

STEFANO TROPEA

Athens and Rome:
Public Inscriptions and Monuments in the Athenian Asty
between Sulla and Antony

Considering the meagre quantity of official decrees issued in the period included between the First Mithridatic war and the triumviral age, it seems that in that span of time the institutions of Athens found it difficult to preserve the civic and political vitality they had been able to maintain at least until the end of the 2nd cent. BCE. In the 1st cent. BCE, in fact, Athens, already lacerated by several social and political clashes, had to cope also with the economic consequences of the city's involvement in the Mithridatic war on the side of the Pontic king, a choice that broke off the long-lasting relationships of friendship and respect with the Roman senate. Until 88 BCE Athens had kept a positive attitude towards its powerful ally in the Mediterranean up to the point of celebrating, thanks to the policy of the archon Medeios, the goddess Roma on the silver coins of the years 90/1 and 90/89 BCE¹. After the fall of Medeios, discontent towards Rome suddenly spread in

* Throughout the paper I will quote a number of Athenian inscriptions I have studied also by mentioning the corresponding record in the database ELA, *The Epigraphic Landscape of Athens* (<http://www.epigraphiclandscape.unito.it/>): e.g. *IG II² 1028+* = ELA id: 182. I also refer to some Athenian places or archaeological spots as they are reported in the "ELA Places list" and in the database records in the form of digital tags (in the records cf. the tags in *Findspot* and *Original location*); obviously the last element is the most specific: e.g. Agora > Panathenaic Way, east of; when I add "uncertain" (or "?") it will mean that the alleged original location or findspot of an inscription/monument or of a fragment has not been safely identified. For every inscription I analyse or recall here more details and a broader discussion can be found in the corresponding ELA record in the database and in the tables below.

Athens, making the city a declared enemy of the senate and a supporter of Mithridates. Thus, began a period characterized by political instability and social uncertainty in which the Athenians strove to keep alive, at least formally, the activities that best represented the institutional tradition of the city. We therefore see the Athenians issuing yearly honours for the ephebes, their *kosmetai* and their teachers, although the frequency of these issues appears to decrease in this age, and for the treasurers of the *prytany*², allowing private intervention for the restorations of damaged buildings, as it may be observed about the Asklepieion of the *asty*, enacting a few interesting – and problematic – documents about judicial or constitutional matters and most of all bestowing honours and statues on foreign individuals, primarily Romans, to an unprecedented extent. In order to keep her vitality Athens had thus to adapt herself to the changes undergoing in the Greek East and to finally accept Roman pervasive presence in the Eastern Mediterranean. One aspect of Athenian public life did not undergo significant changes in the decades between Sulla and Antony, that is the tendency to exploit conspicuous places of the *asty*, mainly the Agora and the Acropolis, to publicly display the official resolutions issued and the honours granted³: in this respect, as it will be demonstrated, specific sectors of those areas particularly emerge as privileged sites for the engraving of public monuments and inscriptions. Following the purposes of the project *The Epigraphic Landscape of Athens (ELA database)*, launched and developed by Chiara Lasagni since 2015, the paper here presented will discuss significant epigraphic case-studies in the attempt to partially reconstruct the epigraphic and monumental landscape of Athens in the core decades of the 1st cent. BCE, a crucial age for the passage from the Late Hellenistic age to the Imperial period through the strengthening of the ties between the history of Athens and the course of Roman politics.

The honours

Honours were bestowed to foreigners in Athens since the 4th cent. BCE, but, despite the increasing power and influence the Romans gained upon Greece since the Second Macedonian war and Flamininus' declaration, the Romans seem to have received very high consideration among the Athenians only from the aftermath of the battle of Pydna (168 BCE). Both before and after this event the

¹ Cf. Thompson 1961, vol. 2, pls. 122-124; see also Mattingly 1971, 92. On Medeios and the years of the dramatic shift to the side of Mithridates cf. Kallet-Marx 1995, 206-212; Habicht 2006², 327-334; Antela-Bernárdez 2009b.

² Cf. ELA idd: 296, 297, 298, 299, 349.

³ Cf. Liddel 2003 about the places of publication of Athenian state decrees.

Athens and Rome

Romans received some official recognition only when their representatives visited Athens, where they were solemnly welcomed at the Piraeus and later escorted through the city by Athenian magistrates and citizens. This protocol took place twice: in 200 BCE, when Attalos I, Rhodian ambassadors and Roman envoys met in Athens, and at the time of Aemilius Paulus' visit to the city in 167 BCE⁴. These were occasional displays of homage to influential visitors – not only to Romans – coming to Athens. As the decades passed and the prestige and influence of Rome increased in the Greek East, the visits of Roman officials to Athens became more and more frequent, demanding continuous acts of loyalty to the formally independent city of Athens. Defending their traditional freedom, the Athenians accepted to award such displays when they were needed but did not seem to have converted such disposition into a regular way of approaching foreign affairs towards Rome. Other similar displays took place around the mid-2nd cent. BCE, when the Athenians first offered sacrifices to the Roman *demos* (*paullo post* 155 BCE) and then celebrated the *Rhomaia* in honour of the goddess Roma (ca. 149/8 BCE)⁵. We have to wait around fifty years from Pydna before we find evidences that such displays of homages were made regular, representing a first step towards the official grant of honours to Roman individuals in Athens. Epigraphic sources testify that from the archontal year 123/2 BCE the Athenian epebes were entrusted to yearly perform the *apantesis*, the first part of the formal and solemn ceremony of welcome, exclusively for high-ranking Roman magistrates visiting the city⁶. From that year such protocol would have been regularly fulfilled by the epebes and formally recorded in the decrees honouring the epebes, their *kosmetai* and their teachers at least for the next twenty-five years⁷. The text of these decrees reveal two other significant details about the increasing connections between the Romans and the Athenians: first of all, the Romans are always mentioned in these texts as *philoï*, *euergetai* and *symmakoi* of the Athenian people, thus sanctioning the positive official relationships existing between them;

⁴ Perrin-Saminadayar 2004/05, 358-369.

⁵ Agora XV no. 180, l. 11 (the chronology of Pleistainos' archonship is disputed; cf. Habicht 2006², 301 for one of the years following the embassy of 155 BCE); *IG II²* 1938 (archon Lysiades; cf. Habicht 2006², 302).

⁶ *IG II²* 1006+ = Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, 207-212 T26, ll. 21, 75 = ELA id: 210.

⁷ The *apantesis* reserved to the Roman guests is attested for the years 119/8 (*IG II²* 1008+, l. 13 = ELA id: 235), 117/6 (*IG II²* 1009+ = Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, 222-229 T30, l. 18 = ELA id: 210), 107/6 (*IG II²* 1011, ll. 18-19 = Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, 229-233 T31 = ELA id: 233), 102/1 (*IG II²* 1028+ = Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, 233-240 T32, ll. 14-15 = ELA id: 182), 97/6 BCE (*IG II²* 1029, l. 10 = Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, 241-242 T33 = ELA id: 195); cf. Pélékidis 1962, 274 and n. 3; Perrin-Saminadayar 2004/05, 361-362 and fns. 50-53. For the place of display of these inscriptions in the eastern sector of the Agora dominated by the Stoa of Attalos and the monumental eastern entrance to the square see Lasagni - Tropea 2019, 169-173.

secondly, the catalogues of the ephebes prove that starting from 123/2 BCE – or probably from some decade or year earlier – foreigners, including Romans, were finally admitted to the Athenian ephebate⁸. It is perhaps no coincidence that a few years after the first attestation of the *apantesis* for the Romans we see the Athenian *demos* bestowing for the first time a public dedication to a Roman, probably erected on the Acropolis, in honour of the proconsul Sextus Pompeius⁹. This evidence – the first preserved if not truly the first public dedication to a Roman¹⁰ – was followed, almost twenty years later, by the inscribed base and statue awarded to his son, Cn. Pompeius Strabo, on the North slopes of the Acropolis at the cross-road between the Peripatos and the Panathenaic Way¹¹. From these first evidences we can infer not only that the Athenians were rather cautious in honouring Romans at least until the second half of the 2nd cent. BCE, limiting displays of honours to specific moments or occasions (e.g. 167 BCE, 150-148 BCE) before making them regular for a span of time (ca. 123-90 BCE)¹², but also that they had – as it was somewhat common in the Greek East – a predilection for bestowing honours on individuals bound each other by kinship and family ties, a disposition that would have been reproduced sometimes in the following decades.

As is well known, the First Mithridatic War, especially the Athenian support granted to Mithridates in 88 BCE and the siege of the city by Sulla (87-86 BCE), marked a great turning point in the history of Athens, involving the entire local community into a harsh fight for political survival and prestige. As Sulla sacked the city in March 86 BCE, Athens, which formally maintained its independence, definitely fell under the protectorate of Rome, whose influence and authority upon Greece were now reaffirmed and tightened. From this moment onwards, Athenian honours for Romans became even more frequent and magnificent, receiving the highest visibility in the most conspicuous places of the *asty*. Two inscriptions particularly awaken interest in this respect, since they mention two major festivals

⁸ Cf. Pélékidis 1962, 186-191; Follet 1988; Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, 250-253.

⁹ *IG II²* 4100 = ELA id: 392 (ca. 118-117 BCE). Cf. Payne 1984, 207 no. I.41.

¹⁰ It seems proper to leave apart from this matter *IG II²* 4099 = ELA id: 438, whose chronology, identification and monument typology are disputed (dedication to or tombstone of Decimus Cossutius, traditionally identified with the Roman architect assigned by Antiochos IV Epiphanes to the Olympieion, but perhaps alternatively a Roman citizen who died in Athens in the 1st cent. BCE); cf. Payne 1984, 14, 143 no. I.14; Habicht 1989, 19 and n. 63 (= Habicht 1994, 175 and n. 63); Kienast 1993, 202; Byrne 2003, 214, 542.

¹¹ *IG II²* 4101 = ELA id: 393. Cf. Payne 1984, 197-198 no. I.51.

¹² Habicht (2006², 301-302) underlines the difference between the time and type of honours awarded by the Athenians to the Romans in comparison with cities like Samos and Rhodes, among whom the first testimonies of these displays date back to 188 BCE.

celebrated in Athens in honour of Sulla and Antony¹³.

