The argument seems week and not supported by any comparative evidence. The author further claims that the Greek language of the new cult statue of

[567] Boatwright (1987) 128.
[568] Boatwright (1987) 132ff.
[569] Mols (2003) 463.

Roma helped to create a counterpart to the Athena Parthenos[570]. The argument is totally unfounded. Images of the goddess with the attributes of Athena are widespread throughout the empire (even during the Republic), while his theory of a "counterpart" implies that Athena Parthenos' cult was advanced by Hadrian. However, there is no such evidence either literary or other, and Hadrian's promotion of Athens and his statue on the Acropolis cannot be interpreted as sponsorship of Athena. If there was a deity whom Hadrian favored in particular and was identified with, it was Zeus, to whom I will return later.

It is true that the temple and the cult, established in the center of the life of the capital, appealed first of all to the people of Rome. However, scholars have failed to see beyond this and acknowledge three facts: first, that Hadrian by renewing the cult of the Goddess in the West picked up from where the first emperor stopped almost a hundred years ago. We know that Augustus was the one who transferred the joint cult of Roma and Augustus from the Greek East to the provinces of the Latin West. Hadrian, now, continues Augustus's work and finally brings Roma, the cult of which started in the Greek East, within the *pomerium*, thus connecting East, West and Rome. Moreover, the fact that the statue depicted a goddess with the attributes of Athena in the *cella* of a temple with strong Greek elements testifies to the blending of Roman and Greek traditions in the heart of Rome. It is clear that the designer of the temple, Hadrian, had a broader image of the empire in his plans.

Second, it is revealing of Hadrian's thoughts that Roma was introduced not in the joint-cult of Augusti nor was she added to the temple of Augustus at Rome. The goddess was introduced as an independent entity, and this increases her importance as a Roman deity, which was one of Hadrian's objectives. The goddess coexists in the

[570] Mols (2003) 464.

temple with Venus, but this serves more as an emphasis of the association of the emperor with Venus Genetrix and as a consequence with the mythical, Trojan origins of the city. More importantly though the emperor displayed his association with the Julio-Claudians whose *genetrix* Venus was, and especially with Augustus, rather than with the Roman people. We know that Hadrian wished to model himself on the first princeps, and he certainly would not miss the opportunity to show his intent to do so in this case. The emphasized role, then, of Roma, and the inclusion of the Augustan line in the monument gave legitimacy to his rule in a much recognizable way.

Finally, the rebirth of Roma's cult is a confirmation of Hadrian's passion for restoration and revitalization as it has been seen, for example, in the completion of the Olympieion and the restoration of the temple of Augustus at Tarraco in 121. The emperor renewed a cult forsaken by his predecessors and he even gave the goddess traditional Greek attributes in the midst of Rome. The extent to which her cult survived in the empire after Hadrian's reign is not yet known. However, her cult was still attested both in the West and the Greek East well into the third century[571]. Roma Aeterna remained a symbol of the longevity of the empire well into Christian times, even though she was not considered a Dea anymore[572]. Perhaps it is not a coincidence that even in modern times people refer to Rome as the Eternal City.

However, it is a mistake to argue that the revival of her cult addressed only the people of Rome as scholars argued above. Under Hadrian, Roma through her cult in the East, her connection with Augustus, and her continuing cult in the empire, has to be perceived as a goddess for the empire as a whole[573]. A cult that would exclude a significant part of the empire (the Greeks among others) from participating in it was

[571] The survival of her cult in the Greek East is a topic worth exploring. The absence of such discussion in Mellor's *Thea Roma* is a major fault in it.
[572] Mellor (1981) 1024ff.
[573] Contra Mols (2003) 463.

not in agreement with Hadrian's empire-wide plans. His vision for the empire was a broader one and included all its elements, above all Roman and Greek. The revival of her cult served as a medium to strengthen the ties between the two parts of the empire, East and West, and to bring closer its distinct cultures. Thus Roma Aeterna served as a link between Romans and Greeks and showed Hadrian's interest in the equal development of both parts.

Roma was not the only deity that served as a means to promote Hadrian's program. As we will see, Hadrian's devotion to Zeus in the East revealed clearly his desire to set his Greeks on an equal partnership with his Roman subjects.

5.5.2 Hadrian Zeus, son of Trajan Jupiter

Beyond any doubt, the deity with which Hadrian wished to associate himself (and was associated by the Greeks) the most was Zeus, the father of gods. Although modern scholarship lacks a monograph on Hadrian's image as Zeus, some information can be retrieved from the scanty literary sources, the recent biography of the emperor by Anthony Birley (1997), while Anna Benjamin's collection of epigraphic data (1963) remains valuable even though it has to be supplemented with new material.

Hadrian was identified with Zeus throughout the Greek East as can be seen in Benjamin's collection of inscriptions. As we saw before, the epithets that accompanied him in his identification with Zeus prove the broadness of imagination and willingness of the Greeks to see him as a manifestation of the great god in their dedications and public records: he was Zeus Epikarpios at Corycos; Panhellenios at Athens, Ephesos and elsewhere; Olympios throughout the East, in Greek cities and Roman colonies alike; Epiphanes at Ephesos; Dodonaios at Nikopolis; Kynegesios at

Stratonikeia- Hadrianopolis; he was even the son of Trajan Zeus Eleutherios at Athens. As such, Hadrian was often honored jointly with his wife Sabina (in the guise of new Hera) as for example at Philippi and Thasos[574].

Popular imagination is also seen in episodes narrated by our literary sources. The *Historia Augusta* relates how the emperor once killed a lion with his own hands[575]. It was in Egypt that the emperor met Pancrates, who composed a poem (mentioned by Athenaeus and fragmentarily preserved on a papyrus) to celebrate the successful hunt in the Libyan desert[576]. A fragment of the poem describes Antinoos awaiting the lion with spear in his hand. But it was Hadrian who struck first, but deliberately only wounded the animal for he wished to test the skill of Antinoos, son of Hermes[577]. The stricken animal grew fiercer and in rage tore at the ground with his paws….. His eyes were flashing dreadful fire, his ravening jaws were foaming, and his teeth were gnashing[578]….. In such guise the beast charged against the glorious god (Hadrian) and Antinoos, like Typhoeus of old against Zeus the slayer of giants,

ὣς ὅ γ' ἔβη] κατέναντα θ[εοῦ] κλυτοῦ Ἀντι[νόου τε,
οἷα γιγαντ[ο]λ[έταο] Διὸς πά[ρο]ς ἄντα Τυφωεύ[ς. (24-25)

---

[574] Philippi: *AnnEp* 1984.818: *Imp(eratori)/Hadriano/Olympio/et Iunoni Con/iugali Sabina[e]*; Thasos: *IG* XII, Suppl. 440: Αὐτοκράτορι/Καίσαρι/Ἁδριανῷ Σεβαστῷ/Ὀλυμπίῳ/σωτῆρι καὶ κτιστῇ/καὶ Σαβείνῃ/Σεβαστῇ/νέᾳ Ἥρᾳ.
For Sabina's assimilation with Hera in the epigraphical record see dedications from Metropolis (*IEph* 4111), Patara (*TAM* II 412), and Tlos (*TAM* II 560).

[575] *HA Hadrian* 26.3: *venatus frequentissime leonem manu sua occidit*.

[576] See above note 529.

[577] Fragment 2, col. 2, ll. 3-9:
τοῖ]ον ἐφεζόμενος δαμασήν[ο]ρα μίμνε λέοντα
Ἀ]ντίνοος λαιῇι μὲν ἔχων ῥυτῆρα χαλινόν,
δεξιτερῆι δ' ἔγχος κεκορυθμένο[ν] ἐξ ἀδάμαντος.
πρῶτος δ' Ἀδριανὸς προιεὶς χαλκήρεον ἔγχος
οὔτασεν, οὐδὲ δάμασσεν, ἐκὼν γὰρ ἀπήμβροτε θ[ηρός·
ε]ὐστοχίης γὰρ πάμπαν ἐβούλετο πειρηθῆναι
Ἀ]ργειφοντιάδαο μεγηράτ[ου Ἀντι]νόοιο.

[578] Fragment 2, col 2, l. 10ff.

The remaining damaged lines tell how the lion mauled Antinoos' horse and was then struck evidently by Hadrian[579]. Hadrian is the skilled hunter that can subdue beasts and tame wild forces. Moreover, he is the Zeus who crushes the ravaging force of Typhoeus, a god who defeats disorder and chaos and secures order and prosperity for his people. The emperor was so pleased with Pancrates' verse that he granted him double allowance at the Museum of Alexandria.

