

Athens, Augustus, and the Settlement of 21 B.C.

Geoffrey C. R. Schmalz

IN RECENT YEARS much has been made of the 'bad blood' between Athens and Augustus, especially in the context of the controversial imperial visit of 21 B.C. The Athenian sojourn of Augustus, the second of three, is known from the rather full, if problematic, account in Cassius Dio (54.7.1-4). Over thirty years ago G. W. Bowersock adduced a supplemental source in Plutarch's *Regum et Imperatorum Apophthegmata* (*Mor.* 207E-F).¹ This passage purports to preserve a letter addressed to the Athenians by Augustus and is construed as evidence for a winter stay on Aegina at the time. Thus taken together, these two sources are the basis for much of the present understanding of the early relationship between Augustus and his Athenian subjects.²

What follows here is a re-evaluation from several different perspectives of the imperial visit of 21 B.C. Through a closer reading of Dio and Plutarch, a review of the history of the period, and finally a consideration of the epigraphic evidence from Athens, several new conclusions will be drawn. First, it will become evident that Dio's account of the imperial visit cannot be placed in the winter of 21 B.C. but belongs rather to the following summer or perhaps even the fall. This rules out Augustus' cele-

¹ G. W. Bowersock, "Augustus on Aegina," *CQ* NS. 14 (1964) 120f, followed in the standard account by H. HALFMANN, *Itinera Principum* (Stuttgart 1986: hereafter 'Halfmann') 24, 158. The letter is incorporated in E. Malcovati, *Imperatoris Caesaris Augusti Operum Fragmenta* (Turin 1969) ep. 70.

² For the most recent characterization see K. Galinsky, *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction* (Princeton 1996) 360. Particular emphasis is given by M. Hoff, "Civil Disobedience and Unrest in Augustan Athens," *Hesperia* 58 (1989) esp. 267ff, following (without credit) G. W. Bowersock, "The Mechanics of Subversion in the Roman Provinces," in A. Giovannini, ed., *Opposition et résistances à l'empire d'Auguste à Trajan* (= *Entretiens Hardt* 33 [Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1987]) 298ff; cf. R. Bernhardt, "Athen, Augustus und die eleusinischen Mysterien," *AthMitt* 90 (1975) 233-37.

brated stay on Aegina, at least for the period under discussion, and thus raises questions about the date and interpretation of Plutarch's evidence. Secondly, by adopting a larger perspective on the imperial visit it is possible to see how Augustus' settlement at Athens fits into a wider program of provincial reform, not only within Greece (where the additional testimony of Pausanias is adduced), but throughout many of Rome's more settled provinces, beginning with the extensive reorganization of Sicily between 22 and 21 B.C. Finally, in an attempt to open up a more helpful local perspective, this paper also examines certain Athenian inscriptions that may have a bearing on the Augustan 'settlement' of 21 B.C. At the very least, the exceptional number of these inscriptions, particularly those dating to the archonship of Apolexis of Oion (probably 21/20 or 20/19 B.C.), should reflect the great flurry of documentary activity that often followed upon an imperial visit.

The Evidence of Cassius Dio (and Pausanias)

Dio's account of the Augustan settlement at Athens is familiar enough, although its full context has never been taken into consideration. Upon arriving in Greece Augustus and his entourage visited Sparta, whose loyalty at Actium and long-standing patronage under the *gens Claudii* had won the early favor of the princeps.³ Due homage was paid to Spartan tradition by their dining together with the town's magistrates (and presumably the local dynast C. Iulius Eurycles) at the *syssition*—which should be taken to mean a state banquet in the "old Ephoreia," where the board of ephors still took their meals and which would appear to have been recently remodeled.⁴ Augustus

³ Halfmann (23f with tabulation at 158) fully discusses the Greek itinerary of 21 B.C. The Spartans had evidently been in the *clientela* of the Claudii (Pulchri or Neronis) since the Middle Republic (see Paus. 7.9.3). More immediately, during the Perusine War they had given refuge to Livia and her Claudian husband, together with their infant son Tiberius (Suet. *Tib.* 6.2, *tutela Claudiorum*); see E. Rawson, "The Eastern Clientelae of Clodius and the Claudii," *Historia* 22 (1973) 227, 229; cf. also B. Levick, "The Beginning of Tiberius' Career," *CQ* n.s. 21 (1971) 482.

⁴ Dio here would appear to use *συσσίτιον* in the same contemporary manner as Plutarch (e.g. *Cleom.* 8.1-9.1); cf. Paus. 3.11.10f. On the important distinction in post-Classical Sparta, see N. M. Kennell, "Where Was Sparta's Prytaneion?" *AJA* 91 (1987) 422. The remodeling (ca 30-20 B.C.) is suggested by A. J. S. Spawforth, "Spartan Cults under the Roman Empire: Some Notes," in J. M.

further indulged Sparta by personally awarding it the old peri-oecic island of Cythera, which the dynast Eurycles later claimed as a personal possession.⁵ Another source (Paus. 4.31.1f), moreover, indicates that at this time Spartan territory was also extended into Messenia at the expense of Sparta's old enemy, whose earlier loyalty to Antonius induced Augustus to deprive Messene of part of its land, quite possibly the long-disputed *ager Dentheliatis*.⁶ It is possible that Augustus also took this occasion to strike at another important Peloponnesian center, Tegea—this time in a symbolic manner by removing the ancient cult statue of Athena and confiscating the fabled relics of the Calydonian boar.⁷

Athens was the next stop on the emperor's itinerary. Here Dio contrasts the good fortune of the Spartans with the subsequent measures taken against the Athenians. In this new settlement Augustus deprived Athens of control over the tributary communities of Aegina (a gift of Antonius) and possibly Eretria, and then proceeded to ban the city's sale of Athenian citizenship.⁸ Dio's own sources attributed these 'economic sanctions'

Sanders, ed., *Philolakon. Lakonian Studies in Honour of Hector Catling* (Oxford 1992) 227–38 at 228 with the evidence at *IG* V.1 141–42; cf. also *SEG* XXXV 329 for the date.