The decree honouring the ephebes of 80/79 or 79/8 BCE (archonship of Apollodoros) and their *kosmetes* Hedulos of Lamptrai, rather well preserved, was issued under the archonship of a man – often identified with a Polycharmos – whose name ended in -ος and the hoplite generalship of Mnaseas, who was also the proposer of the decree (*IG* II² 1039+, ll. 2-4). The text bears three resolutions of the Boule (l. 3, βουλῆς ψηφίσματα) dealing with the activities carried out by the ephebes and their *kosmetes* in their year of service and regulates the awards of public honours to the ephebes and Hedulos of Lamptrai, the honours bestowed by the ephebes themselves to their supervisor and the places of display both of the inscribed stele of the decree, to which a list of the ephebes' names was appended, and the statue and portraits depicting the *kosmetes*¹⁴. What is particularly interesting of this document is the mention of the *Sylleia*, a festival held in honour of Sulla during which the ephebes performed sacrifices and obtained good omens from them (l. 58). The chronology and the historical context of the decree is further strengthened by the mention, among the about one hundred and fifty ephebes honoured, of two princes of Cappadocia, Ariobarzanes and Ariarathes, which are to be identified with the sons of the Ariobarzanes (I) put on the Cappadocian throne by Sulla himself in 96 or 95 BCE, at the time of his praetorship; they figure as Athenian citizens enrolled in the deme Sypalettos and are significantly labelled as Φιλωρωμαῖοι (ll. 140-142)¹⁵. The existence in Athens of a festival celebrating

¹³ *IG* II² 1039+ = ELA id: 214 = Lambert - Schneider 2019, 7-12; *IG* II² 1043+ = ELA id: 245 = Lambert - Schneider 2019, 13-18.

¹⁴ Considering the grant of the Council to the ephebes about the erection of a bronze statue of the *kosmetes* in the Agora and the fact that more than seventy fragments of the original stele had been found by the Byzantine Church of Panaghia Pyrgiotissa, now dismantled, it is likely that this text – as well as many other honorary expressions related to the Athenian ephebate – was set up in a conceptual and spatial connection, on one hand, with the Panathenaic Way, the Dromos where the ephebes held their races and attended processions, and on the other hand with the site of the main Hellenistic gymnasia of the *asty*. Cf. ELA id: 214, *Original location* (Agora > Panathenaic Way, east of; uncertain); Lasagni - Tropea 2019, 169-173, esp. 169-170. This assumption would seem to find confirmation in the statements of the first scholars dealing with the inscribed testimonies of the Athenian ephebate, e.g. Dumont (1875-1876, I, v), who believed that in ancient times they stood «dans le portique d'Attale»; Harrison - Verral 1890, 18 (after Dumont); Guidi 1921/22, esp. 42-46 for the public display of ephebic statues, herms and inscriptions in the Agora; cf. also Pélékidis 1962, 208. Lambert (2020, 126 n. 412) considers the Agora as the probable place of display of the post-Sullan ephebic decrees, dubitatively pointing to the area of the Diogeneion and the Ptolemaion.

¹⁵ The two princes received their education in Athens, but kept tight relationships with the Athenians also later. When the young Ariobarzanes became king in Cappadocia as Ariobarzanes II (63-52 BCE), he commissioned the restoration of the Odeion of Pericles and received a dedication by the three architects engaged in the restoration works, who honoured him as their benefactor (*IG*

Sulla, remembered in history as a merciless enemy of the city, almost a destroyer of Athens, deserves consideration. In fact, we know from the literary sources that during the siege of Athens of 86 BCE and immediately after the conquest of the city Sulla undertook several violent actions towards the besieged: because of the siege the population suffered starvation to such a point that news of episodes of cannibalism and necrophagy are recorded; we also know that Sulla razed to the ground the entire western sector of the Athenian wall, between the Sacred Gate and the Gate of the Piraeus, and cut down the holy woods of Attica and the trees of the Academy and the Lyceum; he also burned extensive portions of the Piraeus, sacked the temples of the Acropolis and killed, especially in the Agora, so many Athenians that a blood-river filled up the square, flooding also the suburb beyond the Dipylon¹⁶. As the sources report, many Athenians died in the attack to the city or after the Roman victory¹⁷, while others were sold as slaves. The testimony of Pausanias in particular depicts Sulla's behaviour towards the Athenians as brutal and savage, inappropriate for a Roman, and attributes to him the destruction of the city, which suffered so greatly that only two hundred years later, under Hadrian, it would have recovered part of its past magnificence¹⁸. Archaeologists have long discussed on the extent of the damages caused by the legions of Sulla in 86 BCE, seeking for reliable archaeological traces of fighting and destruction on the buildings of the Agora¹⁹ or on the facilities of the Long Walls²⁰. Nevertheless, despite the effort in such direction, especially by Hoff, it looks clear that the abundant details about the destruction given in the literary sources did not find sufficient evidences in the material traces, which provide sound proofs about localized fights and destruction but not on the utter annihilation attributed to Sulla's army²¹. Moreover, the literary tradition preserves also a different picture of Sulla,

II² 3426 = ELA id: 348). In the text he bears the official title of *Philopator*, while his father Ariobarzanes I is remembered as *Philorhomaïos*.

¹⁶ See esp. App. *Mith.* 30, 38-41; Plut. *Sull.* 14.

¹⁷ Cf. also Paus. I 20, 6.

¹⁸ Paus. I 20, 7; IX 33, 6.

¹⁹ Hoff 1997, 38-43.

²⁰ Parigi 2016, 388-394. Traces of the booty taken away from Athens have been recognized in the statues and inscribed bases Sulla himself donated to the Ostian temple of Herakles after 82 BCE; cf. Zevi 1969/70, 109-116 (figs. 19-20); Zevi 1976, 60-62, 74-78 figs. 18-27; Coarelli 2021, 91, 93.

²¹ Already Rotroff (1997, 100-106), in the same volume presenting Hoff's paper, reassessed the impact of the Sullan sack of Athens studying potteries coming from the Agora. Also Habicht (2006², 338-341) appeared rather cautious in connecting all the evidences of destruction directly to the Sullan attack, which do not seem to have left Athens as a «champ de ruines». Assenmaker (2013, 396-403) broadly discusses the literary testimonies, the archaeological evidences and the opinions of modern scholars on the matter, developing a "moderate" interpretation on the consequences of Sullan attack to Athens. Parigi (2016) acknowledges that the evidences of destruction on the Long Walls

remembering him also for having spared the city from total annihilation and for having granted freedom and autonomy to Athens²². If on one side the attack to the city caused damages and brought presumably a high number of Athenian citizens to death, on the other hand Sulla wisely decided to stop the massacres and destructions and spared the life to a great number of supporters of the past regime²³, thus deserving the gratitude of the Athenians. In this way Sulla gained, already in the days following the breach of Mar. 1st, a positive reputation for his deeds towards the Athenians, well different from the fame of Mummius about the treatment reserved to Corinth²⁴. In 84 BCE, when Sulla went back to Athens, he definitively reconciled with the population of the city. At that time, he was celebrated as a liberator of Athens, as some coins reproducing the image of the Tyrannicides testify²⁵. The official honours for Sulla and the institution of the *Sylleia*, about which we learn also from an ephebic herm for a winner of the torch-race²⁶, should be dated to about this year. The *Sylleia*, sometimes considered as cult honours for the Roman general²⁷, have been also related to the *Theseia* that celebrated the legendary founder of Athens²⁸. We can thus infer either that the *Sylleia* were held for a few years – until the death of Sulla in 78 BCE – on the occasion of the *Theseia* in the month Pyanopsion (Oct.-Nov.), or that the *Sylleia* should be even identified with the *Theseia*, which might have been renamed for some time in honour of Sulla. The association between the two festivals, not fully provable due to the absence of direct evidences²⁹, has been proposed in accordance to the fact that among the main celebrations of both these festivals there were the *lampades*, the torch-races performed by the ephebes, but also in the light of the contemporaneity between the *Theseia* and the *ludi victoriae Sullanae* held in Rome at the Kalends of November. The two festivals thus celebrated Sulla as a new founder of the two cities, underlining that his passage had inaugurated new eras in the

are very scanty and that, in complex, they look much more limited than the tradition asserted. Cf. also Cuniberti 2006, 143 and n. 67; Leone *apud* Greco 2014, 1047-1049; Parigi 2018. Parigi 2019, which I was able to consult only in the very last days of revision of this article, broadly discusses the literary testimonies and archaeological evidences about the sack of the city by Sulla and generally minimizes the extent of the damages safely assignable to that event, especially if compared to the devastation described by the ancient authors.

²² Plut. *Mor.* 202e; *Synkr. Lys. Sull.* 5, 5; App. *Mith.* 38 (150). Cf. Assenmaker 2013, 400-403.

²³ Plut. *Sull.* 14, 9; Flor. I 40, 10.

²⁴ Plut. *Luc.* 19, 5. Cf. also Strabo IX 1, 20 (C398); Cuniberti 2006, 143-144.

²⁵ Mattingly 1971, 92 (archontal year 82/1 BCE); cf. Habicht 2006², 342, 349.

²⁶ SEG 37, 135 = *Agora* XVIII no. C131, l. 2: [Σ]υλλεῖα λαμπάδα[ν νικήσας].

²⁷ Cf. Habicht 2006², 342; Cuniberti 2006, 144.

²⁸ Raubitschek 1951, 55-57; Payne 1984, 97; Santangelo 2007, 215-217.

²⁹ It is rejected by Pélékidis (1962, 237-239). Burselis (2012, 262 n. 56) asserts that «the Athenian *Sylleia* ... appears as an independent festival».

history of the two cultural and political centres of the Mediterranean. An imposing statue was also set up for Sulla in Athens in order to celebrate his virtue and benevolence towards the Athenian *demos*; although we are not able to find out its original location, since the provenance of the fragments is completely unknown, we may infer that it might have stood in one of the most conspicuous places of the *asty*, perhaps in the Agora³⁰. Habicht, dating an Athenian tetradrachm depicting the statuary group of the Tyrannicides, Harmodios and Aristogeiton, to 84/3 BCE and believing it reflected the image of “tyrant-slayer” Sulla gained in Athens after the death of Aristion, speculated that, exactly as it happened with Antigonos and Demetrios in 307 BCE and as it would have happened after Caesar’s murder with Brutus and Cassius, Sulla’s statue in the Agora may have obtained the most prestigious place for an honorary monument, that is besides the statuary group of the Tyrannicides³¹. Since erecting monuments by the Tyrannicides was normally forbidden, the Athenians of the 80’s BCE would have made an exception only for Sulla. The conjecture by Habicht, which would point to a position of the image of Sulla somewhere by the Orchestra and between the later Temple of Ares and the Odeion of Agrippa, where the groups of the Tyrannicides very presumably stood³², is certainly tantalizing and deserves some consideration, but the silence of the ancient authors and the total absence of archaeological evidences on the association in the Agora between Sulla and the Tyrannicides is somewhat surprising³³. Later Habicht himself confirmed the chronology of the tetradrachm and the image Sulla gained in Athens as “tyrannicide” in 84/3 BCE, but seemed at the same time to abandon the assumption that the Athenians may have granted a statue to Sulla by the Tyrannicides in the Agora³⁴. Clearly the *Sylleia* and the

³⁰ *IG* II² 4103 = ELA id: 395 (*Original location* > Agora, uncertain); on the inscription cf. also Payne 1984, 266 no. I.107.