It was only natural that his subjects would look up to him as Zeus given the gifts and privileges he granted to cities all over the Greek East. It was his building program at Athens that proves this the most and manifests in an impressive way his piety towards the god and of course Hadrian's concern with his public image and posterity. His program at Athens has been extensively dealt with by previous scholars, to whom I refer for detailed discussion of the monuments[580]. The monument which contributed the most to the creation of Hadrian's image as Zeus was the sanctuary of Zeus Olympios at Athens.

The massive temple stood incomplete for almost six hundred years since Peisistratos began construction at the site. Now Hadrian set the Olympieion at the heart of his program for the embellishment of Athens. The temple was dedicated in 128 and the completion came almost four years later in 131/132. Polemon, the sophist, was selected to deliver the inauguration speech[581]. Hadrian dedicated a colossal chryselephantine statue of Zeus in the sekos of the Olympieion[582]; four

[579] Fragment 2, col 2, l. 26ff.
[580] Willers (1990), Boatwright (2000).
[581] Polemon: Philostratus, *Lives of the Sophists* 533: τὸ δὲ Ἀθήνησιν Ὀλύμπιον δι' ἐξήκοντα καὶ πεντακοσίων ἐτῶν ἀποτελεσθὲν καθιερώσας ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ, ὡς χρόνου μέγα ἀγώνισμα, ἐκέλευσε καὶ τὸν Πολέμωνα ἐφυμνῆσαι τῇ θυσίᾳ. ὁ δέ, ὥσπερ εἰώθει, στήσας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπὶ τὰς ἤδη παρισταμένας ἐννοίας ἐπαφῆκεν ἑαυτὸν τῷ λόγῳ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς κρηπῖδος τοῦ νεὼ διελέχθη πολλὰ καὶ θαυμάσια.
[582] As the statue of Zeus in Olympieion was chryselephantine, it recalled the cult statue of Zeus at Olympia, and that of Athena in the Parthenon, both made by Pheidias.

larger-than-life-size statues of Hadrian himself stood before its entrance (two of Thasian marble, two of porphyry). Throughout the temenos stood numerous bronze statues which the Athenians named colonies and many statues of Hadrian Olympios, most of which were dedicated by the Panhellenion cities. The statue bases of Hadrian Olympios from all over the Greek world suggest the Panhellenic character of the Olympieion. Hadrian also received a colossus from the Athenians in the sanctuary, but this, while it may well have been used for worship, stood behind the temple[583]. Although the Olympieion served primarily for the worship of Zeus, it is possible that it was also associated with Hadrian and the imperial cult, even though the emperor was not worshipped there as σύνναος of Zeus Olympios.

In addition to the Olympieion, Hadrian launched the construction of two other buildings, one a temple of Hera and Zeus Panhellenios and a second one for all the gods, a Pantheon[584]. All three buildings have been connected with the Panhellenic council founded by Hadrian at 131/132. Accordingly, Antony Birley suggests that the Olympieion "could well have been served as the meeting-place of the Panhellenion"[585]; Spawforth and Walker suggest that the Pantheon was not really a temple but the meeting place of the council[586]; and Mary Boatwright alludes to a possible connection of the Panhellenion with the temple of Hera and Zeus

---

[583] Pausanias 1.18.6: Ἀδριανὸς ὁ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς τόν τε ναὸν ἀνέθηκε καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα θέας ἄξιον, οὗ μεγέθει μέν, ὅτι μὴ Ῥοδίοις καὶ Ῥωμαίοις εἰσὶν οἱ κολοσσοί, τὰ λοιπὰ ἀγάλματα ὁμοίως ἀπολείπεται, πεποίηται δὲ ἔκ τε ἐλέφαντος καὶ χρυσοῦ καὶ ἔχει τέχνης εὖ πρὸς τὸ μέγεθος ὁρῶσιν—, ἐνταῦθα εἰκόνες Ἀδριανοῦ δύο μέν εἰσι Θασίου λίθου, δύο δὲ Αἰγυπτίου· χαλκαῖ δὲ ἑστᾶσι πρὸ τῶν κιόνων ἃς Ἀθηναῖοι καλοῦσιν ἀποίκους πόλεις. ὁ μὲν δὴ πᾶς περίβολος σταδίων μάλιστα τεσσάρων ἐστίν, ἀνδριάντων δὲ πλήρης· ἀπὸ γὰρ πόλεως ἑκάστης εἰκὼν Ἀδριανοῦ βασιλέως ἀνάκειται, καὶ σφᾶς ὑπερεβάλοντο Ἀθηναῖοι τὸν κολοσσὸν ἀναθέντες ὄπισθε τοῦ ναοῦ θέας ἄξιον.
Pausanias also mentions a statue of Hadrian standing next to that of his adoptive father in the pronaos of the temple of Zeus at Olympia (5.12.6). In this context fits the erection of Hadrian's statue in the Parthenon beside the cult statue of Athena Parthenos, mentioned by the same author (1.24.7). It should be emphasized that Hadrian's was the only statue of a Roman emperor there.
[584] Pausanias 1.18.9: Ἀδριανὸς δὲ κατεσκευάσατο μὲν καὶ ἄλλα Ἀθηναίοις, ναὸν Ἥρας καὶ Διὸς Πανελληνίου καὶ θεοῖς τοῖς πᾶσιν ἱερὸν κοινόν. Cf. Dio Cassius 69.16.2
[585] Birley (1997) 266.
[586] Spawforth and Walker (1985) 97ff.

Panhellenios ("The temple, perhaps designated the Panhellenion, was special to the Panhellenian League"). She also argues that the same temple included a shrine, or, at least a statue, of Hadrian Panhellenios[587].

In any case, after 128 Hadrian included the epithet Olympios in his nomenclature. Indeed, from 128 onwards the commonest epithet of Hadrian was Olympios or the variation Hadrianos Zeus Olympios. In Sparta there was a civic cult of Zeus Olympios in Hadrian's honor, and in Athens the emperor founded the Olympia games in honor of Zeus Olympios. In adopting the epithet Olympios, Hadrian was in fact emphasizing his Panhellenic program, for Zeus Olympios, chief deity of the Greeks, is the Panhellenic god. Hadrian becomes the new Zeus. The emperor is the reincarnation of that Zeus of the old myths and becomes the head of Olympos. At the same time by receiving the epithet Panhellenios he becomes the power that presides over the commonwealth of the Greek cities, he is the Zeus of all the Greeks.

The emperor was an expert in promoting himself by appearing as the inheritor of the legacy of antiquity. Therefore, he did not limit his efforts to Athens. Hadrian benefited from his close association with other long-established religious centers such as Delphi, where he was offered the titles Pythios and neos Pythios by the Achaean League in 126, or Ephesos where his gifts to the city and in particular the sanctuary of Artemis gave him a status equal to that of Zeus. In a decree of 129, during Hadrian's visit there, the council and the people of Ephesos honored the emperor for a number of favors[588]: provision for the corn supply (ll. 12-13), making the harbors navigable (ll.13-14) and diverting the Caystros river (ll. 14-16). Most of all, though, they

[587] Boatwright (2000) 170.
[588] *IEph* 274.

expressed their gratitude for his unsurpassable gifts to the sanctuary by granting it the right of receiving legacies: διδόντα τῇ θεῷ τῶν κληρο/νομιῶν καὶ βεβληκότων τὰ δίκαια/καὶ τοὺς νόμους αὐτῆς (ll. 10-12). The emperor continued bestowing gifts to the city and in 131/132 allowed the city to build a temple for his cult, thus making it twice neokoros. It was a move without precedent as Hadrian, by allowing the city to have the second neokorate, became the first emperor to grant three neokorates in the same Koinon, of Asia. The other two were to Smyrna, around 124, and to Cyzicus, in 123/124[589].

Such benefactions could not pass unnoticed and additional honors were given to Hadrian on the coinage of the city. A cistophoric issue of 129 reflects this spirit of gratitude. Hadrian is shown on the reverse with the legend "Hadrianus Augustus co(n)s(ul) III p(ater) p(atriae)." The legend of the reverse seems to be a continuation of these titles, "*Iovis Olympius Ephesi*". The god is shown sitting on a throne, holding scepter in his left hand, while in his outstretched right hand he holds a small cult image of the Ephesian Artemis[590]. The worship of Zeus Olympios was not new to Ephesos and by the time of Pausanias his temple was well known[591]. William Metcalf was the first to advance the theory that the image and legend on the reverse talk about Hadrian himself[592]. The date of the issue seems to coincide with the visit of the emperor and the gifts mentioned in the decree. The portrayal of the god holding the cult statue of the Ephesian Artemis epitomizes the relationship between the emperor and the city: the emperor shows his pietas towards the goddess and contributes to the welfare of the sanctuary and by consequence of the city. He is the lord and protector of the city. Identification of the emperor and the god is surely intended.