⁵ Dio 54.7.1f; cf. also Strab. 7.7.6 (C325). On the entire episode see P. Cartledge and A. J. S. Spawforth, *Hellenistic and Roman Sparta: A Tale of Two Cities* (London 1989) 98f and esp. 199f.

⁶ See E. Meyer, "Messene," *RE* Suppl. XV (1978) 280; further discussion in G. W. Bowersock, "Augustus in the East: The Problem of Succession," in F. Millar and E. Segal, edd., *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects* (Oxford 1984) 174; cf. L. Migeotte, "Réparation de monuments publics à Messène au temps d'Auguste," *BCH* 109 (1985) 603f. Difficulties between Messene and Sparta over the Dentheliatis are recorded in 14/15: *SEG* XLI 328.40f

⁷ See Paus. 8.46.1–5; cf. S. Alcock, "Spaced-out Sanctuaries: The Ritual Landscape of Roman Greece," in E. Scott, ed., *Theoretical Roman Archaeology: First Conference Proceedings* (=Worldwide Archaeology Series 4 [Aldershot 1993]) 155–65 at 157f, and more fully in her *Graecia Capta: The Landscapes of Roman Greece* (Cambridge 1993) 176–80.

⁸ Cf. L. Robert, "Une épigramme satirique d'Automédon et Athènes au début de l'empire (*Anthologie Palatine* XI 319)," *REG* 94 (1981) esp. 348f, where the Athenian custom of awarding heroic epithets to non-citizen benefactors (e.g. C. Iulius Nicanor as the "New Themistocles") was created subsequently in compensation for the lost foreign revenues; the city would become notorious for this practice (cf. Dio Chrys. *Or.* 31.116). For Aegina, P. GRAINDOR, *Athènes sous Auguste* (Cairo 1927: hereafter 'Graindor') 5–8, still offers the best discussion; according to Appian (*BC* 5.7) also included in Antonius' grant were the islands of Tenos, Ikos, Keos, Skiathos, and Peparethos (Plin. *HN*

primarily to Athens' notoriously pro-Antonian stance ten years before. According to local tradition all of this—from the disappointment at Actium to the present settlement—had already been portended by a peculiar incident on the Acropolis: “the statue of Athena on the Acropolis,” presumably the cult statue of Athena Polias,⁹ was said to have spat blood while turning west to face Rome.¹⁰ Dio then goes on to conclude that Augustus sailed off to Samos for the winter of 20 B.C. immediately after finishing his business in Greece.

Dio's treatment of the Athenian settlement has always been regarded as problematic. Graindor, for one, could not believe that Augustus, a full ten years after Actium, would have manifested his former hostility in this way and at this time; thus his suggestion that Dio shifted this passage from his account of 31 B.C. to contrast more vividly the favored status of Sparta.¹¹ Yet the political situation in Athens vis-à-vis Rome was remarkably similar to that experienced elsewhere in the Empire during the late 20s B.C., when Augustus, having finally pacified Spain and reorganized the other western provinces (not to mention the capital itself), was only just getting around to an administrative tour of the more settled provinces, particularly those of the East. This historical development is clearly laid out at Dio 54.6.1, where he states that “Augustus went to Sicily with the

4.57 lists Aegina as a free community). The case of Eretria is problematic, as it is not otherwise known as an Athenian possession; A. N. Oikonomides, “Defeated Athens, the Land of Oropos, Caesar and Augustus. Notes on the Sources for the History of the Years 49–27,” *AncW* 2 (1979) 97–103, even goes so far as to suggest that Oropos was actually meant.

⁹ Thus B. S. Ridgway, “Images of Athena on the Acropolis,” in J. Neils, ed., *Goddess and Polis. The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens* (Princeton 1992) 119–42 at 126. Alternatively identified with a cult statue of Athena Hygieia by N. Robertson, “Athena's Shrines and Festivals,” in J. Neils, ed., *Worshipping Athena: Panathenaia and Parthenon* (Madison 1996) 47f, arguing that Dio's use of a compass orientation indicates a location out-of-doors; he further notes the later dedication of a statue to Livia as Sebaste Hygieia (*JG* II² 3240).

¹⁰ Dio's words (54.7.3) make it clear that the portent of the Athena statue related to all circumstances in the preceding section: καὶ αὐτοῖς ἐς ταῦτα ἔδοξε τὸ τῷ τῆς Ἀθηναῶς ἀγάλματι συμβᾶν ἀποσκηῖναι (“The Athenians held that these were the calamities portended by what had happened to the statue of Athena....” Tr. J. W. Rich, *Cassius Dio: The Augustan Settlement. Roman History* 53–59 [Warminster 1990: hereafter ‘Rich’] 180).

¹¹ Graindor 17f. On the possibility that Dio was in fact using a non-annalistic source here, see Rich 180 *ad* 54.7.3.

intention of organizing it and other provinces as far as Syria." Significantly enough, in Sicily the island's pro-Pompeian stance of 38–36 B.C. was an important factor in his new policies.¹² When Augustus later traveled through Asia Minor, he was faced with factional strife in several cities and took away from the Rhodians certain islands given by Antonius.¹³ Closer to home is the testimony of Pausanias, noted above, concerning the "punishment" of Messene: Augustus is said to have afterward "struck at other towns which had fought against him, some more than others."¹⁴ If this episode does indeed belong to the period under discussion, then what Pausanias depicts as a form of delayed retribution is rather indicative, in real historical terms, of a wider program of provincial reform. Athens can then be counted, along with Tegea, as one of those other towns that Augustus "struck at" one way or another while he was in Greece, as attested in a similar manner by Dio. Yet because these measures simply happened to be the first taken in Greece since Actium and the defeat of Antonius, they inevitably came to be associated in the sources with the province's past espousal of the Antonian cause.