³¹ Habicht 1976, 135-142, esp. 140-141 (1994, 224-230, esp. 229-230), followed by Payne 1984, 266; Krumeich - Witschel 2009, 208; Azoulay 2014, 195-198. For the tetradrachm cf. Mattingly 1971, 92, *s.v.* Mentor/Moschion (82/1 BCE); Azoulay 2014, 197 fig. 22. For the group of the Tyrannicides in the Agora cf. Ma 2013, 104, 113-114, 118 and *infra*.

³² Cf. Agora XIV, 155-158 and pl. 8; Camp 2010⁵, 104-105; Ma 2013, 104, 113; Di Cesare *apud* Greco 2014, 1077-1079. Fragments of the inscribed base of one of the groups (*IG* I³ 502 = Agora XVIII no. A1) has been found in a late context southeast to the Temple of Ares and north of the Odeion (#M8), but the scholars debate on its original location in the Agora, cf. Agora XVIII no. A1, 4 n. 11.

³³ Azoulay (2014, 195-198), who follows Habicht’s assumption, gives some clues as to the ideological association between Sulla and the Tyrannicides, but also acknowledges the lack of evidence on a material connection between Sulla’s image and the statuary groups of Harmodios and Aristogeiton in the Agora.

³⁴ Habicht 2006², 342 and 349: «[...] à l’époque du second séjour de Sylla dans la ville, [...] les deux magistrats monétaires de l’année 84, Mentor et Moschion, firent représenter sur les

statue erected in a conspicuous place of the Agora for Sulla appeared to the Athenians adequate honours for the liberator (but also the besieger and conqueror) of Athens³⁵.

A parallel case to the decree honouring the ephebes of Apollodoros' archonship is the decree awarding honours to the ephebes of 39/8 or 38/7 BCE (Kallikratides' archonship)³⁶. On one hand the decree is particularly illuminating about the increasing involvement of private citizens in the financial support of the ephebate in this period, as the special honours for the ephebe Sosis of Oe demonstrate (*IG II² 1043+*, ll. 60-74, decree IV)³⁷, on the other hand the decree represents a crucial text for locating the main honorary expressions concerning the Late Hellenistic Athenian ephebate (statues, portraits, inscribed decrees) in the proximity of or even *inside* the Stoa of Attalos, perhaps by the painted portrait the ephebes dedicated to Sosis himself (*IG II² 1043+*, ll. 68-69)³⁸. Most significantly, this text reveals the institution of cult honours for a Roman: in the occasion of his visit to the city in 39-38 BCE Antony was in fact recognized as god and New Dionysos (θεὸς νέος Διόνυσος) and in his honour were held Panathenaic festivals, the *Antoniea Panathenaika* (*IG II² 1043+*, ll. 22-23)³⁹. The foundation of these celebrations represents the height of the positive relationships existing between the triumvir and Athens since his previous sojourn in the city in 42-41 BCE

monnaies d'argent le groupe des "tyrannoctones" Harmodios et Aristogiton. [...] La chose se répéta encore *sous une forme un peu différente* [my italics] quarante ans plus tard, lorsque le gouvernement d'Athènes, toujours de tendance oligarchique, fit exposer la statue en pied des nouveaux "tyrannicides" Brutus et Cassius, à côté du groupe d'Harmodios et Aristogiton».

³⁵ Another honorary base, a very modest inscription and monument assigned to the 1st cent. BCE, was dedicated to a Lucius son of Lucius who is perhaps to be identified with Sulla himself: Agora XVIII no. H407 = ELA id: 394; the fragment was found reused close to the north wing of the Stoa of Zeus and in Antiquity probably occupied an indeterminable spot in the Agora (*Findspot*, Agora > Stoa of Zeus (east of) > #J6, reused; *Original location*, Agora). Van Nijf and Williamson (2015, 107) believe that the decision to celebrate the *Sylleia* in Athens was not spontaneous but seems to have been imposed upon the Athenians by Sulla himself or one of his men.

³⁶ Cf. *supra*, n. 13.

³⁷ Perrin-Saminadayar 2004, 91-92; Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, 256-257 n. 6, 381 no. E-869.

³⁸ Cf. *supra*, n. 14; Lasagni - Tropea 2019, 171-172. ELA id: 245, *Original location* (Agora > Stoa of Attalos, inside).

³⁹ Raubitschek (1946, 148-149), following other scholars, believed that the Great Panathenaic festivals of 39/8 had been renamed after Antony, while Fontani (1999, 198-200) asserted that the Great Panathenaic held in Hekatombaion (Jul.-Aug.) are to be distinguished from the *Antoniea Panathenaika*, specially held at the presence and with the financial support of Antony himself in the winter. It is also worth noting that by 39/8 BCE the *Theseia* had got their original name back (*IG II² 1043+*, l. 22: [... ἐν τοῖς] ἀγῶσιν ἐν τε τοῖς Θησιήο[ις καὶ Ἐπιταφίοις...]); clearly, by this time the *Sylleia* were no longer celebrated in Athens. Cf. also Pélékidis 1962, 236-239; Payne 1984, 99; Kienast 1993, 194-195.

and now renovated and reinforced in the years following the pact of Brundisium (Oct. 40 BCE) and his marriage with Octavia, Octavian's sister, thanks to their visit to Athens of the winter 39-38 BCE⁴⁰. To the same historical and topographical context of this ephobic decree should also belong another inscribed monument dedicated to Antony, a small marble altar or statue base celebrating him and his wife Octavia as benefactor gods: [A]γτωνίου καὶ Ὀ[κτ]αίας δυ(ο)ῖν θε[ῶν ε]ὐεργετῶν⁴¹. The upper-right corner of this block, a fragment about 25 cm wide, has been discovered built into the wall of the house 645a/5 of the Agora, right in front of the northern sector of the Stoa of Attalos (#P8). We may suppose that, although reused, very likely the monument originally stood not far from the place of its discovery, thus somewhere in front of the Stoa of Attalos along the Panathenaic Way⁴². This may be inferred from the fact that a sizeable number of honorary monuments were dedicated to Romans between the sack of the city by Sulla and the age of Antony and that they were regularly set up either on the Acropolis or in the Agora, especially in the area between the Stoa of Attalos and the Dromos where the terrain slopes down to north and the Panathenaic Way bends north-west, leaving an open space dominated by the Bema and the Donor's monument in front of the retaining wall of the front terrace of the Stoa⁴³. Although only about a few of the honorary bases preserved the original location can be precisely identified, it is reasonable to assume that most of them since their erection stood not far from the section of the Panathenaic Way that faces the Stoa of Attalos and that today hosts – on both side of the Dromos – a great number of honorary bases⁴⁴. One of the most imposing statues of this group, first example of the exploitation of this area for honorary purpose, is the monument dedicated to Q. Lutatius Catulus shortly after the Sullan sack of Athens. The statue, which is not preserved, laid on an unfluted column above 7 m tall, whose drums fell in the late III cent. AD and were reused very close to their original location at the extreme north end of the space in front of the Stoa. Since we can determine with acceptable precision the original location of the monument, we may say, following Thompson and Ma, that the height of the column – as well as the growing height of the terrace wall –

⁴⁰ In the same year Antony held the office of gymnasiarch in Athens (Plut. *Ant.* 33, 7). Cf. Fontani 1999, 193-200.

⁴¹ Agora XVIII no. H273 = ELA id: 344; ed. pr. Raubitschek 1946, 149-150. On the stay in Athens of Antony and Octavia in 39-38 BCE cf. also App. *BC V* 76, 322-323; Cass. Dio XLVIII 39, 2. Cf. also Kajava 1990, 71-72, 114 no. 22.

⁴² ELA id: 344, *Original location* (Agora > Stoa of Attalos, in front of; uncertain).

⁴³ Cf. Di Cesare *apud* Greco 2014, 1081 on the “poles” or *epiphanestatoi topoi* of honorary statues in the Agora. In this case, as Thompson (1950, 318) first asserted, the Stoa of Attalos and its terrace wall served «as a background» to the series of statues crowding that space; cf. also Ma 2013, 104, 122; Di Cesare *apud* Greco 2014, 1081.

⁴⁴ Thompson 1950, 317-318; Ma 2013, 68, 104.

was also justified by the downhill terrain characterizing the northern side of the Agora⁴⁵. Honorary monuments were later dedicated not only to Lucullus, who enjoyed a good reputation in the Greek East and received at least two statues in Athens, but also to his brother and daughter. The bases of these monuments, all reused at a later time, were probably scattered between the Sacred Rock, perhaps somewhere by the Propylaia, and the Agora, either generically along the Panathenaic Way or more specifically in the open space in front of the Stoa of Attalos⁴⁶. A few years later a statue supported by a large base was dedicated in the same area also to Q. Caecilius Metellus, later to be known as *Creticus*, celebrated as benefactor and saviour of the Athenian people. In the age of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey the Athenians initially sided with the latter, honouring some of his supporters, such as A. Claudius Pulcher, who also received a statue in front of the Stoa of Attalos, and M. Claudius Marcellus⁴⁷, but after the battle of Pharsalos they bestowed great honours on Caesar, enthusiastically celebrating his *clementia* towards the city. Three honorary bases for Caesar, one bearing a colossal armoured statue and two supporting small monuments, are preserved in Athens, but their original location in the *asty* is highly controversial⁴⁸. They were all reused in the Agora, but probably came from different spots of the square, the colossus perhaps towering above the other honorific statues that crowded the space in front of the terrace wall of the Stoa of Attalos, while the small monuments may have adorned other sectors of the Agora, such as the central portion of the

⁴⁵ Thompson 1950, 318; Ma 2013, 122.

⁴⁶ The dedication for Licinia (*IG II² 4233* = ELA id: 415) appears on a marble stele and is not properly a statue base, although it was most probably associated to a statue of the honouree. The inscription was engraved on the reverse side of a marble plaque bearing *IG II².1 352a*, an honorific decree of the 4th cent. BCE to be placed ἐν ἀκροπόλει. The inscribed stele was thus reused in the 1st cent. BCE for Licinia not too far from the place of display of the original decree. For the honours to Lucullus as *proquaestor* by the Athenian *demos* cf. also *I.Délos* 1620, an honorific base bearing a Latin inscription; Payne 1984, 265 no. I.106.

⁴⁷ The Pompeian M. Claudius Marcellus died in Athens in 45 BCE and was buried in the precinct of the gymnasium of the Academy thanks to Cicero's intercession. The Athenians allowed also the erection on that spot of a marble monument in his honour (*Cic. Fam.* 4, 12, 2-3). A statue for a M. Claudius Marcellus and his wife Flaccilla was set up probably on the Acropolis (*IG II² 4111* = ELA id: 413), but the chronology of the monument and the identity of the honourees are disputed. If this monument actually regards the Pompeian supporter, M. Claudius Marcellus received at least two monuments in Athens, one sepulchral outside the *asty*, the other honorary in the heart of the city. Cf. Kajava 1990, 69-70, 111 no. 6; Habicht 2006², 388-389; Schmalz 2009, 178-179.