[589] For the institution of neocoria see Burrell (2004).
[590] Metcalf (1980) 17.14;15.
[591] Pausanias 7.2.9.
[592] Metcalf (1974).

Hadrian's devotion to Zeus and to his image as Zeus in the region was not simply the expression of the belief that the emperor was Zeus' earthly counterpart appointed by him and endowed with his providence and virtues. I would like to suggest that role to his widespread assimilation with Zeus played Trajan's assimilation with Jupiter in the West. The Latin West already had its own Jupiter, Trajan, and it is not certain that Hadrian's efforts would come to a happy end there given the Senate's preference for his father and enmity towards him. Hadrian desired to shine upon his Greek subjects as a new earthly Zeus, even better than his adoptive father. Eventually, it was his assimilation with Zeus that contributed the most in the sphere of religion to the promotion of his vision among the easterners. Therefore, we should briefly take a look at Trajan as Jupiter here.

Dio Cassius informs us that when Trajan had captured the land of the Armenians and brought their kings to his own terms, the Senate voted to him all the usual honors and also bestowed upon him the title *Optimus*[593]. This statement obviously reflects Trajan's official acceptance of the honor in 114, after the Senate once again had implored him to accept the title. The appellation *Optimus* was normally restricted to Jupiter, Optimus Maximus, whose temple dominated the Capitoline Hill. Pliny, probably reflecting public sentiment, had attached the epithet to Trajan as early as February 98 (*Letters* 10.1.2; *Panegyricus* 2.7; 88.4). By his assimilation with Jupiter the emperor was transformed from a mere mortal into a leader destined by providence (see above discussion on Trajan *deus electus*). Once the epithet was given wider currency, it was natural that it should quickly appear in the West (and its Greek equivalent, *aristos*, in the East) on unofficial inscriptions

[593] Dio Cassius 68.18.3-23.1: ἐπεὶ δὲ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἀρμενίων χώραν εἶλε, καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν βασιλέων τοὺς μὲν ὑποπεσόντας ἐν τοῖς φίλοις ἦγε, τοὺς δέ τινας καὶ ἀπειθοῦντας ἀμαχεὶ ἐχειροῦτο, τά τε ἄλλα ἐψηφίζετο αὐτῷ πολλὰ ἡ βουλή, καὶ ὄπτιμον, εἴτ' οὖν ἄριστον, ἐπωνόμασεν.

becoming fairly common in this medium from 101 onwards. Trajan allowed the coinage to carry the title *Optimus*, in late 103 or early 104, even if he was careful not to incorporate it in his formal titulature. Its appearance on the coinage testifies to something more. The series is characterized by the appearance on the obverse of the imperial name in the dative case: *Imp(eratori) Traiano Aug(usto) Ger(manico) Dac(cico) P(ontifici) M(aximo) Tr(ibunicia) P(otestate) Co(n)s(ul) V P(atri) P(atriae),* and the dedicatory formula *SPQR Optimo Principi* on the reverse[594]. The combination of formula and dedicatory dative suggests the passage of a resolution expressing a spirit of homage and devotion of Rome to the princeps, whose virtues (most probably in the first Dacian War) made him rank only just after the supreme deity.

In the East, Trajan was identified with Zeus Eleutherios at Athens[595] and with Zeus Embaterios at Hermione in Peloponnesos[596], but in both cases only after his death[597]. During his life, Trajan was worshipped with Zeus only at Pergamos. Trajan allowed the city a second neokorate making it the first city to have two imperial temples. This second temple was dedicated to Zeus Philios and Trajan, and is sometimes called the Traianeum[598]. Games were founded, commonly called simply the Traianeia, but also known as the Traianeia Diphileia.

The coinage of Pergamos is a witness to the cult. Two different types have been identified: the first depicts the bust of Trajan on the obverse and that of Zeus on the reverse, with the legends Αὐτ(οκράτωρ) Τραϊανὸς Σεβαστός, and Ζεύς Φίλιος

[594] E.g. *BMCRE* III.54, 156.
[595] See above note 470.
[596] *IG* IV 701.
[597] See also Price (1984) 273, 153 for coins of Selinus in Cilicia from three different reigns in the second and third century that show Trajan within his temple enthroned as Zeus holding thunderbolt and scepter.
[598] See Price (1984) 252, 20 with earlier bibliography.

respectively[599]; the other type reveals the interior of the temple. On the obverse there is a tetrastyle temple within which Zeus Philios, holding *patera* and scepter, is enthroned. Trajan in military dress, is shown approaching him to do homage. The legend reads Φίλιος Ζεύς Αὐτ(οκράτωρ) Τραϊανός. Roma and Augustus inside their local temple appear on the reverse. The legend reads θεᾷ Ῥώμῃ καὶ θεῷ Σεβαστῷ[600].

However, there is a conflict between these coins which depict Zeus and Trajan and the preserved statues which represent Trajan and Hadrian (Zeus' statue has not been found yet). Barbara Burrell rejects the idea that Zeus was ousted by Hadrian and suggests that according to an unpublished inscription (dated to 135-138) Hadrian allowed the Pergamenes to set up a portrait of his in the temple[601]. The emperor, she explains, did not permit the city to build a temple for him (wishing to restrain spending at Pergamos, where they were still working on the porticoes around Trajan's temple), and instead he modified the request by allowing the city to put his portrait in the temple. However, the Pergamenes set up a statue modeled after Trajan's cult image, and presumably Hadrian's statue received similar respects[602].

I believe that Burrell is right and indeed it seems that the erection of his statue there, at the end of his reign, took place with the intention of him being worshipped. Both statues, of Trajan and Hadrian, were of colossal size and were found in the *sekos* of the temple. I also want to add that given Hadrian's character it is very unlikely that the emperor would decline divine honors in the city altogether and especially in the company of his adoptive father and Zeus, the god he revered the most in the East.

---

[599] *Weber Coll. III.*1.5212-5213.
[600] *Weber Coll. III.*1.5214.
[601] Burrell (2004) 26-27. Also Price (1984) 252, 20. cf. Birley (1997) 166, who enthusiastically claims that "the great sanctuary was to be turned into a shrine for Trajan and Hadrian together……There was no room left for Zeus Philios".
[602] Burrell interprets "eikon" as a portrait of Hadrian. However, it should be noted here that the term "eikon" was used for both "portrait" and "statue" in Greek inscriptions. I am not aware which of the two meanings is implied here, as the inscription remains unpublished. Until then we should cautiously accept Burrell's translation of the word.

Hadrian had shown elsewhere his desire to associate himself with both figures, especially in a religious context. It was at Olympia that a statue of Hadrian was set up in the *pronaos* of the temple of Zeus next to that of Trajan by the Achaean League (Pausanias 5.12.6). Of course, the context is not that of imperial cult, but, still, it shows one of the characteristics of Hadrian: appropriation of local cults as means of establishing himself and connecting with the local populations. The same can be also argued about Hadrian's statue next to the cult statue of Athena Parthenos in the Parthenon, an honor offered to no other Roman emperor (Pausanias 1.24.7). Is there really any doubt that the ancient visitor to the temple at Pergamos, once he saw the colossal statue of Hadrian in the *sekos*, would infer that the emperor had a share now in the worship offered there? Moreover, in what concerns Trajan and Hadrian, we must underline the fact that Trajan was honored as Zeus after his death while Hadrian already during his life. In the only instance where Trajan was worshipped along with (and not as) Zeus at Pergamos Hadrian "intruded" and his cult statue entered the temple. Thus Hadrian in a sense diminished Trajan's importance in the temple and shifted the focus of the Pergamenes on himself.

Hadrian had been by far the most influential imperial figure in the Greek East. His frequent journeys to the region secured an unprecedented relationship with the local populations. His philhellenism preceded his arrival to a city, which was viewed as an epiphany. Hadrian was hailed as Zeus more than any of his predecessors and his gifts were manifestations of his providence and honest interest in the welfare of the region. The locals helped him re-invent himself in the form of Zeus. His grants to small and large sanctuaries alike made him the head of the gods, the leader of the Pantheon. As such, Hadrian is constantly honored in the monuments of the period.