Recent discussions also reject the significance of a triumviral legacy for Augustus' Athenian settlement. Emphasis is given instead to the behavior of Dio's statue of Athena, which has come to be regarded as an historical incident with real political implications. Some point to the event as an incontestable "act of opposition" to Augustus, while others would even portray it as an instance of political theater staged by anti-Roman elements in the city.¹⁵ Yet this is all very wide of the mark. Dio cites the Acropolis incident not as a historical explanation (which is given generally in 54.6.1), but as an earlier portent—in a fashion reminiscent of the notorious *Statuenwunder* of the triumviral

¹² See S. S. Stone, "Sextus Pompey, Octavian and Sicily," *AJA* 87 (1983) 11–22, esp. 20ff; R. J. A. Wilson, *Sicily under the Roman Empire: The Archaeology of a Roman Province, 36 B.C.–A.D. 535* (Warminster 1990) 36.

¹³ See Dio 54.7.6, with G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford 1965) 102ff; on Rhodes, cf. App. *BC* 5.7 with the recent study of A. Erskine, "Rhodes and Augustus," *ZPE* 88 (1991) 271–75.

¹⁴ Paus. 4.31.1f, esp. καὶ ὁ μὲν τούτων ἕνεκα Μεσσηνίοις καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἀντιταξαμένων τοῖς μὲν αὐτῶν ἔλαττον, τοῖς δὲ καὶ ἐς πλεον ἐπεξήλθε.

¹⁵ Thus Hoff (*supra* n.2) 269 (following Bowersock [*supra* n.2] 299 and [*supra* n.13] 106): "the incident ... must have been meant as an insult to Rome and the Emperor."

period.¹⁶ In a similar manner, for instance, Dio gives a prodigy reported before the battle of Mutina (43 B.C.), according to which first a statue of Magna Mater on the Palatine turned from east to west, and then an image of Minerva at Mutina dripped blood and milk (46.33.3f). The Athenian Acropolis was already known to Dio and his readers as an especially good site for such supernatural events, for in his account of Actium (50.12.2) an ominous windstorm was said to have overturned statues of Antonius and Cleopatra.¹⁷ Whether omen or 'incident', the behavior of Athena's statue on the Acropolis could have only augured well for Augustus in any event, for the turning toward Rome would mean good fortune for his regime, but the spitting of blood would reflect rather on the Athenians as troubled devotees of the goddess.

The date of Augustus' actions in Greece remains to be considered. The most serious problem in Dio's account, as presently understood, lies in the chronological framework applied by scholars. From Bowersock on the accepted view has maintained that Augustus sailed to Greece from Sicily in midwinter, probably early in 21 B.C. (the first months of the consulship of Marcus Lollius); this would place the emperor in Athens sometime in the third quarter of the Attic year 22/21 B.C. Despite the orthodoxy of this view, Dio does not suggest (54.6.1–7.1) that Augustus cut short his ambitious agenda in Sicily and risked a hazardous midwinter voyage. In fact there is every indication that Augustus was fully occupied on the island throughout those fall and winter months, thereby suggesting a departure for Greece sometime after May, at the earliest, which also marked the opening of the Roman military sailing season.¹⁸

Augustus had probably arrived in Sicily in late September or early October of 22 B.C.¹⁹ There he embarked on an extensive

¹⁶ For Dio's frequent recourse to such portents, see Rich 12; cf. 180 *ad* 54.7.3.

¹⁷ Cf. Plut. *Ant.* 60.2f with a similar prodigy report and characteristic 'personalizing' treatment, discussed by J. Mossman, "Plutarch's Use of Statues," in M. A. Flower and M. Toher, edd., *Georgica: Greek Studies in Honour of George Cawkwell* (=BICS 58 [London 1991]) 112f.

¹⁸ Cf. Halfmann 158. On the Roman sailing season, albeit with fleet activity in mind, see Veg. 4.39: the seas were considered closed at least "until the sixth day before the Ides of March" (*i.e.*, 10 March), but remained highly uncertain until "the sixth day before the Kalends of June" (*i.e.*, 27 May).

¹⁹ Cf. Rich 178 *ad* 54.6.1. Augustus could not have left for Sicily before 1 September 22 B.C., when he dedicated the temple of Jupiter Tonans (54.4.2), and Dio gives no hint that the princeps moved away from the capital immediately afterward.

reorganization of the province, involving the establishment of as many as six new colonies (probably as typical Augustan veteran settlements) and the extension of the *ius Latii* to several Sicilian towns; a considerable amount of imperial construction was evidently initiated as well, perhaps even including the new amphitheater at Syracuse.²⁰ On this occasion Augustus may also have had problems with his Sicilian procurator (*cf.* Plut. *Mor.* 207B). The princeps meanwhile had to deal with some very serious problems reported from Rome. Following his repeated refusal to undertake another consulship, the consular elections proved factious and extremely protracted: the one newly elected consul, Lollius, was left to assume office alone at the beginning of the new year. Augustus was still working in Sicily "a long time" afterward when a consular colleague, Q. Aemilius Lepidus, was finally elected (March or even later?);²¹ at this time the princeps decided to recall Agrippa from Lesbos to quell the residual violence at Rome (Dio 54.6.5f).²² Agrippa's return found the princeps still in Sicily, and it was only sometime later that Augustus left the province (54.7.1). Hence it is difficult to see how Dio's narrative and the emperor's ongoing reforms in Sicily can be assigned to a few short months at the end of 22 B.C. and the beginning of 21 B.C.

Dio goes on to report the imperial visits to Sparta and Athens, as discussed above, then concludes with Augustus on Samos at the start of winter, 21/20 B.C. Here a final difficulty in the conventional chronology emerges. If all the developments in Sicily and at Rome (Dio 54.1–6.6) took place in the autumn of 22 B.C. and perhaps the first month of 21 B.C., which seems most unlikely, then we are left with very little reported for the entire

²⁰ Dio 54.6.1, 7.1; Plin. *HN* 3.89f; *cf.* Strab. 6.2.5. On the Augustan settlement see especially Wilson (*supra* n.12) 33–45, esp. 38ff (*coloniae* and *municipia*), 44f with fig. 30; Stone (*supra* n.12) 20ff with n.79 for the amphitheater.