⁴⁸ *IG II² 3222* = Raubitschek 1954, 68-69 no. P = ELA id: 404; Agora XVIII no. H249 = ELA id: 405; Agora XVIII no. H250 = ELA id: 406. The archaeologists Thompson and Vanderpool (*apud* Raubitschek 1954, 69) assumed that the large base bearing *IG II² 3222* originally supported a colossal statue of Caesar and that the hole preserved on the top of the block pointed to the presence of a spear leaning on the stone.

Agora on the western side of the Panathenaic Way, presumably by the later Odeion, the western side of the Agora or the north-western space between the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios and the Altar of the Twelve Gods⁴⁹. As it has been discussed above, a particularly conspicuous spot in the Agora was certainly reserved later to the Caesaricides Brutus and Cassius, who received special honours and bronze images in Athens at least since the second half of 44 BCE⁵⁰. The statue base for Brutus has been found reused in a modern archaeological context over the Panathenaic Way in front of the Eleusinion, therefore some meters outside the Agora to the south-east, while the presence of a monument for Cassius, very presumably standing alongside the statue of Brutus, is known only from Cassus Dio's testimony⁵¹. The words of the historian are decisive to assign the original location of these monuments παρά τε τὴν τοῦ Ἄρμωδίου καὶ παρά τὴν τοῦ Ἀριστογείτονος, thus revealing the ideological connection the Athenians suggested between the murder of Caesar and the one accomplished by the Tyrannicides almost five centuries earlier⁵². If we know that in the Agora the images of Brutus and Cassius stood precisely beside the ones of Harmodios and Aristogeiton, perhaps one flanking the right side of the statuary group and the other its left side, we cannot safely locate the original location in the square of the two statuary groups of the Tyrannicides, upon which the scholars have long debated⁵³. Certainly, standing on the western side of the Panathenaic Way, the two groups of the Tyrannicides presumably occupied the same area of the square in the central or more probably in the northern sector of the Agora, as Camp and Ma more recently asserted⁵⁴. Raubitschek speculated that the Athenians may have only reinscribed one of the groups of the Tyrannicides to Brutus and Cassius, but this theory did not gain credit among scholars, so that we may perhaps maintain that the statues for Brutus and Cassius were simply added to the two statuary groups depicting Harmodios and Aristogeiton⁵⁵.

⁴⁹ On the honorific “poles”/epiphanestatoi topoi of the Late Hellenistic Agora cf. again Di Cesare *apud* Greco 2014, 1081. Cf. also Camp 2010⁵, 63 no. 15 (*monument bases near the Metroon*), 118 no. 42 (*monument bases of the Odeion*) and the site map.

⁵⁰ Habicht 2006², 349, 384, 390-393.

⁵¹ Cass. Dio XLVII 20, 4; Raubitschek 1959, 18 = ELA id: 407, *Findspot* (Acropolis > North Slopes > Eleusinion, west of > #S19). For Brutus' and Cassius' visit to Athens in 44-43 BCE see Plut. *Brut.* 24, 1-3; Raubitschek 1957, 4-11.

⁵² Cf. Azoulay 2014, 198-200.

⁵³ Cf. *supra*, n. 32. On the precise position of Brutus' and Cassius' images see Agora XIV, 159.

⁵⁴ Camp 2010⁵, esp. 104; Ma 2013, 104, 113. *Contra*, Krumeich and Witschel (2009, 208) place the two groups in the centre of the square; cf. also Azoulay 2014, 201 fig. 23 (after Agora XIV, pl. 8, but more confident on the position of the groups of the Tyrannicides in the central part of the square).

⁵⁵ Raubitschek 1959, 21; *contra*, Ma 2013, 104.

Finally, in the period of Antony's and Octavia's stay in Athens or following their departure in 38 BCE three other individuals were significantly granted honours in Athens in light of their close ties to the Roman general, as well as high honours continued to be awarded by the Athenians to Antony himself⁵⁶. In the Agora both C. Cocceius Balbus, legate of Antony and *imperator*, and M. Iunius Silanus, Antony's financial officer in Greece between 34 and 32 BCE, received honorary statues in the space facing the terrace wall of the Stoa of Attalos. Balbus' statue stood on an unfluted column more than 2 m high, while Silanus' bronze image raised upon an articulated base that was curiously dedicated to the gods not by the Athenians, but on the part of the *koinon* including Boiotians, Euboians, Locrians, Phocians and Dorians. The benevolence Silanus showed towards these peoples as *antitamis* probably deserved their gratitude, although we are not able to explain why this dedication was set up in Athens. It is possible either that the city was chosen as honorary site for Silanus since it functioned as headquarters of Antony, as Geagan supposes, or that at the time the dedication was sanctioned by the *koinon* Silanus was stationed in Athens⁵⁷. At about the same time the Athenians rededicated an earlier statue on the Acropolis, north of the Erechtheion, to an Aristokrates who is most likely to be identified with the Greek orator who was friend to Antony⁵⁸. As the honorary inscribed base reused for him, which most probably was not moved from its original position, reveals, at some point he had received the Roman citizenship from Antony himself and was therefore celebrated in Athens as Μᾶρκον Ἀντώνιον [Ἄρι]σ[τοκρά]τ[η]ν⁵⁹.

⁵⁶ Between 39 and 31 BCE the bases of two *kolossoi*, originally dedicated to Pergamene kings beside the Parthenon, were reinscribed in honour of Antony (ELA id: 411-412). Plutarch (*Ant.* 60, 6) reports that shortly before the final battle against Octavian the two statues were thrown down by a hurricane, one of the omens foretelling Antony's defeat and death, but they were probably brought down by the Athenians themselves after Actium; cf. Di Cesare 2010, 237-238.

⁵⁷ Cf. *Agora* XVIII, 226 and n. 309. It must be noted that the fragments of these two monuments were both found reused in later buildings that occupied portions of the ancient Stoa of Attalos, which in 1860 the first editors mistook for the Gymnasium of Ptolemy and the Stoa Poikile; cf. ELA id: 403 (Balbus), *Findspot* (Agora > Stoa of Attalos, south-west end > Tower W5: Church of Panaghia Pyrgiotissa, demolished; formerly known as: Gymnasium of Ptolemy); ELA id: 423 (Silanus), *Findspot* (Agora > Stoa of Attalos; formerly known as: Stoa Poikile).

⁵⁸ Cf. Plut. *Ant.* 69, 1.

⁵⁹ In the late 30s BCE also two women related to supporters of Antony visited Athens. A Sempronia, probably the sister-in-law of L. Sempronius Atratinus and wife of L. Gellius Publicola, received a statue on the Acropolis, while Sempronia Atratina, daughter of Atratinus and wife of P. Aemilius Lepidus, set up a dedication on the Sacred Rock. On the identification of the two women and their family ties cf. Kajava 1990, 72-74, 115 nos. 30-31.

The Asklepieion

A very interesting context for this period is the site of the Asklepieion that since the end of the 5th cent. BCE occupied one of the terraces of the southern slopes of the Sacred Rock. Although part of the area of the southern slopes of the Acropolis had suffered damages due to the events related to the siege laid by Sulla to the last stronghold held by Aristion⁶⁰, we have no direct testimonies about traces of destruction concerning the facilities of the sacred precinct of Asclepios. Nonetheless, the epigraphic sources give us news of restoration works undertaken since the 60s of the 1st cent. BCE on several buildings of the precinct on the initiative of some private Athenian citizens who served as priests of Asclepios and Hygieia at the temple. From these texts most of the scholars have inferred that the Asklepieion was severely damaged at the time of Sulla⁶¹. As the inscriptions reveal, some private citizens financed at their own expense the restoration works on the damaged parts of the precinct. The most zealous men sponsoring these works were two priests from the deme Kephissia: Socrates, who was in charge in a year between 75/4 and 62/1 (perhaps 63/2 BCE), and Diocles, who operated in the Asklepieion in 51 BCE⁶². Socrates is known from an inscribed architectural element that reports about the restorations undertaken by him on a spring (κρήνη) and an entrance (εἴσοδος), perhaps the monumental access to the spring itself (e.g. the Sacred Spring on the north-east corner of the precinct). He is said to have also provided the site with new doors⁶³. The inscription runs on a triangular base which had been presumably part of a choregic monument and was then reused to commemorate the accomplishment of the restorations. The four fragments of the inscribed marble have been found by Koumanoudes in the north-east corner of the precinct between the entrance to the cave spring and the western *analemma* of the Theatre of Dionysos⁶⁴, therefore most probably a few meters away from the original place of the inscription right at the entrance to the cave from the Doric Stoa, where it perhaps decorated one specific point of the facilities composing the door itself⁶⁵.

⁶⁰ See App. *Mith.* 38 (149) about the fire that destroyed part of the Odeion. Appian ascribes it to the responsibility of Aristion himself, while Pausanias (I 20, 4) reports that the fire was caused by Sulla.

⁶¹ Aleshire 1991, 16; Habicht 2006², 338; Melfi 2007, 358-359; Saporiti *apud* Greco 2010, 183; Parigi 2013, 449. Cf. also Assenmaker 2013, 398-399.

⁶² Aleshire 1991, 105-106 no. 4032 (Diocles), 189 no. 13112 (Socrates); Melfi 2007, 359, 397, 422 tab. 4 nos. 144-145, 534.

⁶³ *IG II²* 4464 = ELA id: 345. For a good plan presenting a reconstruction of the precinct of Asclepios as it appeared in 1st cent. AD cf. Travlos 1971, 129 Abb. 171; Greco 2014, 180 fig. 89.

⁶⁴ Ed. pr. Koumanoudes 1876, 527-528 no. 10.

⁶⁵ As already proposed by Aleshire (1989, 34), the inscription would not refer to the entrance door of the precinct, but only to the entrance of the Round Spring House located in the heart of the

The activity of Diocles is described in a very well-preserved decree dating back to the 28th day of Skirophorion in the archontal year of Lysander (52/1 BCE), therefore at the very end of the archontal year⁶⁶; the text concerns some repairs to be made in the following year, when Lysiades was designated to serve as archon (51/0 BCE). Through these restorations Diocles intended to bring the temple back to its *archaias taxis* (ll. 14-18), but in the meantime inaugurated a new phase of the sanctuary. As it is repeated several times in the decree, more specifically in the request of permission for the repairs, in the grant by the Council and in the prescribed text of the dedications that would have been set up on the restored elements, the repairs would have regarded: the doors of the *propylon*, i.e. “the doors that previously led to the *hieron*”⁶⁷; the roof of the back part of the *propylon* itself, a sort of roofed hall at the back of the *propylon* being part of it⁶⁸; the *naos* of the ancient temple (*aphidruma*) of Asclepios and Hygieia, which had to be either partially restored or entirely rebuilt⁶⁹. The decree also provided that these elements should have been decorated with two dedications preserving the memory of the repairs. These texts would have been displayed directly on the restored parts of the *propylon* (ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν θυρῶν καὶ τῆς στέγης, ll. 23-27) and on the walls of the *cella* (ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ναοῦ, ll. 27-30). Therefore, the text of the decree itself, whose stone has been found generically on the terrace occupied by the *temenos*, should have been erected in a place of great visibility strictly related to the repairs financed by Diocles. In this regard there are several possibilities of location that may be discussed. The inscribed stele may in fact have been

temenos; cf. also Melfi 2007, 359-360, esp. 360: «non è, dunque, inverosimile che l’epigrafe di Socrate fosse effettivamente posta a ricordare esclusivamente un restauro della grotticella che custodiva la fonte sacra, alla quale si fornirono porte ed un inquadramento architettonico di qualche tipo». For other restorations realized on the Doric Stoa in the middle of the 1st cent. BCE cf. Parigi 2013, 449.