The number of monuments, statues and temples, dedications and inscriptions that are associated with him, dull the memory not only of his predecessor but also of the emperors of the first century among the Greeks. Hadrian *neos* Zeus became the counterpart of Trajan Jupiter. This identification underlined the importance that Greek religion had for Hadrian and shifted the interest from the Roman Trajan Jupiter to the Greek Hadrian Zeus. By promoting the cult of Zeus, Hadrian gave a new emphasis on traditional Greek religion and refreshed the collective memory of Hellenism. He created a center, a religious one, around which the Greek populations unified. Jupiter was a deity that could not appeal to Greek sentiments, but rather remained a symbol of the Roman people and his role could only relate to them. By assimilating with Zeus and focusing on his cult the emperor once again rejected his predecessor's policy of annexing-and-Romanizing and instead promoted the idea of coexistence of Greek and Roman traditions for the welfare of the Roman empire. In the words of Jean Beaujeu, Hadrian practiced a "philhellénisme à dominante jovienne et meme olympienne."[603]

I suggest that it is in this context of unification that Hadrian promoted equally the cults of Zeus in the East and Roma in the West. By building her temple at Rome and encouraging her cult, Hadrian filled a gap in the Roman Pantheon and corrected the injustice made by his predecessors after Augustus. Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline Hill was Rome's most exalted god, but he was hardly distinctive enough to be the imperial god of Rome's new empire. Roma's cult, although still popular and widespread in the East, could not satisfy the need of the Greeks for religious leadership by a more familiar, local divine figure. So, in a sense, Hadrian's promotion of Zeus responded to this need. Hadrian displayed pietas and devotion to Roman and Greek deities and traditions alike. At the same time, the religious policy

[603] Beaujeu (1955) 276.

of the emperor revealed his wish to create two cultural centers, one in the West around Rome, and the other in the Greek mainland and Asia Minor. Both centers would be allowed, based on their own traditions and under the leadership of the princeps, to produce culture which would be equally acceptable by each other.

The two cults did not divide, but, on the contrary, helped bring the two main elements of the empire closer. The deities themselves were able to unite. In fact, the divinity most often joined with Roma in the East, as it is attested in inscriptions, was Zeus in his various manifestations: Zeus Eleutherios, Zeus Kapetolios, Zeus Ktesios, Zeus Patroos, Zeus Polieus, and Zeus Solymeus. And when the emperors joined the cult of Roma, they often took over the characteristics of Zeus. Thus, a Roman emperor borrowing from Zeus his qualities became the guardian of Panhellenic traditions. Zeus Olympios and Roma Aeterna guaranteed the divine guidance and prosperity of the empire and they can serve as an example of unification through the blending of cultural diversities.

5.6 Summary

In this chapter I discussed certain religious aspects of Hadrian's reign. First I discussed Hadrian's claim to divine election. Hadrian advertised himself as the son of Trajan appointed by him but selected by the gods. Jupiter himself had the providence to select Trajan's successor and the emperor implemented his will. By doing this, Hadrian followed established practice and presented his reign as commanded by humans and gods alike.

Next, I put under investigation the use of epithets that were attributed to him by the Greeks in honorific and other inscriptions. I discussed how these epithets identified the emperor with major divinities of the Greek pantheon. By doing so, the

Greeks conversed with the emperor in a religious language, which was already part of their tradition, mythical and historical. Hellenistic kings and Roman emperors as well as officials and other individuals were constantly addressed in this style. This helped the Greeks introduce these individuals into their everyday life and understand the cultural changes and political necessities that their presence meant. By placing Hadrian in the sphere of Greek myth and religion, the people of the region extended a welcoming message to him. Hadrian, who could never resist such initiatives, expressed his thankfulness by the showering of gifts upon cities and individuals and the promotion of anything that was Greek. This procedure created an atmosphere which encouraged the implementation of his program both for the region and the empire as a whole.

At the same time rumors of his idiosyncrasies were circulating fast. The complex personality of the emperor as well as his interest in every kind of knowledge, as this is evidenced in our sources, created an almost mythical aura around him and raised him to the level of divine and superhuman. The emperor was certainly flattered by such rumors and did nothing to prove them wrong. On the contrary, during his journeys around the Mediterranean, he eagerly sought contact with the supernatural. This behavior did not seem to offend the Greek people. It was probably within the limits of behavior they could accept from a ruler.

It seems that the reaction in Rome was quite the opposite. Hadrian had already damaged his image by the killings that occurred early in his reign (and he would damage it further in the end by the murder of Servianus and his grandson Pedanius Fuscus). Hadrian had never been particularly popular among the senatorial groups, although he was in general well received by the populace of the capital. It is possible that the Philhellenism of the emperor would not ring well in the ears of the Senators,

given the precedent of Nero, whose memory was still fresh. Therefore, it is only natural that the conservative and to a certain degree xenophobic Senate would not welcome the news of an emperor hailed to such a degree as a god and even magician or astrologer. Perhaps, there was nothing that Hadrian could do about it, as in all certainty he encouraged and promoted such an image. It is improbable that the building of the temple of Roma and Venus, along with other benefactions to the city, could change the mood, as it is evident in the negative senatorial tradition preserved in Dio. Hadrian was displaying Roman attitudes to a lesser degree than his adoptive father, a much beloved figure at Rome, and in the eyes of many Romans he was less Roman than his position demanded. And in truth, he was not! He was a provincial from Hispania, as was Trajan, but the latter knew well to conceal his personal flaws by completely following Roman standards in performing his greatest role, that of the Roman emperor.

We may assume that the building of the temple of Roma and Venus at the heart of Rome revitalized, to a certain degree, the national feeling of the populace. By this gesture, Roma, the deification of the power of the city and thus the state, becomes one of the most important divinities of the city and the empire, a counterpart to Jupiter on the Capitoline Hill. The reinvention of Roma connected Hadrian's religious program with that of the first princeps and bridged her cult in the East with that in the West and Rome. At the same time, Hadrian's encouragement of and assimilation with the Greek Zeus had a similar impact on the psyche of the Greeks. Now the Greeks had again their own god, the head of the Greek Pantheon, to preside over their lives. Hadrian became a benevolent, omnipresent Zeus, who now came from the West to encourage the people of the East to participate in an empire which is more welcoming than ever before. The promotion of these cults clearly reveals the roles that Hadrian

had in his plans for the western and eastern parts of the empire. The two cults would now function as the focal points of two cultural centers, at Rome and on both coasts of the Aegean. The cult of Zeus would bring together the Greek people and encourage them to work collectively in bringing into completion Hadrian's vision for the region. At the same time, Roma would be his divine partner and serve as a constant reminder of the imperial center's interest in the region.

Whatever Hadrian's personal beliefs may have been, he adapted official policy to suit the various parts of the empire and consistently promoted the cult of the traditional gods of Rome, of Greece and of the imperial house. Religion could hardly be separated from administration in antiquity, and Hadrian knew this very well. He consciously used it in order to serve his desire for consolidation of traditions and cultures and to finally bring together the two main cultural partners of an empire which he hoped he could truly unite. Hadrian aspired to turn the cultural divisions of his subjects into a unifying force that would provide homogeneity and peace. And he was certainly justified given the relative stability of the empire under the Antonines. More than other emperors of the first two centuries, he seemed to have viewed religion as a means to bring together, to achieve unity. Therefore, it is not an exaggeration to say that Hadrian became the first emperor after Augustus to promote the princeps' role as the religious leader of the Roman Empire.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

In the 21 years of his reign, the emperor Hadrian visited *inermis* the Greek East more than any of his predecessors. During his lengthy stays on the Greek mainland and Asia Minor the emperor showed his sincere interest in everything Greek. The emperor was a sincere philhellene, but this was not the only motive for his benefactions to the region. More important was his desire to promote his program for the region that would ultimately affect the entire empire.

Hadrian realized that the survival of the empire could not depend entirely on Rome but also on the loyalty of the provinces. The Greek East was an important part of the empire, both in terms of geography and its dynamism. Hadrian understood that the Greek East could offer more to the empire than the greatness of its past. Asia Minor and the Greek mainland must now participate more actively in the affairs of the empire, contributing both by culture and politics. He advanced the idea of two imperial centers, one in the West, centered on Rome, and another in the East, centered on the big cities of the Greek mainland and Asia Minor. By bringing the region closer to Rome, Hadrian could accelerate their further integration into the Empire and bring to completion his plan for its unification. The present study focused on the various aspects of this program and the ways by which the emperor promoted it in the Greek East.