²¹ The electoral crisis of 19 B.C., though severely aggravated by the 'conspiracy' of Egnatius Rufus, gives an indication of just how late in the year a consul *ordinarius* might be elected in a time of political strife: it was only after 1 August that C. Sentius Saturninus, the sole consul, was able to preside over the election of his colleague. See, most recently, D. A. Phillips, "The Conspiracy of Egnatius Rufus and the Election of Suffect Consuls under Augustus," *Historia* 46 (1997) 107, 111f.

²² Bowersock (*supra* n.1: 120) incorrectly claims that "Dio does not say where the Emperor was at the time of the riots at the beginning of 21 B.C."; Halfmann (163) simply places Agrippa in Rome sometime early in the new year.

year of 21 B.C.—merely the notice of the imperial visits to Sparta and Athens (54.7.1–4). In view of the probable length of Augustus' stay in Sicily, it seems much more sensible to assign the princeps' initial movements in Greece to the summer, or perhaps even the fall, of 21 B.C. Athens was probably not reached until after the beginning (in July) of the new Attic year 21/20 B.C. Dio gives no hint of a new seasonal cycle until the end of his brief account of the provincial settlement in Greece, which also concluded the consulship of Lollius (and Lepidus): "After completing his business in Greece, Augustus sailed to Samos and spent the winter there. In the spring of the year in which Marcus Apuleius and Publius Silius (Nerva) held the consulship [20 B.C.], he proceeded to Asia and organized everything there and in Bithynia."²³

The Augustan settlement at Athens therefore took place at least six months later than is commonly supposed and was completed just in advance of the winter of 20 B.C. Thus Dio never meant for his readers to include 21 B.C. in the accounts of Augustus' eastern winters, thereby leaving four, not five, such occasions (31/30 and 30/29, then 21/20 and 20/19 B.C.). At the same time, the historian provides—as anticipated at 54.6.1—a rather systematic, if schematic, overview of Augustus' new administrative initiatives in Sicily, Greece (and Athens), and then Asia and Bithynia; but only in the case of Greece, with its longer history and greater cultural importance, does the historian pause to elaborate on this theme.

It may be too much to speak of an Augustan 'policy' at this time for the province of Achaëa. Yet a consistent theme runs through the various settlements in Athens and among the Peloponnesian towns, revealing a remarkably conservative, almost antiquarian, concern for the place of an 'Old Greece' within (but still culturally distinct from) the principate. The territorial primacy of Sparta in the Peloponnese, exercised at the expense of the contemporary regional centers of Messene and Tegea, certainly points to such a historically-minded initiative.²⁴ The

²³ Dio 54.7.4 (tr. Rich); in contrast, Bowersock (*supra* n.1: 120) assumes an entire year intervened between Augustus' arrival in Greece and his departure to Asia.

²⁴ This does not mean, of course, that the interests of Sparta's neighbors would always be slighted: a Mantinean embassy to Rome in A.D. 1/2, for instance, won an important imperial decision against the activities of local *negotiatores* (*IG* V.2 268). For the date see A. J. Gossage, "The Date of *IG* V(2) 516 (*SIG*³ 800)," *BSA* 49 (1954) 56.

same can be said of Augustus' liberation of Aegina from Athens. Far from being a willful gesture of imperial displeasure toward the Athenians, the measure betrays a proper recognition of the island's historical independence and its venerable rôle as a counter-weight to Athenian influence over the Saronic Gulf. Such a celebration of the 'traditional' Greece by Augustus in 21 B.C. stands in marked contrast to the approach later taken by Nero, the only Julio-Claudian emperor to visit Greece. During his lengthy tour of the province's various festivals (66–67), Nero sought to develop an alternative model for Greece's contemporary identity, integrating the cultures of province and empire in his hazy vision of an 'imperial Achaea'—a vision that privileged Corinth, provincial capital and imperial-cult center, and the newly expanded Achaean League above Sparta and Athens.²⁵ Dio appreciated the fundamental difference between these two imperial missions, however derisive his account (62.8.2f): "But [Nero] crossed over into Greece, not at all as Flamininus or Mummius or as Agrippa and Augustus, his ancestors, had done, but for the purpose of driving chariots, playing the lyre, making proclamations, and acting in tragedies."

The Evidence of Plurarch (*Mor.* 207E–F)

With the Sicilian winter of 22/21 B.C. fully accounted for in Dio, we are now faced with a second historiographical problem. Dio's account of the Athenian settlement of 21 B.C. is commonly linked with an anecdote at Plut. *Mor.* 207E–F. This isolated passage purportedly preserves a letter written by Augustus to his Athenian subjects during a winter sojourn in the East: Τοῦ δ' Ἀθηναίων δήμου ἐξημαρτηκέναι τι δόξαντος, ἔγραψεν ἅπ' Αἰγίνης βούλεσθαι μὴ λανθάνειν αὐτοὺς ὀργιζόμενος, οὐ γὰρ

²⁵ See G. Woolf, "Becoming Roman, Staying Greek: Culture, Identity and the Civilizing Process in the Roman East," *PCPS* 40 (1994) 133; on Nero's "liberation" of Greece, cf. S. Alcock, "Nero at Play? The Emperor's Grecian Odyssey," in J. Elsner and J. Masters, edd., *Reflections of Nero: Culture, History, Representation* (London 1994) 105f; on Corinth as the center of the province's new imperial cult, see esp. A. J. S. Spawforth, "Corinth, Argos, and the Imperial Cult: Pseudo-Julian, *Letters* 198," *Hesperia* 63 (1994) 211–32.