⁶⁶ IG II² 1046 = ELA id: 222.

⁶⁷ IG II² 1046: τὰ θυρώματα τῆς πρότερον οὔσης εἰς τὸ ἱερόν εισόδου (ll. 11-12); θυρῶσαι τὸ ἀρχαῖον πρόπυλον (l. 16); τὴν ἀνάθεισιν τῶν θυρωμάτων (l. 20).

⁶⁸ IG II² 1046: τὴν ὀπίσω τοῦ προπύλου στέγην (ll. 12-13); στεγάσαι δὲ καὶ τοῦ προπύλου τὸ ὀπίσω μέρος (ll. 16-17); στεγάσαι τοῦ προπύλου τὸ ὀπίσω μέρος (l. 21).

⁶⁹ IG II² 1046: τὸν ναὸν τοῦ ἀρχαίου[ου] ἀφιδρύματος τοῦ τε Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ τῆς Ὑγείας (ll. 13-14); τὸν ναὸν τὸν ἀπέναντι τῆ[ς] εἰσόδου (ll. 17-18); κατασκευάσαι[ι] δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀρχαῖον (ναὸν) (ll. 21-22). The use of verb κατασκευάζω at ll. 15 and 21 does not help in understanding the nature and extent of the repair works. The rare word ἀφιδρύμα may indicate images or statues of divinities (cf. Suda, s.v. ἀφιδρύματα: τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἀγάλματα; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* II 22, 2; Strabo XII 5, 3, C567; Plut. *Num.* 8, 12), reproductions of temples, altars or statues (Diod. Sic. XV 49, 1-2; Strabo VIII 4, 4, C360; XVI 4, 4, C769), branch sanctuaries, but also proper cultual buildings or *sacella* (Cic. *Att.* XIII 29, 1; Strabo VI 2, 6, C 272). The word *aphidruma* is intended in the meaning of “branch sanctuary” especially by Aleshire (1989, 32 n. 4: «i.e. a sanctuary founded as an outpost by another sanctuary»), since the Athenian Asklepieion was believed to have been founded as an outpost of the renowned sanctuary of Epidauros.

set up leaning against the wall of the precinct that faced the Peripatos, either on the internal or the external side, perhaps by the same *propylon* repaired by Diocles that already hosted the more specific text about the restorations made on that element; the exact location of this entrance is unknown, but the definition provided by our decree about “θυρώματα that previously led to the *hieron*” made possible to place that entrance in the middle section of the southern wall of the *temenos*. The *propylon*, not to be identified with the one drawn by Travlos, should have been later obliterated by the erection of the Augustan stoa; the *propylon* thus identified should have made the visitor entering the precinct look at the temple, especially at the southern wall of the building or its south-east corner, «approximately in front of him/her»⁷⁰. This would confirm the definition given in the decree to the *naos* as τὸν ἀπέναντι τῆ[ς] εἰσόδου (ll. 17-18), “facing the entrance”. It should not be ruled out also the possibility that the decree was originally set up either along the internal or external walls of the temple itself, therefore by the restored *cella* decorated with the more specific inscription about that part, or in the space between the access from the Peripatos and the sanctuary, perhaps leaning against some votive monument or other pre-existing facilities about which we have no archaeological and topographical attestations.

Problems arise with the interpretation of another inscription from the Asklepieion dealing with other building works realized in the *temenos* in the 1st cent. BCE⁷¹. The text, inscribed on an epistyle block ca. 1.60 m wide, records the erection of an ‘adjoined’ *oikos* and an exedra in the *temenos* of Asclepios and Hygieia by a priest from Kephissia who accomplished these works in the archonship of L[- -]. The major issue concerns the chronology of the text due to the problematic identification of the donor from Kephissia and of the fragmentary name of the archon. Graindor placed the text in the Augustan age mainly from palaeography, believing that the works had been undertaken in the archonship of Leonidas (12/1 BCE) by an unattested donor from Kephissia⁷². Follet revised this interpretation assigning the inscription to the archonship of Lysiades (51/0 BCE) and

⁷⁰ Melfi 2007, 362-363. Cf. Aleshire 1989, 32-34; Saporiti *apud* Greco 2010, 183. On the identification of the *propylon* mentioned in the decree with the original access of the temple, dating back to the end of the 5th cent. BCE and represented on the “Monument of Telemachos” cf. Beschi 1967/68, 396-397; Saporiti *apud* Greco 2010, 184 F.18; *contra*, Travlos (1971, 127-128, 129 Abb. 171) argued that the *temenos* had two *propylaia*, one along the western wall of the *temenos*, thus looking to the rear side of the sanctuary, the other, enriched by a roofed hall on the back, between the south-west corner of the *temenos* and the so-called Outer Pelargikon.

⁷¹ IG II² 3174 - SEG 39, 212 = ELA id: 346.

⁷² Graindor 1917, 6-7 no. 5; followed by Kirchner (IG II² 3.1, 3174); Melfi 2007, 361, 422 no. 146; Ma 2008, 14 (mistakenly pointing to the «first century AD»).

identifying the benefactor in the same Diocles of the decree *IG II² 1046*, thus restoring in l. 1 [Διοκλῆς Διοκλέου]ς Κηφισιεύς ἱερεὺς γενόμενος ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ Λ[υσιά]δου ἄρχοντος ἐνιαυτ[ῶι]⁷³. Certainly, the text poses issues also about the already debated topography of the Asklepieion, since it mentions two facilities previously unattested in inscriptions and whose traces have not been detected by the archaeologists. First of all, we cannot establish whether in that occasion the ‘adjoined’ *oikos* and the exedra have been properly built up or just repaired, since the closing verb [ἀ]νέθη[κεν] referring to the dedication does not give clues about the nature of the works undertaken. Secondly, we are not able to understand the purpose of these two facilities or their position in the *temenos*, while we can safely assert that the inscription deals with two structures different from those mentioned both in *IG II² 4464* (Spring, entrance to the Spring) and in *IG II² 1046* (entrance doors to the temple, roofed rear hall of the propylon, *naos* of the shrine). No elements, in fact, lead to a possible identification of the *oikos* and exedra with one of the structures mentioned in the two decrees⁷⁴. Therefore, if the inscribed epistyle block is to be associated, at least chronologically, to the repairs promoted by Diocles and announced in the decree of 52/1 BCE, as I believe, we may surmise that this priest from Kephissia undertook a vast and ambitious program of restorations in the Asklepieion in the mid-1st cent. BCE⁷⁵. A third issue concerns the original location of this third inscription in the *temenos*. It may be surmised that the inscribed epistyle decorated one of the two facilities repaired inside the precinct by the dedicator. Therefore, rejecting the identification of the *oikos* with the roofed hall at the back of the *propylon*, we cannot recognize it as the specific text regarding the repairs of the monumental entrance to the precinct (*IG II² 1046*, ll. 23-27). Moreover, the block was reused in an Early Byzantine basilica, as a later decorated moulding on the lower surface attests, and the three fragments composing the inscription were later separated and stored in different places of the *asty*. Only frg. *a* was found somewhat close to the middle terrace of the southern slopes of the Acropolis⁷⁶.

⁷³ Follet 1989, 41-44; followed by Aleshire 1989, 214 n. 1.

⁷⁴ Melfi 2007, 361; *contra*, Follet (1989, 43) translated [τὸν π]ροσκέμενον οἶκον with “la pièce voisine” and identified it with the στέγη of *IG II² 1046*, ll. 13, 23, 26; cf. also Aleshire (1991, 106), who follows Follet in this identification.

⁷⁵ This is admitted also by Melfi (2007, 361), even though she prefers to date the text to 12/1 BCE; *contra*, Aleshire (1991, 106) believes that *IG II² 3174* is the epistyle of the *propylon*.

⁷⁶ It was found in 1834 by Pittakis on the site of the temple of Demeter Chloe, located on the terrace just beneath the Acropolitian sanctuary of Athena Nike, but Follet (1989, 42) suspects that it was actually discovered in the area of the Asklepieion and that Pittakis reported the findspot either generically or through a mistaken identification of the site.

Laws, constitutions and lawcourts

Another noteworthy context about the public life in Athens in the period between Sulla's siege and the visits of Antony concerns the constitutional settlements in force in the city. We possess a few fragmentary inscriptions providing interesting information about such matter, although the scholars debate on their interpretation. The position of these text in the Athenian topography is also problematic.

The harsh debate on the nature of the Athenian constitution after Sulla rises primarily from the ambiguous testimonies of the ancient authors⁷⁷. Appian claims that Sulla deprived the Athenian citizens of the right to vote, promising to grant the city its freedom later and to restore the right only to their descendants, and that he punished those who had opposed the constitution previously given by the Romans to Greece, which was from that moment reintroduced by new laws⁷⁸. Plutarch and Strabo report that Sulla after the conquest and sack of the city pardoned the citizens awarding *eleutheria* and *autonomia* to Athens⁷⁹. These statements, partially deriving from Sulla's memoirs, present the Roman general as the restorer of the political order existing before Athens' support to the Pontic cause. Sulla, also celebrated as the "tyrant-slayer", had brought back the city to the Roman allegiance, restoring the influence of the senate on Athens and reasserting on it the political arrangements defined by Rome for Greece. Nevertheless, Athens was since 205 BCE a free city allied to Rome and, protected by this *status*, no specific constitution could be imposed on it at least until 86 BCE. The existence of a proper "Sullan constitution" for Athens is today considered less probable and his political resolutions seem now only to have given back the authority to the aristocracy – or better the 'new aristocracy' – that under Roman patronage had dominated the trades with Delos and the local policy in the pre-Mithridatic decades. Three inscriptions dated to the years between 86 and 38 BCE must be particularly discussed in the attempt to partially reconstruct the institutional settlement of the city.

The first text, whose interpretation is very controversial also because of the poor state of conservation of the inscription, reports perhaps a law code approved by the Areopagus and later ratified by the Athenian assemblies⁸⁰. It deals with a community that desired to live «in democracy» (ἐν δημοκρατίαι, l. a 7) and to be governed by magistrates chosen «by allotment and show of hands» (οἱ κλήρωι καὶ χε[ιροτονίαι ἐκλεγόμενοι], l. a 8). The practice of sortition through *kleroteria* is mentioned several times in the text (ll. a 8, 10, 20, 23) as well as we can find also a

⁷⁷ Cf. esp. Geagan 1967; Hoff 1994; Kallet-Marx 1995, 212-220; Habicht 2006², 345-353; Ferrary 2014², 217-218.