I first examined the historical context in which the emperor and the people of the region came into contact. Accordingly, I presented the political position of the Greeks in the Empire during the second century A.D. I argued that the Greek elites aimed at their participation in the administration of the region and the empire and at the same time they showed signs that they wished to minimize the degree of imperial interference in the affairs of the Greek cities. Hadrian's accession to the throne showed that the region and its people must not be valued only for their past and cultural traditions, but also, and more importantly, for the dynamism and energy that they could bring to the Empire. He envisaged a Greek world that could actively participate in the administration of the Empire and his program of unification. He showed signs that the Empire did not belong only to Romans, but to all subjects of Rome, prominent among them the Greeks. The most visible action by which he showed his interest was the foundation of the Panhellenion council. As I showed, the council functioned more as a cultural rather than a political organization, mainly associated with the imperial cult. It was this character of the council, as well as its focus on the cities of the Greek mainland, Athens in particular, that can explain the absence of major cities of Asia Minor from among its members.

In order to better understand Hadrian's program for the Greek East we had to talk about the people that this program addressed. Accordingly, in the next chapter of my study, I talked about these people and defined the circumstances in which they came into contact with the emperor. Thus, I first discussed Hadrian's travels in the region and using comparative material I showed how an imperial visit could affect a city or an entire region. I argued that the goal of his travels was to secure the empire, foster relations with the local populations, and promote his program. I argued that not only local elites and religious officials were among those interesting him, but also the

lowest classes of a city, rustic people, farmers and merchants. All of them were looking forward to an imperial visit in order to present their case and advance their interests, personal and communal alike. I further argued that Hadrian's program did not address only the elites but aimed at the broad population as well, although, as is expected, the emperor relied first on the elites' support for the implementation of his program.

In the last two chapters, I presented evidence for the promotion of Hadrian's program. I focused on numismatic material and religious themes. In the first part of chapter three I dealt with the organization of the mints in the second century. I discussed the administrative mechanisms of these mints and argued that a number of persons were involved in the production of coins: from the emperor and his family to Roman officials and governors to Greek local magistrates. All were able to influence the iconography of an issue. This discussion helped us understand better the circumstances under which a particular message was carved and why. The second part of this chapter examined these messages. By presenting a number of coins from the central mint and the provincial ones, I showed how coinage reveals Hadrian's goals: to associate himself and his reign with his predecessor and the Julio-Claudian dynasty, with myths and traditions of Rome and the Greek East alike; to present himself as the earthly image of Olympios Zeus, the god of all the Greeks; and to advertise the basic principles of his reign and his sincere interest in the welfare of the provinces individually and of the entire empire.

The last chapter treated the role of religious language and themes in the promotion of Hadrian's program in the Greek East. I demonstrated how the emperor and Greeks "conversed" in religious terms. I showed that these terms derived from local traditions, mythical and historical themes, and eased the contact between the

emperor and locals. I first examined Hadrian's claim to divine election. I argued that Hadrian legitimized his accession by invoking both earthly and divine commands. Next I discussed the use of religious language as reflected in the numerous epithets attached to Hadrian in a number of inscriptions. After this I examined certain aspects of Hadrian's personality that linked him to the superhuman and divine. I suggested that both the epithets used to address the emperor and his association with superhuman, almost divine powers were part of the religious language and themes that were familiar to the Greek populations in the East, and consequently facilitated the Greeks' approving of the emperor and his plans. Finally I discussed Hadrian's association with the goddess Roma and Zeus. I suggested that the emphasis on the cult of Roma during Hadrian's reign, mainly in the Latin West but also in the East, is indicative of Hadrian's desire to highlight the importance of her cult and Rome as unifiers of the empire. At the same time, Hadrian promoted the cult of Zeus in the Greek East and was assimilated with him. I showed that Hadrian's association with the Greek Zeus came as a response to Trajan's reception as Jupiter in the West, and also placed Hadrian at the heart of the Greek pantheon, something that eased his reception among the Greeks. Moreover, I suggested that this emphasis on the two cults reflects Hadrian's desire to underline first, the two main cultural components of the empire, Roman and Greek, and second, their crucial role in its stability. They both served as unifiers of the empire.

It became clear from this discussion that the promotion of Hadrian's program was a dynamic, evolving process which involved considerable input from imperial circles and the public alike. Initiatives did not come only from the emperor. On the contrary, the Greek people responded to Hadrian's interest and displayed their willingness to follow him. Without negating the genuineness of Hadrian's

philhellenism, I believe that he fervently pursued his relations with the Greeks on account of his desire to promote his program for the region and his overall vision for the unification of the empire. Perhaps, if we view this atmosphere between Hadrian and the Greeks as the result of both the philhellenism of the emperor and the pursuit of his imperial program, we can comprehend better the history of the Roman Empire in the second century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alcock (1993), Alcock S.E., *Graecia Capta: The landscapes of Roman Greece*, Cambridge 1993

Alcock (1997), Alcock S.E., Greece: a landscape of resistance? in D.J. Mattingly (ed.), *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism; Power, discourse, and discrepant experience in the Roman Empire*, JRA Suppl. 23, Portsmouth 1997, 103-115

Alexander (1938), Alexander P.J., Letters and Speeches of the Emperor Hadrian, *HSCPh* 49 (1938) 141-177

Anderson (1993), Anderson G., *The Second Sophistic: A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*, London 1993

Ando (1998), Anthony Birley, Hadrian: The Restless Emperor, London 1997, rev. by Ando C., *Phoenix* 52 (1998) 183-185

Ando (2000), Ando C., *Imperial ideology and provincial loyalty in the Roman Empire*, Berkeley 2000

Arafat (1996), Arafat K.W., *Pausanias' Greece. Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers*, Cambridge 1996

Beaujeu (1955), Beaujeu J., *La religion Romaine à l'apogée de l'empire. I: La politique religieuse des Antonins (96-192),* Paris 1955-

Bellinger (1956), Bellinger A.R., Greek Mints under the Roman Empire, in R.A.G. Carson and C.H.V. Sutherland (edd.), *Essays in Roman Coinage Presented to Harold Mattingly*, Oxford 1956, 137-148

Benjamin (1963), Benjamin A.S., The altars of Hadrian in Athens and Hadrian's Panhellenic Program, *Hesperia* 32 (1963) 57-86

Bennett (1997), Bennett J., *Trajan Optimus Princeps. A Life and Times*, Bloomington 1997

Birley (1997), Birley A.R., Hadrian. *The Restless Emperor*, London 1997

Birley (1997a), Birley A.R., Hadrian and Greek Senators, *ZPE* 116 (1997) 209-245

Birley (2003), Birley A.R., Hadrian's Travels, in L. de Blois et alii (edd.), *The Representation and Perception of Roman Imperial Power. Proceedings of the third workshop of the international network Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, c. 200 B.C. – A.D. 476)*, Netherlands Institute in Rome, March 20-23, 2002, Amsterdam 2003, 425- 441

Blamberg (1976), Blamberg J.E., *The Public Image Projected by the Roman Emperors (AD 69-117) as reflected in Contemporary Imperial Coinage*, PhD Thesis, Indiana University 1976

Bloesch (1987), Bloesch H., *Griechische Munzen in Winterthur*, Winterthur 1987-

Boatwright (1987), Boatwright M.T., *Hadrian and the City of Rome*, Princeton 1987

Boatwright (2000), Boatwright M.T., *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire*, Princeton 2000

Boer, den (1975), Boer W. den, Trajan's Deification and Hadrian's Succession, *AncSoc* 6 (1975) 203-12

Bollansée (1994), Bollansée J., *P.Fay*. 19, Hadrian's Memoirs, and Imperial Epistolary Autobiography, *AncSoc* 25 (1994) 279-302

Bosch, Quellen Ankara, Bosch, E., *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Ankara im Altertum*. «Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayinlarindan», Ser. 7, no. 46, Ankara 1967

Boulvert (1970), Boulvert G., *Esclaves et affranchis impériaux sous Haut-Empire. Rôle politique et administrative*, Naples 1970

Bowersock (1969), Bowersock G.W., *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1969

Bowersock (1973), Bowersock G.W., Greek Intellectuals and the Imperial Cult in the Second Century AD, in E.J. Bickerman and W. den Boer (edd.), *Le Culte des souverains dans l'Empire Romain*, Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1973, 179-212

Bowie (1974), Bowie E.L., Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic, in M.I. Finley (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Society*, London 1974, 166-209

Bowie (1991), Bowie E.L., Hellenes and Hellenism in Writers of the Early Second Sophistic in S.Said (ed.) *ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΜΟΣ, Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg 25-27 Octobre 1989*, Leiden (1991) 183-204

Bowie (1997), Bowie E.L., Hadrian, Favorinus, and Plutarch, in J. Mossman (ed.), *Plutarch and his Intellectual World. Essays on Plutarch*, London 1997, 1-15