ἂν ἐν Αἰγίνῃ διαχειμάσειεν. ἄλλο δ' οὐδὲν οὐτ' εἶπεν αὐτοὺς οὐτ' ἐποίησε.²⁶

Bowersock assigned this letter to the imperial visit as recorded in Dio, which he believed to have taken place in the winter of 21 B.C. Because Plutarch's text implies just such a seasonal date, and nothing more, there appeared no reason why the two accounts should not be synchronized, especially as Bowersock had accounted for all the princes' other winters.²⁷ As a parallel account of Augustus' second Athenian sojourn, therefore, the letter's mention of "some offense" (ἐξημαρτηκεῖναι τι) and the consequent anger of the emperor could be explained easily by reference to Dio.²⁸

Because the historical record rules out such a winter sojourn on Aegina, it is difficult to know what to do with Plutarch's evidence. One way out of the difficulty is simply to read Plutarch differently. In this regard the most crucial part of Augustus' letter is the clause concerning his winter plans (οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐν Αἰγίνῃ διαχειμάσειεν), which is universally interpreted as an unfulfilled conditional to mean that Augustus "would not otherwise have finished out the winter on Aegina"—as translated below. Yet the same clause can also be read to imply an original potential optative, which leaves Augustus making the opposite point: "he believed that they were not unaware of his anger, since he *would not finish* out the winter on Aegina."²⁹ On this reading Augustus would have originally planned to remain on

²⁶ "When the Athenian people seemed to have committed some offense, Augustus wrote from Aegina that he believed that they were not unaware of his anger, since he would finish out the winter on Aegina. Otherwise he said nothing, nor did he act against them." Cf. Malcovati (*supra* n.1); the same text appears in the Teubner edition of W. Nachstädt *et al.*, *Plutarch, Moralia* II (1971). Cf. also the Budé edition of F. Fuhrmann, *Plutarque, Oeuvres Morales* III (Paris 1988).

²⁷ Bowersock (*supra* n.1) 120. For other reasons Graindor (17f) already suggested we move the letter-writing episode up to 31/30 B.C.; but Augustus' movements after Actium are fully accounted for in Dio (51.4.1), and the unspecified offense in Plutarch (ἐξημαρτηκεῖναι τι) is evidently too insignificant to refer to the Athenians' support of Antonius.

²⁸ This much is asserted even though Plutarch's own introduction to the letter implies that the Athenian provocation was not aimed primarily at Augustus. Incidentally, Bernhardt (*supra* n.2: 235f) believes that Plutarch's text implies an unsuccessful lobbying effort by the Athenians to have Augustus remain with them for the winter.

²⁹ See Smyth no. 1824 for the original potential optative with ἂν; Bowersock's reading would be better suited to a different emendation, especially ἂν ... διαχειμάζειν (cf. the Budé edition), which would yield the imperfect indicative sense needed (see Smyth no. 1846).

the island, which had been a favorite winter resort for many Hellenistic monarchs,³⁰ but subsequently decided to move on from the province altogether. In this way Plutarch's testimony can at least be squared with the conclusion of Dio's account (54.7.4), which records Augustus' departure from Greece. Hence it would be possible to reassign the letter to the late autumn of 21 B.C., instead of the previous winter when Augustus was in Sicily.

Unfortunately the clause suffers from a textual problem that prohibits any certain reading. Plutarch's text has been emended, because the manuscript tradition preserves a suspect construction (οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐν Αἰγίῃ διαχειμάσειν), using a rare future infinitive with ἂν. As given above, the most widely accepted emendation (from the 1889 Teubner edition of G. Bernadakis) adopts the optative form, διαχειμάσειεν.³¹ The present infinitive διαχειμάζειν has now been suggested as well (in the most recent Budé edition); this straightforward solution would give the conventional interpretation of the passage. A third solution would retain the manuscript's reading of διαχειμάσειν and simply delete the conditional ἂν;³² the word could easily have slipped into the text originally as a duplication of the preposition (ἐν) that follows, and then assumed its final form (*alpha* in place of the *epsilon*) as a later copyist's mistaken attempt at correction. This last solution would also yield the historical reconstruction suggested above—with Augustus using a future indicative to communicate his intention *not* to winter on Aegina.

As matters stand now, however, it is impossible to decide between these interpretations. Consequently, it may be preferable to make more sparing use of Plutarch's evidence. In fact, were we to suppress Augustus' letter altogether, the overall understanding of the Athenian settlement of 21 B.C. would not be materially altered. This is particularly true as we have been able

³⁰ The Attalid purchase of the island (209 B.C.) is recorded in *IG II² 885* (with historical justifications given); cf. Polyb. 9.42.5–8; 22.8.9f. It may have held a Pergamene garrison; see most recently R. E. Allen, *The Attalid Kingdom: A Constitutional History* (Oxford 1983) 42f and esp. 74f; cf. *SEG XXV 320*, an altar dedicated by the Aeginetans to "Zeus (Hellenicus?) and Athena, on behalf of King Attalus."

³¹ See the apparatus in the Teubner edition, Nachstädt *et al.* (*supra* n.26) p.108; the emendation διαχειμάσαι suggested by Emperius in 1847 (accepted in Babbitt's Loeb edition), is generally rejected.

³² An alternative suggestion in Babbitt's Loeb edition (234 n.2), which he offers "simply to accord with what little we know of the historical facts." For the new Budé emendation see Fuhrmann (*supra* n.26) *ad loc.*; cf. p.313 n.6.

to add a greater dimension to Dio's account of the settlement and to adduce a better supplemental source, the Messenian passage in Pausanias.

The Epigraphical Evidence

Finally, consideration of the documentary evidence may also be helpful in opening a strictly local perspective on the Athenian settlement. How, or even whether, the imperial visit was ever publicly commemorated remains an open question. Of the many altars dedicated in the city to Augustus over the course of his principate, some may well belong to this occasion. Even more tentatively, a contemporary prytany inscription may preserve part of a public notice, later deliberately erased, of the imperial visit.³³

On the other hand, the epigraphic record of the period does offer some likely traces of Augustus' enactments. Thus, in connection with the emperor's prohibition of the sale of citizenship, J. K. Davies has observed "a rough correlation" with the virtual disappearance of foreign ephebes listed as *xenoi* by the Augustan period.³⁴ Since at least the late second century B.C. the

³³ Thus D. J. Geagan, "The Third Hoplite Generalship of Antipatros of Phlya," *AJP* 100 (1979) 65ff (=SEG XXIX 125). The prytany document is published partially as *Agora* XV 292a and now complete as SEG XXVIII 161. Altars: nineteen have been identified or posited (including the eleven in *IG* II² 3224–35); for discussion see especially A. Benjamin and A. E. Raubitschek, "Arae Augusti," *Hesperia* 28 (1959) 68–85. Additional examples in D. J. Geagan, "Imperial Visits to Athens: The Epigraphical Evidence," *Praktika, VIIIth Congress for Greek and Latin Epigraphy, Athens, 1983* (Athens 1984) 74 with n.21. There is also the undated statue dedication in *ArchDelt* 29 B (1973–74) 84 with photograph (=SEG XXIX 168).