⁷⁸ App. *Mith.* 38 (150), 39 (151-152).

⁷⁹ Plut. *Synkr. Lys. Sull.* 5, 5 (*supra*, n. 22); Strabo IX 1, 20 (C 398). Cf. Cuniberti 2006, 144.

⁸⁰ SEG 26, 120 - SEG 30, 80 = Agora XVI no. 333 = ELA id: 277.

reference to a principle of equality (l. *a* 14). Scholars have long debated whether the text should be ascribed to a democratic or demagogic government established in Athens or instead to an oligarchic constitution, as the central role apparently attributed by the text to the Areopagus and the association of election and sortition may prove. On the same level, the chronology of the text is also harshly disputed, since it has been dated to the 2nd cent. BCE, but also to the stormy years of the First Mithridatic war (88/7 BCE, pro-Mithridatic regime of Athenion⁸¹; 87/6, year of Sulla's siege⁸²; 84/3, post-Sullan constitution⁸³); on the contrary, Habicht has wisely affirmed that the state of conservation of the text should prevent anyone from giving a precise chronology to the inscription, perhaps to be assigned to a period before Sulla's conquest of the city, and from attempting an interpretation of the text⁸⁴. With these assumptions, it looks clear that also the identification of the original location of the text is problematic, chiefly because the publication clause is not preserved (the three fragments have been found reused in the Agora). Nevertheless, the text may be related to another inscription, dated to the middle of the 1st cent. BCE (or the very end of the 2nd cent. BCE?), preserving the final section of a decree or a law code⁸⁵. It was to be publicly engraved «so that it may not fall into oblivion because of time» (ll. 4-5) and probably promoted the persistency in Athens of the «usual democratic spirit» (ll. 9-11), probably referring to a democratic constitution or, again, to principles of equality regulating Athenian public life⁸⁶. In any case, a similar height of letters, apparently coeval letter-forms and perhaps also an analogy about the contents may reveal the possibility to associate *IG II² 1062* and the decree *Agora XVI* no. 333 as two close texts dealing with judicial or constitutional matters and referring to the traditional democratic ideals which permeated Athenian political life at every stage of its history⁸⁷. In this case we may feel a little more confident about the original location of the stone bearing the text, since in

⁸¹ Badian 1976, 115-117; cf. *SEG* 26, 120.

⁸² Oliver 1980, 199-20, followed by Antela-Bernárdez 2009a, 105-108. The constitution, manifesting Peripatetic principles, is attributed by Oliver to Athenion himself and to the archontal year 87/6 BCE.

⁸³ Geagan 1971, 101-108 no. 3.

⁸⁴ Habicht 1995, 318-320; cf. Habicht 2006², 352-353.

⁸⁵ *IG II² 1062* = *ELA* id: 276.

⁸⁶ The decree has been associated to one of the democratic governments perhaps introduced in Athens following 49 BCE and the civil war won by Caesar, when several political shifts and constitutional changes occurred in the city of Athens. We are not able to establish whether and when passages from oligarchy to democracy (or vice versa) took place; cf. Habicht 2006², 351-352. For a dating of the text to about 100 BCE see now Papazarkadas 2021, 116 and n. 52.

⁸⁷ Only a closer study on the two texts through an in-depth autoptic examination of the fragments and a study of the letter-forms on the model of Tracy's research may confirm this conjecture and help to establish the degree of similarity between the two inscriptions.

IG II² 1062 the clause of display is attested at ll. 6-8: it provides that the text is to be engraved most probably in more copies and to be set up on the Acropolis (the toponym is restored) and in the lawcourts of Athens. On the other hand, we un-luckily possess no clues about the place of discovery of the inscribed fragment of *IG II²* 1062. The clear mention to the lawcourts may allude to the buildings of the Agora and in particular of the southern sector of the square, made monumental in the 2nd cent. BCE but later probably abandoned, at least for judicial aims, in the 1st cent. BCE⁸⁸. Nevertheless, in the light of an epigraphic discovery of 2003 we must also consider another possible location for the *dikasteria* in Late Hellenistic Athens. In an article of 2017 Papazarkadas has examined a decree of 103/2 BCE about “monthly lawsuits” (ἔμμηνοὶ δίκαι) whose stone has been found in a rescue excavation at 98β Adrianou Street, in the Plaka⁸⁹. The editor maintains that in that neighbourhood it may be identified another possible district of *dikasteria* and court buildings where sortition was regularly carried out, as the finding of a *kleroterion* has revealed⁹⁰. Papazarkadas referred particularly to facilities like the Diogeneion, the Prytaneion, about which a location near St. Demetrios Katiphoris has been supposed, and the Theseion, thus pointing to the area north-east of the Acropolis and east of the Roman Agora that hosted the north-east corner of the Post-Herulian walls⁹¹. As well as a location in the Agora, which was deduced

⁸⁸ From the half of the 2nd cent. BCE buildings like the so-called Aiakeion, the East Building, the Middle Stoa or the South Stoa (II) probably reproduced in the new monumental square the activities carried out, between the 3rd and the mid-2nd cent. BCE, by the great peristyle building unearthed under the northern section of the Stoa of Attalos. The excavation of that site east of the Panathenaic Way has provided samples of “*psephoi*” and even a sort of “ballot box”, findings that may evoke the practice of sortition mentioned several times in the text Agora XVI no. 333 (on the early buildings under the Stoa of Attalos and the “ballot box” cf. Agora XXVIII, *passim*; Camp 2010⁵, 119-122; Malacrino *apud* Greco 2014, 1147-1151; Papazarkadas 2021, 116; on the interpretation of the Heli-aia/Aiakeion as a lawcourt cf. Agora XXVIII, 103; Camp 2010⁵, 164 fig. 130). However, the judicial function of the area has not been thoroughly ascertained; moreover, it seems that to the (partial?) abandonment of the southern sector of the Agora may have somewhat contributed the damages due to Sulla’s siege of Athens, but still lack decisive proofs. Partial restorations in the area were undertaken only decades later (cf. Agora XXVIII, 91-98, 103; Camp 2010⁵, 164-171; Dickenson 2017, 152-157; on the destruction of buildings in this area by Sulla and their restoration cf. Hoff 1997, 38-43; Leone *apud* Greco 2014, 1048-1049; extent of Sulla’s devastation reassessed and minimized in Parigi 2019, 84-86).

⁸⁹ Papazarkadas 2017, 326-328 (text, photos and translation). The text has been examined in ELA id: 347.

⁹⁰ About the *kleroterion* unearthed in the same excavation which brought to light the decree published by Papazarkadas cf. Papazarkadas 2017, 338 n. 58, 351; now Papazarkadas 2021.

⁹¹ Papazarkadas 2017, 350-352; ELA id: 347, *Findspot* (Athens > Plaka > Odos Adrianou); *Original location* (Athens > Plaka; uncertain, other possible locations for court buildings should not

from the findspots of the fragments of *Agora XVI* no. 333, this other area east of the Agora should therefore also be taken into account in the attempt to reconstruct the original place both of the lawcourts that functioned in Athens in the 1st cent. BCE and of the stones bearing law codes or decrees on judicial matters that were also set up in the judicial district of the city.

One last interesting example is represented by a fragmentary text bearing two decrees, the final lines of the first and the opening formulae of the second⁹². The mention of the archon Demochares, in charge “after Demetrios”, in the second text has permitted to date the decrees to 49/8 BCE, in a moment preceding the battle of Pharsalos and the visit of Caesar to Athens. The decree may have been issued jointly by the Boule and the Demos (l. 11), perhaps testifying that the two assemblies began to collaborate again after decades in which the Demos appears to have been rather inactive or minimally involved in the decision-making process in Athens. Although the contents of the text are hardly understandable due to the fragmentary condition of the stone, the new mention of the Demos has been taken by the scholars as particularly significant for the political set-up of Athens in the middle of the 1st cent. BCE. Nevertheless, the text tells us less than one may think on the constitutional settlement of Athens in that time, since we cannot truly understand which role the Demos had covered in the past decades and which role it was to assume in this new historical and troubled phase for Athenian institutions⁹³. We are only able to place generically the inscribed stone on the Acropolis thanks to the publication clause of the first decree (ll. 2-3), while the place of discovery of the fragment in a non-archaeological context (by a modern fountain that in the late-19th cent. decorated the district of Psyri) prevents us from being more accurate on its original place of display.

Conclusion

It appears clear that in the decades here discussed the political life of Athens was substantially limited by the diminished activity of the public assemblies, which issued no more than ten or eleven decrees and laws in a span of around forty years, suffering of a chronic political instability due to frequent and not entirely clear shifts

be ruled out). Cf. also Papazarkadas 2021, 116-118. For the Prytaneion cf. Greco 2011, 535-537 F.42 (Di Cesare); for the Theseion see Greco 2011, 551-553 F.47 (Di Cesare).

⁹² *IG II²* 1047 = ELA id: 246.

⁹³ Habicht 2006², 350-351.

of regimes and constitutions⁹⁴. On the contrary, the cultural and religious climate of Athens preserves its vitality thanks to a lively sequence of religious celebrations, educational activities related to the ephebate and the philosophical schools, and honorary displays for foreign politicians and visitors. Most of the public efforts sustained by the local institutions with the help of private economic intervention in that period relate to such expressions. Some specific areas of the *asty* appeared in a state of decay, as they may have begun to appear already at the end of the 2nd cent. BCE, or suffered damages of different extent and nature. Restoration campaigns, mostly left to the private initiative of wealthy citizens, as we have seen in the case of the Asklepieion, started only in ca. 80 BCE and seem to be not too extensive and relevant, allowing to reassess or scale down the impact of the events related to the siege of Sulla on the buildings of Athens⁹⁵. Monumental changes involved only specific sectors of the most significant areas of the *asty* and appear to definitely convert Athens into a cultural capital of the Mediterranean in search of a new identity within the Graeco-Roman world. The performance of traditional and new religious rites and cultural activities and the erection of honorary monuments to the masters of the East were now the main elements of the prestige of a city that strove to preserve the memory of her glorious past and to adapt herself to the new condition of the Greek world. In the attempt to cope with this metamorphosis at the eyes of the Athenians the Acropolis and the Agora still maintained, even in those troubled decades, their key-role as most significant places of display for any epigraphic or monumental object of official relevance. Although partially altered by the events of the 1st cent. BCE and the rearrangements of the period, they truly were, once more, the two beating hearts of Athenian public life. An exception appears to be the judicial activities and texts, since the Acropolis seems to have maintained its role as place of display of juridical inscriptions, while the Agora seems to have been replaced in this case by the new lawcourts' districts, among which the one detected to the east of the great square.

stefano.tropea2@unibo.it

⁹⁴ A statement from Cicero (*Rep.* II 1, 2), interpreting the entire Athenian history in opposition to Roman constitutional history, better fits with the Athenian political scene of the 1st cent. BCE: [...]
Atheniensium, quae persaepe commutata esset [...].