Bowie (2002), Bowie E.L., Hadrian and Greek Poetry, in E.N. Ostenfeld (ed.) *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks. Studies in Cultural Interaction*, Aarhus 2002, 172-197

Breeze and Dobson (2000), Breeze D.J. and Dobson B., *Hadrian's Wall*, 4th ed., London 2000

Buraselis (1989), Buraselis K., *ΘΕΙΑ ΔΩΡΕΑ. Μελέτες πάνω στην πολιτική της δυναστείας των Σεβήρων και την Constitutio Antoniniana*, Athens 1989

Bureth (1988), Bureth P., Le préfet d'Égypte (30 av. J.-C.-297 ap.J.-C.): État présent de la documentation en 1973 in *ANRW* 10.1 (1988) 472-502

Burnett (2005), Burnett A., The Roman West and the Roman East, in C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett (edd.), *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, Oxford 2005, 171-180

Burrell (2002/2003), Burrell B., Temples of Hadrian, not Zeus, *GRBS* 43,1 (2002/2003) 31-50

Burrell (2004), Burrell B., *Neokoroi: Greek cities and Roman emperors*, Boston 2004

Butcher (1988), Butcher K., *Roman Provincial Coins. An Introduction to the "Greek Imperials"*, London 1988

Butcher (2005), Butcher K., Information, Legitimation, or Self-Legitimation? Popular and Elite Designs on the Coin Types of Syria, in C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett (edd.), *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, Oxford 2005, 143-156

Calandra (1996), Calandra E., *Oltre la Grecia: alle origini del filellenismo di Adriano*, Naples 1996

Carson (1956), Carson R.A.G., System and Product in the Roman Mint, in R.A.G. Carson and C.H.V. Sutherland (edd.) *Essays in Roman Coinage Presented to Harold Mattingly*, Oxford 1956, 227-239

Castritius (1964), Castritius H., Der Phoenix auf den aurei Hadrians und Tacitus' Annalen VI,28, *JNG* 14 (1964) 89-95

Cat. Ossolinski, Sukkienik G., *Catalogue of ancient coins in the Ossolinski National Institute Library*, 5 parts, Wroclaw 1985-

Charlesworth (1937), Charlesworth M.P., The Virtues of a Roman Emperor. Propaganda and the Creation of Belief, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 1937, 105-133

Clairmont (1966), Clairmont C.W., *Die Bildnisse des Antinous. Ein Beitrag zur Porträtplastik unter Kaiser Hadrian*, Rome 1966

Clinton (1989) Clinton K., Hadrian's Contribution to the Renaissance of Eleusis, in S. Walker and A. Cameron (edd.), *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire. Papers from the Tenth British Museum Classical Colloquium* (1989) 56-68

Clinton (1997), Clinton K., Eleusis and the Romans: Late Republic to Marcus Aurelius, in M.C. Hoff and S.I. Rotroff (edd.), *The Romanization of Athens: Proceedings of an International Conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska* (April 1996), Oxford 1997, 161-181

Corp. Glos. Lat, Loewe G., *Corpus glossariorum Latinorum*, Leipzig 1888-1923

Curty (1994), Curty O., À propos de la SUGGENEIA entre cités, *REG* 107 (1994) 698-707

Curty (1995), Curty O., *Les Parentés Légendaires entre Cités Grecques: Catalogue raisonné des inscriptions contenant le terme SUGGENEIA et analyse critique*, Geneva 1995

Deininger (1965), Deininger J., *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Munich 1965

Dignas (2002), Dignas B., *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Oxford 2002

Di Segni (1994), Di Segni L., A New Toponym in Southern Samaria, *Liber Annuus 44 (1994) 579-584*

Dräger (2000), Dräger M., Überlegungen zu den Reisen Hadrians durch Kleinasien, *Klio* 82 (2000) 208-216

Duncan (1948), Duncan T.S., The Aeneas Legend on Coins, *CJ* 44.1 (1948) 15-29

Eck (1970), Eck W., *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian. Prosopographische Untersuchungen mit Einschluß des Jahres- und Provinzialfesten der Statthalter*, Munich 1970

Eck (1982), Eck W., Jahres- und Provinzialfasten der senatorischen Statthalter von 69/70 bis 138/139. 1. Teil, *Chiron* 12 (1982) 281-362

Eck (1983), Eck W., Jahres- und Provinzialfasten der senatorischen Statthalter von 69/70 bis 138/139. 2. Teil, *Chiron* 13 (1983) 147-237

Eilers (2002), Eilers C., *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities*, Oxford 2002

Elwyn (1993), Elwyn S., Interstate Kinship and Roman Foreign Policy, *TAPhA* 123 (1993) 261-286

Engels (1990), Engels, D., *Roman Corinth. An Alternative Model for the Classical City*, Chicago 1990

Erskine (2001), Erskine A., *Troy between Greece and Rome. Local Tradition and Imperial Power*, Oxford 2001

Evans (1992), Evans J. DeRose, *The Art of Persuasion. Political Propaganda from Aeneas to Brutus*, Ann Arbor 1992

Evelpidis Coll., Hackens T. and Evelpidis R.H., *Collection Réna H. Evelpidis, Athènes*, Athens 1970-

Evers (1994), Evers C., *Le portraits d' Hadrien. Typologie et ateliers*, Bruxelles 1994

Fayer (1976), Fayer C., *Il culto della dea Roma. Origine e diffusione nell'Impero*, Pescara 1976

Fayoum, Bernand É., *Recueil des inscriptions grecques du Fayoum*. 3 vols. Leiden, Paris 1975-1981.

Fears (1977), Fears, J.R., *Princeps a deis electus: the divine election of the Emperor as a Political Concept at Rome*, Rome 1977

Fears (1981), Fears J.R., The Cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology, *ANRW* 17.2 (1981) 827-948

Ferrary (1996), Ferrary J.-L., Rome, Athènes et le Philhellénisme dans l' Empire Romain, d' Auguste aux Antonins, in *Convegno Internazionale: Filellenismo e Tradizionalismo a Roma nei Primi Due Secoli dell' Impero* (Rome, 27-28 April 1995), Rome 1996, 183-210

Fishwick (1990), Fishwick D., Dio and Maecenas: The Emperor and the Ruler Cult, *Phoenix* 44.3 (1990) 267-275

Fishwick, The Imperial Cult, Fishwick D., *The imperial cult in the Latin West: studies in the ruler cult of the western provinces of the Roman Empire*, 3 vols., Leiden 1987-2005

Follet (1976), Follet S., *Athènes au IIe et au IIIe siècle. Études chronologiques et prosopographiques*, Paris 1976

Follet and Peppas-Delmouzou (1997), Follet S., Peppas- Delmouzou D., Le Décret de Thyatire sur les bienfaits d' Hadrien et le "Pantheon" d' Hadrien à Athènes, *BCH* 121 (1997) 291-309

Fraser (2006), Fraser T.E., *Hadrian as Builder and Benefactor in the Western Provinces*, Oxford 2006

Friesen (1993), Friesen S.J., *Twice Neokoros. Ephesus, Asia and the Cult of the Flavian Imperial Family*, Leiden 1993

Garnsey (1998), Garnsey P., Aspects of the Decline of the Urban Aristocracy in the Empire, in W. Scheidel (ed.), *Cities, Peasants and Food in Clasical Antiquity. Essays in Social and Economic History*, Cambridge 1998, 3-27

Geagan (1979), Geagan D.J., Roman Athens: Some Aspects of Life and Culture I: 86 B.C.-A.D. 267, in *ANRW* 7.1 (1979) 371-437

Gleason (1995), Gleason M.W, *Making men: sophists and self-presentation in ancient Rome*, Princeton 1995

Gnecchi, Medaglioni, Gnecchi F., *I medaglioni romani*, 3 vols, Milan 1912

Gradel (2002), Gradel I., *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, Oxford 2002

Graf (1985), Graf F., *Nordionische Kulte: religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulten von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai und Phokaia*, Rome 1985

Graindor (1973), Graindor P., *Athènes sous Hadrien*, New York 1973

Grant (1950), Grant M., *Roman Anniversary Issues. An Exploratory Study of the Numismatic and Medallic Commemoration of Anniversary Years 49 B.C.-A.D. 375,* Cambridge 1950

van Groningen (1957), van Groningen B.A., Preparatives to Hadrian's Visit to Egypt, in *Studi in onore di Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni II*, Milan 1957, 253-256

Halfmann (1979), Halfmann H., *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr*, Göttingen 1979

Halfmann (1986), Halfmann H., *Itinera principum: Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im Römischen Reich*, Stuttgart 1986

Hardetert (1998), Hardetert P., *Propaganda, Macht, Geschichte. Fünf Jahrhunderte Römische Geschichte von Caesar bis Theodosius in Münzen geprägt*, Gelsenkirchen 1998

Harl (1996), Harl K.W., *Coinage in the Roman Economy, 300 B.C. to A.D. 700*, Baltimore 1996.