³⁴ J. K. Davies, "Athenian Citizenship: The Descent Group and the Alternatives," *CJ* 73 (1977) 105–21 at 119 with n.83. The recent redating of several crucial ephebic documents would tend to support Davies' view: *IG* II² 1043 (of 39/38 or 38/37 B.C.) is now the latest inscription known to include the *xenoi* formally; II² 1965 (dated by Kirchner to "fin s. I a.") has been shown independently to represent a previous *ephebeia* of ca 40 B.C. (together with II² 1961, 2463); see S. Dow, "Catalogi Generis Incerti *IG* II² 2364–2489: A Check-List," *AncW* 8 (1983) 95–106 at 98. Working with the incorrect Corpus dates, some have argued that, in response to Augustus' prohibition, foreigners were later catalogued separately, but this practice is not attested until ca 84/85–92/93 (*IG* II² 1996). For this view see C. Pélékidis, *Histoire de l'épheebe attique des origines a 31 avant Jesus-Christ* (Paris 1962) 190f; such an early 'binary

Athenian *ephebeia* had operated as an important avenue for naturalization, with *xenoi* ephebes continuing to be listed as such at least in the 30s B.C. (cf. *IG II*² 1043). The standard type of post-Sullan, first-century B.C. ephebic decree, recording the ritual activities and civic involvement of the 'graduating' class of ephebes, is attested as late as the archonship of the elder Apolexis (probably 21/20 or 20/19 B.C.)—though the appended catalogue is evidently lost, along with the final lines of the decree itself.³⁵ By contrast, the ephebic lists certainly dating to after the Augustan settlement (*IG II*² 1962–64) are apparently formatted in an entirely new manner, omitting any reference to origin, whether demotic or other. The earliest extant new-style document (*IG II*² 1964) can be dated to 20/19 or 19/18 B.C. and thus may represent the very first *ephebeia* (or possibly the second) after its reorganization.³⁶ On this view, the restriction imposed by Augustus had the effect of making entry into the *ephebeia* (with a new tuition cost, presumably) tantamount to the conferral of citizenship. This new scheme would have resulted in a sizable influx of naturalized foreigners each year (perhaps as many as 30–40),³⁷ which may well have had wider social reper-

structure' is accepted by M.-F. Baslez, "Citoyens et non-citoyens dans l'Athènes imperiale au Ier et au IIe siècles de notre ère," in S. Walker and A. Cameron, edd., *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire* (=BICS 55 [London 1989]) 18f with 35f for tabulated documents.

³⁵ Recorded as *IG II*² 1040 (+1025), which has now been reassigned to the early Augustan archonship of Apolexis (Apellikontos) from Oion. For the nature and date of this document (reverting to the view of Graindor 101f), see Kallet-Marx and Stroud (n.40 *infra*) esp. 25ff, with *IG II*² 1043 as an unexplained "aberration." On the *ephebeia* and naturalization, cf. M. J. Osborne, "Athenian Grants of Citizenship after 229 B.C.," *AncSoc* 7 (1976) 107–25 at 114 and esp. 119.

³⁶ See *IG II*² 1964, 1963 (13/12 B.C.). The earlier inscription is linked prosopographically with a statue dedicated to Augustus as the "new Apollo" (*SEG* XXIX 167=*IG II*² 3262+4725) during the imperial visit in August or September of 19 B.C.—thus at the end of the ephebic year 20/19 B.C. or at the beginning of the next in 19/18 B.C. The statue's donor, the ephebic agonothete Poseidonius Demetrius of Phlya, heads the list of ephebes in *IG II*² 1964.2.

³⁷ To judge from the number of *xenoi* in *IG II*² 1043, whose total enrollment of ca 120 ephebes is comparable with that of *IG II*² 1963 (13/12 B.C.); cf. the similar figures from the latter half of the second century B.C. in S. V. Tracy, "Agora I 7181+*IG II*² 944b," *Hesperia* Suppl. 19 (1982) 157–61 at 158f. Note the much larger enrollment in *IG II*² 1961; this *ephebeia* was perhaps even twice as large as the others, to judge from its extant contribution list of three

cussions. Such may be discerned in the sudden Athenian preoccupation with specialized list-making: catalogues of tribes, clans, and the like—all with their implicit emphasis on Attic *eugenia*—were assiduously compiled from the late 20s B.C.³⁸

Certain other Athenian inscriptions of the period may relate to Augustus' new territorial policy toward Athens. The cleruchy on Tenos, one of the islands given back to Athens by Antonius, is known to have honored the princeps' personal quaestor, P. Quinctilius Varus (*cos.* 13 B.C.), by erecting a statue to him as their patron and benefactor.³⁹ Unlike Aegina, never a permanent Athenian cleruchy anyway, the Athenians were evidently confirmed in their ancient dominion over Tenos. Varus' benefactions may well have been conferred while Augustus and his staff were still in the region of Attica, for he was similarly honored at Athens (*IG* II² 4124), or just subsequently, when the imperial court wintered on Samos. Significantly enough, there were some contemporary developments on Lemnos, the single most important Athenian dependency. Sometime during the 20s B.C. a protracted dispute over land-rights arose on the grain-rich island between the declining "cleruchy" of Myrina and (presumably) that of neighboring Hephaestia; some sort of religious matter, perhaps having to do with the celebrated Lemnian Kabeirion, was apparently at issue as well.⁴⁰ At about the time of

tribes (Cecropis, Attalis, Hippothontis), which gives some sixty-eight ephebes (with at least twenty-seven *xenoi*), as compared with thirty-four in the same tribes as listed in *IG* II² 1043.