⁹⁵ Cf., among others, Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, 640 and n. 8.

Athens and Rome

HONORARY MONUMENTS FROM SULLA TO ANTONY				*R=REUSED
<i>Date</i>	<i>Honouree</i>	<i>Findspot</i>	<i>Original location</i>	<i>ELA-id:</i>
after 86 BCE	Lucius (Sulla?)	Agora, western sector - R	Agora	394
86-84 BCE	Q. Lutatius Catulus	Agora, Stoa of Attalos (in front of north-end, R)	Agora, Stoa of Attalos (in front of north end)	400
86-83 BCE	Sulla	unknown	Agora ?	395
72-71 BCE	M. Terentius Varro Lucullus	Agora, southern sector - R	Agora, Stoa of Attalos (in front of) ?	396
ca. 71 BCE ?	Lucullus	Acropolis, Propylaia - R	Acropolis ?	397
ca. 71 BCE ?	Lucullus	Acropolis, North slopes -R	Agora, Stoa of Attalos (in front of) ?	398
ca. 71 BCE ?	Licina	Acropolis, Propylaia - R	Acropolis	415
67-62 BCE	Q. Caecilius Metel- lus	Agora, eastern sector - R	Agora, Stoa of Attalos (in front of)	401
63-52 BCE	Ariobarzanes II of Cappadocia	Acropolis, Odeion of Pericles - R?	Acropolis, Odeion of Pericles	348
mid-1 st cent. BCE ?	Caius (Orconius ?)	Acropolis, west of the Parthenon	<i>in situ</i>	399
53-48 BCE	A. Claudius Pulcher	Agora, eastern sector - R	Agora, Stoa of Attalos (in front of)	402
ca. 50-45 BCE ?	M. Claudius Mar- cellus - Flaccilla	Acropolis, Propylaia - R	Acropolis ?	413
49-47 BCE	Caesar	Agora, eastern sector - R	Agora, Stoa of Attalos (in front of)	404
48 BCE	Caesar	Agora, Odeion (area of) -R	Agora, Odeion (area of)?	405
48 BCE	Caesar	Agora, Odeion (area of) - R	Agora, Odeion (area of)?	406
44-43 BCE	Brutus	Acropolis, North slopes - R	Agora, northern sector?	407
44-43 BCE	Cassius	(literary <i>testimonium</i>)	Agora, northern sector ?	410
42-40 BCE	L. Marcius Censorinus	Acropolis, by the north-west corner of the Parthenon	Acropolis, between Par- thenon and Propylaia	419
40-35 BCE	C. Cocceius Balbus	Agora, eastern sector - R	Agora, Stoa of Attalos (in front of)	403
39/8 BCE	Antony - Octavia	Agora, eastern sector - R	Agora, Stoa of Attalos (in front of) ?	344
39-31 BCE	Antony	(literary <i>testimonium</i>)	Acropolis, east of the Parthenon	411
39-31 BCE	Antony	(literary <i>testimonium</i>)	Acropolis, east of the Parthenon	412
34-32 BCE	M. Iunius Silanus	Agora, Stoa of Attalos - R	Agora, Stoa of Attalos (in front of)	423
late 30s BCE	Sempronia	Acropolis, Propylaia (east of)	<i>in situ</i>	420
second half 1 st cent. BCE	M. Antonius Aristokrates	Acropolis, north of the Erechtheion	<i>in situ</i>	418

Stefano Tropea

EPHEBIC DECREES				*R=REUSED
<i>Date</i>	<i>Kosmetes honoured</i>	<i>Findspot</i>	<i>Original location</i>	<i>ELA-id:</i>
80-78 BCE ?	Hedulos of Lamptrai	Agora, eastern sector ? - R	Agora, east of the Panathenaic Way ?	214
second half 1 st cent. BCE ?	Sostratos of Halae	Agora, eastern sector - R	Agora, east of the Panathenaic Way ?	215
44/3 BCE ?	(not preserved)	Plaka, St. Demetrios Katiphoris - R	Agora, east of the Panathenaic Way ?	243
41/0 or 40/39 BCE	--- of Marathon	Acropolis, east of Propylaea - R; Plaka, St. Demetrios Katiphoris - R; Syntagma Square - R	Agora, east of the Panathenaic Way ?	244
38/7 or 37/6 BCE	Olympiodoros of Hagnous	Plaka, St. Demetrios Katiphoris - R	Agora, inside the Stoa of Attalos	245

RESTORATION WORKS AT THE ASKLEPIEION				*R=REUSED
<i>Date</i>	<i>Person involved</i>	<i>Findspot</i>	<i>Original location</i>	<i>ELA-id:</i>
63/2 BCE ?	Socrates of Kephissia (donor)	Acropolis, South slopes > Sanctuary of Asclepios (area of) > Sanctuary of Asclepios (precinct of) > Sacred Spring	Acropolis, South slopes > Sanctuary of Asclepios (area of) > Sanctuary of Asclepios (precinct of) > Sacred Spring	345
52/1 BCE	Diocles of Kephissia (decree, authorization for restorations)	Acropolis, South slopes > Sanctuary of Asclepios (area of) > Sanctuary of Asclepios (precinct of)	Acropolis, South slopes > Sanctuary of Asclepios (area of) > Sanctuary of Asclepios (precinct of)	222
51/0 or 12/1 BCE ?	Diocles of Kephissia ?	Acropolis > South slopes > Sanctuary of Aphrodite Pandemos (area of) - R; Library of Hadrian - R	Acropolis, South slopes > Sanctuary of Asclepios (area of) > Sanctuary of Asclepios (precinct of)	346

Athens and Rome

LAWS OR CONSTITUTIONS				*R=REUSED
<i>Date</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Findspot</i>	<i>Original location</i>	<i>ELA-id:</i>
103/2 BCE	Decree on monthly lawsuits	Athens > Plaka > Odos Adrianou	Athens > Plaka ?	347
1st cent. BCE ?	Law code or decree approving laws	Agora > East Building of the South Square > East Building (west of), reused; Agora > Bouleuterion (area of), reused unknown	Agora ?	277
After 48 BCE ?	Law code or decree promoting democratic ideals	unknown	Acropolis ?	276
49/8 BCE	Decrees on unknown matters	Athens > Psyri (reused)	Acropolis	246

Bibliografía

- Agora XIV: H.A. Thompson - R.E. Wycherley, *The Agora of Athens: The History, Shape and Uses of an Ancient City Center*, Princeton 1972.
- Agora XV: B.D. Meritt - J.S. Traill, *The Athenian Councillors. Vol. XV of The Athenian Agora*, Princeton 1974.
- Agora XVI: A.G. Woodhead, *The Agora of Athens. Inscriptions: The Decrees*, Princeton 1997.
- Agora XVIII: D.J. Geagan, *The Agora of Athens. Inscriptions: The Dedicatory Monuments*, Princeton 2011.
- Agora XXVIII: A.L. Boegehold, *The Lawcourts at Athens. Sites, Buildings, Equipment, Procedure, and Testimonia*, Princeton 1995.
- Aleshire 1989: S.B. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion: The People, Their Dedications, and The Inventories*, Amsterdam.
- Aleshire 1991: S.B. Aleshire, *Asklepios at Athens. Epigraphic and Prosopographic Essays on the Athenian Healing Cults*, Amsterdam.
- Antela-Bernárdez 2009a: B. Antela-Bernárdez, *Between Medeios and Mithridates: The Peripatetic Constitution of Athens (Agora I 235I)*, «ZPE» 171, 105-108.
- Antela-Bernárdez 2009b: B. Antela-Bernárdez, *Entre Delos, Atenas, Roma y el Ponto:*

- Medeo del Pireo*, «Faventia» 31, 49-60.
- Assenmaker 2013: P. Assenmaker, *Poids symbolique de la destruction et enjeux idéologiques de ses récits. Réflexion sur les sacs d'Athènes et d'Ilion durant la première guerre mithridatique*, in *Destruction. Archaeological, philological and historical perspectives*, ed. by J. Driessen, Louvain, 391-414.
- Azoulay 2014: V. Azoulay, *Les Tyrannicides d'Athènes. Vie et mort de deux statues*, Paris.
- Badian 1976: E. Badian, *Rome, Athens and Mithridates*, «AJAH» 1, 1976, 105-128.
- Beschi 1967/68: L. Beschi, *Il monumento di Telemachos, fondatore dell'Asklepieion ateniese*, «ASAA» 45/46, 381-436.
- Buraselis 2012: K. Buraselis, *Appended Festivals. The Coordination and Combination of Traditional Civic and Ruler Cult Festivals in the Hellenistic and Roman East, in Greek and Roman Festivals. Content, Meaning, and Practice*, ed. by J.R. Brandt, J.W. Iddeng, Oxford, 247-265.
- Byrne 2003: S.G. Byrne, *Roman Citizens of Athens*, (Studia Hellenistica 40), Leuven-Dudley (MA).
- Camp 2010⁵: J.McK. Camp II, *The Athenian Agora: Site Guide*, Princeton.
- Coarelli 2021: F. Coarelli, *Silla a Ostia*, in *Ostia, l'Italia e il Mediterraneo. Intorno all'opera di Mireille Cébaillac-Gervasoni*, a cura di M.L. Caldelli, N. Laubry, F. Zevi, (C.E.F.R. 583), Rome, 91-98.
- Cuniberti 2006: G. Cuniberti, *La polis dimezzata. Immagini storiografiche di Atene ellenistica*, Alessandria.
- Di Cesare 2010: R. Di Cesare, *L'Acropoli dall'ellenismo all'impero 'umanistico'. Aspetti politici di monumenti*, in *Die Akropolis von Athen im Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, hrsg. von R. Krumeich, Ch. Witschel, Wiesbaden, 233-250 (and taff. 33-40).
- Dickenson 2017: C.P. Dickenson, *On the Agora: The Evolution of a Public Space in the Hellenistic and Roman Greece (c. 323 BC-267 AD)*, Leiden-Boston.
- Dumont 1875-1876: A. Dumont, *Essai sur l'éphébie attique*, I-II, Paris.
- Ferrary 2014²: J.-L. Ferrary, *Philhellénisme et impérialisme. Aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique, de la seconde guerre de Macédoine à la guerre contre Mithridate*, (B.E.F.A.R. 271), Rome (first ed. Rome 1988).
- Follet 1988: S. Follet, *Ephébes étrangers à Athènes (Romains, Milésiens, Chypriotes etc.)*, «CCEC» 9, 19-32.
- Follet 1989: S. Follet, *Contribution à la chronologie attique du premier siècle de notre ère*, in *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire: Papers from the Tenth British Museum Classical Colloquium*, (BICS Suppl. 55), ed. by S. Walker - A. Cameron, London, 37-44.
- Fontani 1999: E. Fontani, *Il filellenismo di Antonio tra realtà storica e propaganda politica: le ginnasiarchie ad Atene e ad Alessandria*, «Studi Ellenistici» 12, 193-210.
- Geagan 1967: D.J. Geagan, *The Athenian Constitution after Sulla*, (Hesperia Suppl. 12), Princeton.
- Geagan 1971: D.J. Geagan, *Greek Inscriptions*, «Hesperia» 40, 96-108.
- Graindor 1917: P. Graindor, *Inscriptions grecques (Athènes, Mégare, Ténos)*, «RA» 6, 1-67.