Heitsch (1963), Heitsch E., *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit*, vol. 1, 2nd ed., Göttingen 1963, 52-54

Herr (1971), Herr M.D., The Historical Significance of the Dialogues between Jewish Sages and Roman Dignitaries, in J. Heinemann and D. Noy (edd.), *Studies in Aggadah and folk-literature*. Scripta Hierosolymitana 22, Jerusalem 1971, 123-150

Henderson (1923), Henderson B.W., *The Life and Principate of the Emperor Hadrian*, London 1923

Heuchert (2005), Heuchert V., The Chronological Development of Roman Provincial Coin Iconography, in C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett (edd.), *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, Oxford 2005, 29-56

Hill (1966), Hill P.V., The Aurei and Denarii of Hadrian from Eastern Mints, *NumChr* 6 (1966) 135-143

Hill (1970), Hill, P.V., *The Dating and Arrangement of the Undated Coins of Rome,* London 1970

Hill (2004), Hill P.R., *The construction of Hadrian's Wall*, Oxford 2004

Howgego (1985), Howgego, C.J., *Greek Imperial Countermarks. Studies in the Provincial Coinage of the Roman Empire*, London 1985

Howgego (2005), Howgego C.J., Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces, in C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett (edd.), *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, Oxford 2005, 1-17

Imhoof-Blumel (1901-1902), Imhoof-Blumel F., *Kleinasiatische Münzen*, 2 vols, Vienna 1901-1902.

Imhoof-Blumel (1913), Imhoof-Blumel F., *Die antiken Münzen Mysiens*, Berlin 1913

Instinsky (1962), Instinsky H.U., *Die Siegel des Kaisers Augustus. Ein Kapitel zur Geschichte und Symbolik des antiken Herrschersiegels*, Baden-Baden 1962

Johnston (1985), Johnston A., The so-called "Pseudo-Autonomous" Greek Imperials, *ANSMN* 30 (1985) 89-112

Jones (1971), Jones C.P., *Plutarch and Rome*, Oxford 1971

Jones (1996), Jones C.P., The Panhellenion, *Chiron* 26 (1996) 29-56

Jones (1998), Jones C.P., A Constitution of Hadrian Concerning Cyrene, *Chiron* 28 (1998) 255-266

Jones (1999), Jones C.P., A Decree of Thyateira in Lydia, *Chiron* 29 (1999) 1-21

Kapetanopoulos (1992-1998), Kapetanopoulos E., The Reform of the Athenian Constitution under Hadrian, *Horos* 10-12 (1992-1998) 215-237

Karamesine-Oikonomidou (1975), Karamesine-Oikonomidou M., *Η Νομισματοκοπία της Νικοπόλεως*, Athens 1975

Karivieri (2002), Karivieri A., Just one of the boys. Hadrian in the Company of Zeus, Dionysus and Theseus, in E. N. Ostenfeld (ed.), *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks. Studies in Cultural Interaction*, Aarhus 2002, 40-54

Karwiese (1995) Karwiese S., The Church of Mary and the Temple of Hadrian Olympios, in H. Koester (ed.), *Ephesos Metropolis of Asia. An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture*, Valley Forge 1995, 311-319

Kienast (1959-1960), Kienast D., Hadrian, Augustus und die eleusinischen Mysterien, *JNG* 10 (1959-1960) 61-69

Kreitzer (1996), Kreitzer L.J., Striking New Images. *Roman Imperial Coinage and the New Testament World*, Sheffield 1996

Kremmyde-Sicilianou (1996), Kremmyde-Sicilianou S., *Η Νομισματοκοπία της Ρωμαικής Αποικίας του Δίου*, Athens 1996

Kuhlmann (2002), Kuhlmann P., *Religion und Erinnerung. Die Religionspolitik Kaiser Hadrians und ihre Rezeption in der antiken Literatur*, Göttingen 2002

Lambert (1984), Lambert R., *Beloved and God, The story of Hadrian and Antinoos*, London 1984

Lamberton (1997), Lamberton R., Plutarch and the Romanizations of Athens, in M.C. Hoff and S.I. Rotroff (edd.), *The Romanization of Athens: Proceedings of an International Conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska* (April 1996), Oxford 1997, 151-160

Levick (1982), Levick B., Propaganda and the Imperial Coinage, *Antichthon* 16 (1982) 104-116

Lewis (1991), Lewis N., Hadriani Sententiae, *GRBS* 32.3 (1991) 267-280

Lewis (1993), Lewis R.G., Imperial Autobiography, Augustus to Hadrian, in *ANRW* 34.1 (1993) 629-706

Lindgren Collection, Lindgren H.C. and Kovacs F.L., *Ancient bronze coins of Asia Minor and the Levant from the Lindgren collection (Lindgren I),* San Mateo, California 1985

Lomas (1993), Lomas K., *Rome and the Western Greeks 350 BC- AD 200: Conquest and Acculturation in Southern Italy*, London 1993

MacCormack (1981), MacCormack S.G., *Art and ceremony in late antiquity*, Berkeley 1981

Macro (1979), Macro A.D., A Confirmed Asiarch, *AJP* 100 (1979) 94-98

Macro (1980), Macro A.D., The Cities of Asia Minor under the Roman Imperium, *ANRW* 7.2 (1980) 658-697

Magie (1950), Magie D., *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ*, 2 vols, Princeton 1950

Marek (1993), Marek Chr., *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia,* Tübingen 1993

Martin (1974), Martin J.-P., Hadrien et le phénix. Propagande numismatique, in *Mélanges d' histoire ancienne offerts a William Seston*, Paris 1974, 327-337

Martin (1982), Martin F., *La documentacion griega de la cancilleria del emperador Adriano*, Pamplona 1982

Mellor (1975), Mellor R., *Thea Roma: the worship of the goddess Roma in the Greek world*, Gottingen 1975

Mellor (1981), Mellor R., The Goddess Roma in *ANRW* 17.2 (1981) 950-1030

Merkelbach and Şahin (1988), Merkelbach R. and Şahin S., Die Publizierten Inschriften von Perge, *EA* 11 (1988) 97-170

Metcalf (1974), Metcalf W.E., Hadrian, Jovis Olympius, *Mnemosyne* 27 (1974) 59-66

Metcalf (1980), Metcalf W.E., *The Cistophori of Hadrian*, New York 1980

Millar (1964), Millar F., *A Study of Cassius Dio*, Oxford 1964

Millar (1977), Millar F., *The emperor in the Roman world, 31 BC-AD 337*, London 1977

Millar (1993), Millar F., *The Roman Near East 31 BC-AD 337*, Harvard 1993

Mionnet, Mionnet T.E., *Description de Médailles antiques Grecques et Romaines*, Paris 1806-

Mols (2003), Mols, S.T.A.M., The Cult of Roma Aeterna in Hadrian's Politics, in L. de Blois et alii (edd.), *The Representation and Perception of Roman Imperial Power. Proceedings of the third workshop of the international network Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, c. 200 B.C. –A.D. 476)*, Netherlands Institute in Rome, March 20-23, 2002, Amsterdam 2003, 458-465

Moser (1974), Moser R.K., *Coinage as a means of dating the portraits of the emperor Hadrian*, M.A. Thesis, Univ. of California 1974

Münsterberg (1973), Münsterberg R., *Die Beamtennamen auf den griechischen Münzen geographisch und alphabetisch geordnet*, Hildesheim 1973

Nock (1928), Nock A.D, Notes on Ruler-Cult I-IV, *JHS* 48 (1928) 21-43

Nock (1930), Nock A.D., ΣΥΝΝΑΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ, *HSCPh* 41 (1930) 1-62

Oliver (1951), Oliver J.H., Athenian Citizenship of Roman Emperors, *Hesperia* 20 (1951) 346-349

Oliver (1970), Oliver J.H., *Marcus Aurelius: aspects of civic and cultural policy in the East*, Hesperia Suppl. 13, Princeton 1970

Oliver (1978), Oliver J.H., Panachaeans and Panhellenes, *Hesperia*, 47 (1978) 185-191.