³⁸ The catalogues of the tribe Leontis (*IG* II² 2461–62) should date to soon after 20 B.C. on prosopographic grounds; the registers of the Ceryces and Amyndridae (*SEG* XXX 93, *IG* II² 2338), which belong respectively to the archonships of Apolexis of Oion and Areius of Paeania, can be placed in 21/20 and 20/19 B.C. On the nature of these catalogues, *cf.* Dow (*supra* n.34) 98, 104.

³⁹ *IG* XII.5 940 (*OGIS* 463; Ehrenburg and Jones, *Documents* 203); considerable diplomatic activity is also indicated in the honors given to the naval prefect C. Iulius Naso (*IG* XII.5 941). For Varus rôle see W. John, "Quinctilius (20)," *RE* 24 (1963) 908f, with E. Badian, "The Quaestorship of Tiberius Nero," *Mnemosyne* SER. 4 27 (1974) 160–72 at 172 with n.35. I owe the suggestion of Samos to the anonymous reader of an earlier draft of this paper.

⁴⁰ The dispute is recorded in at least two extant inscriptions: see the important new study by R. M. Kallet-Marx and R. S. Stroud, "Two Athenian Decrees Concerning Lemnos of the Late First Century B.C.," *Chiron* 27 (1997) *passim*, for new editions of the two relevant documents with detailed epigraphic and historical commentary. With their revisions and new joins, the two inscriptions are now recorded as *IG* II² 1051+1058+*SEG* XXIV 141 (=

Augustus' visit or shortly thereafter, Athenian ambassadors successfully arbitrated both sets of disputes, which were settled to the satisfaction of the two parties concerned and which may also have had the effect of repairing Myrina's fortunes. A commemorative monument personifying the city of Athens, dedicated jointly in the Agora by the Athenian populations on Lemnos and Imbros, may reflect the happy outcome of the settlement.⁴¹

In more general terms the Athenian sojourn of 21 B.C. appears to have inspired a heightened degree of administrative documentation characteristic of imperial advents. As indicated above, Augustus' visit probably coincided with the archon-year of Apolexis of Oion. This year was also notable in that it marked the third hoplite generalship of Antipater of Phlya, who would go on to hold the office for a total of seven times.⁴² As it happens, Apolexis' tenure is by far the best documented of any archonship from the Augustan period, with the survival of at least

"Decree 1") and *IG II*² 1052+1053+1063 ("Decree 2")—with a new join between 1063b and 1053. The specific nature of the Lemnian disputes are alluded to only in a fragmentary manner: in "Decree 1," esp. lines 11, 13, 50 (respectively, disputed rights over "unassigned and public" lands, "relief" for Myrina and its "revival"); in "Decree 2," esp. 43 (reference to a local "procession"). I wish to thank Professor Ronald Stroud for kindly allowing me to read this article before its publication.

⁴¹ J. H. Oliver, *Hesperia* 4 (1935) 57 no. 9. Another possible commemoration survives from Hephaestia in the form of a corporate statue awarded to the Athenian Areopagus (*IG XII.8* 26b), from the second hoplite generalship of Epicrates of Leuconoea—probably before 14/13 B.C. (cf. *IG II*² 1721.14f); Graindor (105ff) connected this dedication, perhaps mistakenly as we are not informed on any action by the Areopagus, to the Lemnian dispute under discussion. For the dates of these disputes, which involved a series of interventions over a period of time, at least three archon-dates and two dating references to *strategoí* are given in "Decree 1" (lines 26–31, names lost); the herald of the *boule* and *demos* in the decree, Oinophilus (II) of Steiria, had served in that office since at least the year of Apolexis' archonship (*Agora XV* 290.9–15). In "Decree 2" the archon-year of Apolexis is mentioned, though perhaps only retrospectively.

⁴² See Geagan (*supra* n.33) *passim*. *Agora XV* 290 (*IG II*² 2467 col. iii lines 1–7) records Antipater's third generalship, which is synchronized with the archonship of Apolexis through *Agora XV* 292a–b, as confirmed by J. S. Traill, "Prytany and Ephebic Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 51 (1982) 208f no. 11 (noted at *SEG XXXII* 137).

eight public inscriptions.⁴³ The following table presents the events of Apolexis' archonship:

Local Events during the Archonship of Apolexis (II) of Oion (21/20 B.C.)	
<i>Strategos:</i> Antipater of Phlya (III)	<i>Herald of the Boule:</i> Oenophilus of Steirea
(1) Hecatombaion = VIII Cecropis	PANATHENAIA (<i>IG</i> II ² 1040.37f) Prytany decree (<i>SEG</i> XXVIII 161)
(2) Metageitnion = IX Hippothontis	Prytany decree (<i>Agora</i> XV 291) Dodecade II (?) (<i>FdD</i> III.2 61)
(3) Boedromion = X Aiantis	CHARISTERIA festival (<i>IG</i> II ² 1040.5ff) ELEUSINIA (<i>IG</i> II ² 1040.38) {Eleusinian Mysteries reformed by Themistocles}
.....
(8) Anthesterion = III Pandionis	Decree for Themistocles (<i>SEG</i> XXX 93)
(9) Elaphebolion = IV Erechtheis	CITY DIONYSIA (<i>IG</i> II ² 1040.37) Prytany decree (<i>IG</i> II ² 1048)
PLUS	Lemnian decree (II) (<i>IG</i> II ² 1063 [+1052-53])

Among the public events mentioned in this list of inscriptions was the city's second *Dodekaiis* procession to Delphi. Presumably modeled on the more elaborate *Pythaidēs* of the late Hellenistic period, there were five such processions during Augustus