Oliver (1989), Oliver J.H., *Greek constitutions of early Roman emperors from inscriptions and papyri*, ed. by K. Clinton, Philadelphia 1989

Papaefthymiou (2001), Papaefthymiou E., Hadrien et la Macedoine, *Revue Belge de Numismatique et de Sillographie* 147 (2001) 67-78

Papageorgiadou-Bani (2004), Papageorgiadou-Bani H., *The Numismatic Iconography of the Roman Colonies in Greece. Local Spirit and the Expression of Imperial Policy*, Athens 2004

Paribeni and Romanelli (1914), Paribeni R. and Romanelli P., Studi e ricerche archeologiche nell' Anatolia meridionale, *MonAnt* 23 (1914) 5-277

Pelling (1995), Pelling C.B.R., Plutarch and Roman Politics, in B. Scardigli (ed.) *Essays on Plutarch's Lives*, Oxford (1995) 319-356

Perret (1929), Perret L., *La titulature impériale d' Hadrien*, Paris 1929

Price (1979), Price S.R.F, The Divine Right of Emperors, rev. of J.R.Fears, Princeps a Deis Electus: The Divine Election of the Emperor as a Political Concept at Rome, Rome 1977, *CR* 29 (1979) 277-279

Price (1984), Price S.R.F., *Rituals and power: the Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge 1984

Price (1984a), Price S.R.F., Gods and Emperors: The Greek Language of the Roman Imperial Cult, *JHS* 104 (1984) 79-95

Perinthos-Herakleia, Sayar M.H., *Perinthos-Herakleia (Marmara Ereğlisi) und Umgebung. Geschichte, Testimonien, griechische und lateinische Inschriften,* Vienna 1998.

Raubitschek (1945), Raubitschek A.E., Hadrian as the Son of Zeus Eleutherios, *AJA* 49.2 (1945) 128-133

Reynolds (1978), Reynolds J., Hadrian, Antoninus Pius and the Cyrenaican Cities, *JRS* 68 (1978) 111-121

Reynolds (2000), Reynolds J.M, New Letters of Hadrian to Aphrodisias: trials, taxes, gladiators and an aqueduct, *JRA* 13 (2000), 5-20

Rizakis (1998), Rizakis A.D., Incolae-Paroikoi: populations et communautés dependants dans les cites et les colonies Romaines de l' Orient, *REA* 100 (1998) 599-617

Rizakis (2001), Rizakis A.D., La constitution des elites municipales dans les colonies romaines de la province d' Achaïe, in O. Salomies (ed.), *The Greek East in the Roman Context. Proceedings of a Colloquium organized by the Finnish Institute at Athens May 21 and 22, 1999*, Helsinki 2001, 37-49

Robert, Hellenica, Robert L., *Hellenica. Receuil d'épigraphie de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*, 12 vols, Limoges 1940-

Robert (1967), Robert L., *Monnaies grecques. Types, legendes, magistrates monétaires et géographie*, Geneva 1967

Romeo (2002), Romeo I., The Panhellenion and Ethnic Identity in Hadrianic Greece, *CP* 97 (2002) 21-40

Rothman (1978), Rothman M.S. Pond, Posthumous Hadrianic Medallions, *ANSMN* 23 (1978) 107-128

Saller (1982), Saller R.P., *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*, Cambridge 1982

Salmeri (2000), Salmeri G., Dio, Rome, and the Civic Life of Asia Minor, in S. Swain (ed.), *Dio Chrysostom: politics, letters, and philosophy*, Oxford 2000, 53-92

Sanct.Baalshamin III, Dunant C., *Le Sanctuaire de Baalshamîn à Palmyre, III. Les Inscriptions*, Neuchâtel 1971.

Schäfer (1981), Schäfer P., *Der Bar Kokhba- Aufstand*, Tübingen 1981

Scheer (1993), Scheer T.S., *Mythische Vorväter: Zur Bedeutung griechischer Heroenmythen im Selbstverständnis Kleinasiatischer Städte*, Munich 1993

Scheid (1998), Scheid J., *Recherches archéologiques à la Magliana: Commentarii Fratrum Arvalium qui supersunt: les copies épigraphiques des protocoles annuels de la confrérie arvale: 21 av.-304 ap. J.-C.*, Rome 1998

Scott (1929), Scott K., Plutarch and the ruler cult, *TAPhA* 60 (1929) 117-135

Scott (1932), Scott K., The Elder and Younger Pliny on Emperor Worship, *TAPhA* 63 (1932) 156-165

Sear (1982), Sear D.R., *Greek Imperial Coins and their Values*, London 1982

Sherk (1988), Sherk R.K., *The Roman Empire: Augustus to Hadrian*, Cambridge 1988

Sherwin-White (1973), Sherwin-White A.N., *The Roman Citizenship*, 2nd ed, Oxford 1973

Sijpesteijn (1969), Sijpesteijn P.J., A New Document concerning Hadrian's Visit to Egypt, *Historia* 18 (1969) 109-118

Smallwood (1966), Smallwood E.M., *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Nerva Trajan and Hadrian*, Cambridge 1966

Spawforth (1999), Spawforth A.J., The Panhellenion Again, *Chiron* 29 (1999) 339-352

Spawforth and Walker (1985), Spawforth A.J., Walker S., The World of the Panhellenion. I. Athens and Eleusis, *JRS* 75 (1985) 78-104

Spawforth and Walker (1986), Spawforth A.J., Walker S., The World of the Panhellenion II: Three Dorian Cities, *JRS* 76 (1986) 88-105

Stertz (1993), Stertz S.A., Semper in omnibus varius: The Emperor Hadrian and Intellectuals, *ANRW* 34.1 (1993) 612-628

Strack (1933), Strack P.L., *Untersuchungen zur Römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Teil II. Die Reichsprägung zur Zeit des Hadrian*, Stuttgart 1933

Strubbe (1984-1986), Strubbe J.H.M, Gründer kleinasiatische Städte: Fiktion und Realität, *AncSoc* 15-17 (1984-1986) 253-304

Suceveanu (1975), Suceveanu A., În legătură cu statutul juridic al oraşului Tomis în epoca romană*, Pontica* 8 (1975) 115-124

Swain (1996), Swain S., *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50-250*, Oxford 1996

Sydenham (1968), Sydenham E.A, *Historical references on coins of the Roman Empire from Augustus to Gallienus***,** London 1968

Sylloge(3), Dittenberger W., *Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*, 3rd ed., 4 vols, Leipzig 1915-1924

Syme (1982), Syme R., The Career of Arrian, *HSCPh* 86 (1982) 181-211

Syme (1985), Syme R., Hadrian as Philhellene. Neglected Aspects, *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium* 1982/1983 (1985) 341-362

Taeger (1957-1960) Taeger F., *CHARISMA. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes*, 2 vols, Stuttgart 1957-1960

Talbert (1984), Talbert R.J.A, *The Senate of Imperial Rome*, Princeton 1984

Tobin (1997), Tobin J., *Herodes Attikos and the City of Athens. Patronage and Conflict under the Antonines*, Amsterdam 1997

Toynbee (1934), Toynbee J.M.C., *The Hadrianic School. A Chapter in the History of Greek Art*, Cambridge 1934

Veyne (1990), Veyne P., *Bread and circuses: historical sociology and political pluralism*, transl., London 1990

Wallace-Hadrill (1981), Wallace-Hadrill, A., The Emperor and his Virtues, *Historia* 30 (1981) 298-323

Weber (1907), Weber W., *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus,* Leipzig 1907

Weber Coll., Forrer L., *The Weber Collection of Greek Coins*, London 1922-1929

Wegner (1956), Wegner, M., *Hadrian. Plotina, Marciana, Matidia, Sabina,* Berlin 1956

Weiss (2005), Weiss P., The Cities and their Money, in C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett (edd.), *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, Oxford 2005, 57-68

Westermann and Schiller (1954), Westermann W. L. and Schiller A. A., *Apokrimata: decisions of Septimius Severus on legal matters*, New York 1954

Whitmarsh (2001), Whitmarsh T., *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*, Oxford 2001

Whitmarsh (2005), Whitmarsh T., *The Second Sophistic*, Oxford 2005

Whittaker (1994), Whittaker C.R., *Frontiers of the Roman Empire. A Social and Economic Study*, Baltimore 1994

Wiedermann (1981), Wiedermann T.E.J., Greek and Roman Slavery, Baltimore 1981

Willers (2000), Willers D., *Hadrians panhellenisches Programm. Archäologische Beiträge zur Neugestaltung Athens durch Hadrian*, Basel 1990

Woolf (1994), Woolf G., Becoming Roman, Staying Greek: Culture, Identity and the Civilizing Process in the Near East, *PCPhS* 40 (1994) 116-143

Zanker (1995), Zanker P., *The mask of Socrates: the image of the intellectual in antiquity*, Berkeley 1995