⁴³ The following year, 20/19 B.C., though less likely, is not out of the question; most recently canvassed by Kallet-Marx and Stroud (*supra* n.40: 24-27). It should be emphasized that the date of 21/20 B.C. is offered above not on the basis of tribal cycles, as erroneously suggested by J. A. Notopoulos, "Studies in the Chronology of Athens under the Empire," *Hesperia* 18 (1949) 12; cf. J. S. Traill, "Greek Inscriptions from the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 47 (1978) 297 under no. 22. Testimonia in (1) *IG* II² 1040 (+1025) lines 14, 35; (2) II² 1048.2f (*Agora* XV 281); (3) II² 2876; (4-6) *Agora* XV 281.2f, 291, 292a.3 (cf. *SEG* XXIX 125); (7) *FdD* III.2 61.1f (8) *SEG* XXX 93.1f. For the archonship of Apolexis in the Lemnian "Decree 2," see *supra* nn.40-41. The *ephebeia* of Apolexis (ca 40 B.C.) is known from *IG* II² 1965.10-13 (with II² 1961, 2463) and early public office in II² 3505.6. After his archonship Apolexis was listed as the most senior member of the tribe Leontis from Oion (*IG* II² 2641.4: 'Ἀπόληξις Ἀπελλικῶντος] (ἐξ Οἴου)); *contra*, O. W. Reinmuth, "The Attic Archons Named Apolexis," *BCH* 90 (1966) 96f; cf. S. Dow, *A Study of Inscriptions Honoring the Athenian Councillors* (=Hesperia Suppl. 1 [1937]) 191 n.1.

tus' reign—all led by the prominent Athenian benefactor Eucles of Marathon, life-long priest of Pythian Apollo and builder of the so-called Market of Caesar and Augustus.⁴⁴ Perhaps the most extraordinary event in the archonship of Apolexis was the religious reform initiated by Themistocles of Hagnous, the Eleusinian *dadouchos* (sacred "torch-bearer"). In addition to a general reformation of his own *genos* of the Ceryces, Themistocles evidently helped revive the ancient prestige of the Eleusinian Mysteries: after conducting an extraordinary investigation into its ritual customs, the *dadouchos* enhanced the "awesomeness" of the initiation rite, particularly in the summoning of Kore; presumably these improvements had to do with a new and costly staging of the central ceremony in the Telesterion.⁴⁵ Themistocles was also given credit for somehow reorganizing the ancestral priesthood of Poseidon-Erechtheus on the Acropolis (Plut. *Mor.* 843D). Such initiatives apparently formed part of a larger archaizing movement toward the systematic reorganization of Athenian state-cults at this time; in part, this may have also resulted in "a change in the method of appointment for many, if not all, gentilician priesthoods from restricted sortition to direct election, probably by the members of the *genos* which controlled the priesthood."⁴⁶

A year or two later, during the archonship of Areius of Paeania, the lesser-known *genos* of the Arynandridae revised their membership, which administered the ancient cult of Cecrops on the Acropolis; the catalogue was later inscribed onto

⁴⁴ See Graindor 139–47; recorded fully in *FdD* III.2 59–64. On Eucles' rôle see further W. Ameling, *Herodes Atticus I: Biographie* (= *Subsidia Epigraphica* 11 [Hildesheim 1983]) 11.

⁴⁵ Recorded in the honorific decree for Themistocles *SEG* XXX 93 esp. lines 31–37. K. Clinton, *Myth and Cult: The Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Athens 1992) 86, explains the ritual significance of the "ritual summoning" (ἔκκληξις). For the traditional staging duties of the *dadouchos*, see R. Garland, "Religious Authority in Archaic and Classical Athens," *BSA* 79 (1984) 75–123 at 99.

⁴⁶ S. Aleshire, "The Demos and the Priests: The Selection of Sacred Officials at Athens from Cleisthenes to Augustus," in R. Osborne and S. Hornblower, edd., *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis* (Oxford 1994) 337, against the purely constitutional interpretation by J. H. Oliver, *The Civic Tradition and Roman Athens* (Baltimore 1983) 15ff.

the archive walls of the shrine.⁴⁷ An atmosphere of cultural archaism clearly predominated in Athens during the late 20s B.C.—at least among a certain traditionally-minded segment of Athenian society. Although it is impossible to know whether any aspect of this local trend affected Augustus' early experience of the city and its citizens, it is worth noting at least one controversy. The sweeping reforms of Themistocles, as it happens, may well have been the cause of an intense religious dispute over the rightful privileges of the Eleusinian priesthood settled only after the dispatch of a deputation to Rome for the judgment of Augustus, himself an initiate of the Mysteries.⁴⁸

Several important points, and more than one correction, have emerged from this discussion. First, Augustus' letter in Plutarch to his Athenian subjects should be considered not as evidence for the emperor's stay on Aegina but rather for his winter departure from the island and from the province of Greece altogether. This conclusion in turn reopens the more difficult question of how we should relate Plutarch's evidence chronologically with the larger, annalistic history of Cassius Dio. A closer reading of Dio has meanwhile revealed that Augustus' second visit to Athens could not have taken place in the winter of 21 B.C., when he was fully occupied with affairs in Sicily and Rome. Instead, his arrival in Attica must have taken place sometime in the latter half of 21 B.C., probably during the Athenian archonship of Apolexis of Oion, whose tenure preserves such an unusually high degree of public and reform-minded activity.

NEW YORK CITY
September, 1997

⁴⁷ IG II² 2338 with Graindor 30, 97–100; cf. SEG XXX 120. See also R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford 1996) 285f; E. Kearns, "Change and Continuity in Religious Structures after Cleisthenes," in P. A. Cartledge and F. D. Harvey, edd., *Crux: Essays in Greek History Presented to G. E. M. de Ste. Croix on His 75th Birthday* (London 1985) 194f. Soon afterward the *genos* also issued a commendation for an unknown benefactor (SEG XXX 99). The archonship of Areius coincided with the dedication of the Temple of Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis, which almost certainly took place in connection with the princeps' Parthian settlement of 20 B.C.—either at the time of the settlement or during the following year, when Augustus visited Athens for the last time.

⁴⁸ Suet. *Aug.* 93; on the emperor's interest see Bernhardt (*supra* n.2) 235f.