Athens and Rome

- Greco 2010: E. Greco, *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C. Tomo 1, Acropoli - Aeropago - Tra Acropoli e Pnice*, (SATAA 1), Atene-Paestum.
- Greco 2011: E. Greco, *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C. Tomo 2, Colline sud-occidentali - Valli dell'Ilisso*, (SATAA 1), Atene-Paestum.
- Greco 2014: E. Greco, *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C. Tomo 3***, *Quartieri a nord e a nord-est dell'Acropoli e Agora del Ceramico: Agora del Ceramico*, (SATAA 1), Atene-Paestum.
- Guidi 1921/22: G. Guidi, *Il Muro Valeriano a S. Demetrio Katiphori e la questione del Diogeneion*, «ASAA» 4/5, 33-54.
- Habicht 1976: Ch. Habicht, *Zur Geschichte Athens in der Zeit Mithridates' VI.*, «Chiron» 6, 127-142 (republ. in Habicht 1994, 216-230).
- Habicht 1989: Ch. Habicht, *Athen und die Seleukiden*, «Chiron» 19, 7-26 (republ. in Habicht 1994, 164-182).
- Habicht 1994: Ch. Habicht, *Athen in hellenistischer Zeit: gesammelte Aufsätze*, München.
- Habicht 1995: Ch. Habicht, *Athen. Die Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischer Zeit*, München.
- Habicht 2006²: Ch. Habicht, *Athènes hellénistique. Histoire de la cité d'Alexandre le Grand à Marc Antoine*, Paris (french transl. and second ed. of Habicht 1995).
- Harrison - Verral 1890: J.E. Harrison - M. de G. Verral, *Mithology and Monuments of Ancient Athens, Being a Translation of a Portion of the "Attica" of Pausanias*, London-New York.
- Hoff - Rotroff 1997: M.C. Hoff - S.I. Rotroff (ed. by), *The Romanization of Athens: Proceedings of an International Conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska, April 1996*, (Oxbow Monograph 94), Oxford.
- Hoff 1997: M.C. Hoff, *Laceratae Athenae. Sulla's Siege of Athens of 87/6 B.C. and its Aftermath*, in Hoff - Rotroff 1997, 33-51.
- Kajava 1990: M. Kajava, *Roman Senatorial Women and the Greek East. Epigraphic Evidence from the Republican to the Augustan Period*, in *Roman Eastern Policy and Other Studies in Roman History. Proceedings of a Colloquium at Tvärminne, 2-3 October 1987*, (Comm. Hum. Litt. 91), ed. by H. Solin - M. Kajava, Helsinki, 59-124.
- Kallet-Marx 1995: R. Kallet-Marx, *Hegemony to Empire. The Development of the Roman Imperium in the East from 148 to 62 B.C.*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-Oxford.
- Kienast 1993: D. Kienast, *Antonius, Augustus, die Kaiser und Athen*, in *Klassisches Altertum, Spätantike und frühes Christentum. Adolf Lippold zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet*, hrsg. von K. Dietz - D. Henning - H. Kaletsch, Würzburg, 191-222.
- Koumanoudes 1876: S.A. Koumanoudes, *Ἐπιγραφαὶ ἐκ τῶν περὶ τὸ Ἀσκληπιεῖον τόπον*, «Athenaion» 5, 513-530.
- Krumeich - Witschel 2009: R. Krumeich - Ch. Witschel, *Hellenistische Statuen in ihrem räumlichen Kontext: Das Beispiel der Akropolis und der Agora von Athen*, in *Stadt-bilder im Hellenismus*, hrsg. von A. Matthaei - M. Zimmermann, Berlin, 173-226.
- Lambert - Schneider 2019: S.D. Lambert - J.G. Schneider, *The Last Athenian Decrees*

- Honouring Ephebes*, (AIO Papers 11) <https://www.atticinscriptions.com/papers/aio-papers-11/>.
- Lambert 2020: S.D. Lambert, *British Museum. Decrees of the Council and Assembly*, (AIUK 4.2), <https://www.atticinscriptions.com/papers/aiuk-42/>.
- Lasagni - Tropea 2019: C. Lasagni - S. Tropea, *Il paesaggio epigrafico di Atene: iscrizioni pubbliche e spazio urbano nell'Atene ellenistica*, «Axon» 3.2, 149-176.
- Liddel 2003: P. Liddel, *The Places of Publication of Athenian State Decrees from the 5th Century BC to the 3rd Century AD*, «ZPE» 143, 79-93.
- Ma 2008: J. Ma, *The Inventory SEG XXVI 139, and the Athenian Asklepieion*, «Tekmeria» 9, 7-16.
- Ma 2013: J. Ma, *Statues and Cities. Honorific Portraits and Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World*, Oxford.
- Mattingly 1971: H.B. Mattingly, *Some Third Magistrates in the Athenian New Style Silver Coinage*, «JHS» 91, 85-93.
- Melfi 2007: M. Melfi, *I santuari di Asclepio in Grecia*, I, (Studia Archaeologica 157), Roma.
- Oliver 1980: J.H. Oliver, *A Peripatetic Constitution*, «JHS» 100, 199-201.
- Papazarkadas 2017: N. Papazarkadas, *Judicial and Financial Administration in Late Hellenistic Athens: A New Decree of the Athenian Council*, «Hesperia» 86, 325-357.
- Papazarkadas 2021: N. Papazarkadas, *Courts, Magistrates and Allotment Procedures: A New Inscribed Kleroterion from Hellenistic Athens*, in *Symposium 2019. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Hamburg, 26.-28. August 2019)*, hrsg. von K. Harter-Uibopuu - W. Riess, Wien, 105-204.
- Parigi 2013: C. Parigi, *The Romanization of Athens: Greek Identity and Connectivity between Athens and Rome in the 1st Century BC*, in *SOMA 2012: Identity and Connectivity. Proceedings of the 16th Symposium on Mediterranean Archaeology, Florence, Italy, 1-3 March 2012*, I, (BAR 2581.1), ed. by L. Bombardieri - A. D'Agostino - G. Guarducci [et al.], Oxford, 447-455.
- Parigi 2016: C. Parigi, *The Athenian Walls in the 1st Century BC*, in *Focus on Fortification: New Research on Fortifications in the Ancient Mediterranean and the Near East. Papers of the Conference on the Research of Ancient Fortifications, Athens 6-9 December 2012*, ed. by R. Fredriksen - S. Müth - P.I. Schneider [et al.], Oxford-Philadelphia, 384-396.
- Parigi 2018: C. Parigi, *Athen und die Plünderung durch Sulla: archäologische und topographische Überlegungen*, in *Argonautica. Festschrift für Reinhard Stupperich*, hrsg. von J. Fouquet - S. Herzog - K. Meese [et al.], (Boreas 12), Marsberg-Padberg, 158-174.
- Parigi 2019: C. Parigi, *Atene e il sacco di Silla. Evidenze archeologiche e topografiche fra l'86 e il 27 a.C.*, (Kölner Schriften zur Archäologie 2), Wiesbaden.
- Payne 1984: M.J. Payne, *Aretas eneken: Honors to Romans and Italians in Greece from 260 to 27 B.C.*, (PhD Diss., Michigan State University), Ann Arbor.
- Pélékidis 1962: Ch. Pélékidis, *Histoire de l'éphébie attique des origines à 31 avant Jésus-Christ*, Paris.
- Perrin-Saminadayar 2004: É. Perrin-Saminadayar, *L'éphébie attique de la crise*

Athens and Rome

- mithridatique à Hadrien: miroir de la société athénienne?* in *L'hellénisme d'époque romaine: nouveaux documents, nouvelles approches (I^{er} s. a.C. – III^e s. p.C.). Actes du Colloque international à la mémoire de Louis Robert – Paris, 7-8 juillet 2000*, éd. par S. Follet, Paris, 87-103.
- Perrin-Saminadayar 2004/05: É. Perrin-Saminadayar, *L'accueil officiel des souverains et des princes à Athènes à l'époque hellénistique*, «BCH» 128/129, 351-375.
- Perrin-Saminadayar 2007: É. Perrin-Saminadayar, *Éducation, culture et société à Athènes. Les acteurs de la vie culturelle athénienne (229-88): un tout petit monde*, Paris.
- Raubitschek 1946: A.E. Raubitschek, *Octavia's Deification at Athens*, «TAPhA» 77, 146-150.
- Raubitschek 1951: A.E. Raubitschek, *Sylleia*, in *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson*, ed. by P.R. Coleman-Norton, Princeton, 49-57.
- Raubitschek 1954: A.E. Raubitschek, *Epigraphic Notes on Julius Caesar*, «JRS» 44, 65-75.
- Raubitschek 1957: A.E. Raubitschek, *Brutus in Athens*, «Phoenix» 1, 1-11.
- Raubitschek 1959: A.E. Raubitschek, *The Brutus Statue in Athens*, in *Atti del III Congresso Internazionale di Epigrafia greca e latina (Roma, 4-8 settembre 1957)*, Roma, 15-21.
- Reinmuth 1955: O.W. Reinmuth, *The Ephebic Inscription, Athenian Agora I 286*, «Hesperia» 24, 220-239.
- Rotroff 1997: S.I. Rotroff, *From Greek to Roman in Athenian Ceramics*, in Hoff - Rotroff 1997, 97-116.
- Santangelo 2007: F. Santangelo, *Sulla, the Elites and the Empire. A Study of Roman Policies in Italy and the Greek East*, (Impact of Empire 8), Leiden-Boston.
- Schmalz 2009: G.C.R. Schmalz, *Augustan and Julio-Claudian Athens. A New Epigraphy and Prosopography*, (Mnemosyne Suppl. 302), Leiden-Boston.
- Thompson 1950: H.A. Thompson, *Excavations in the Athenian Agora: 1949*, «Hesperia» 19, 313-337.
- Thompson 1961: M.E. Thompson, *The New Style Silver Coinage of Athens*, (Numismatic Studies 10), New York.
- Travlos 1971: J. Travlos, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie des antiken Athens*, Tübingen.
- van Nijf - Williamson 2015: O.M. van Nijf - Ch. Williamson, *Re-inventing Traditions: Connecting Contexts in the Hellenistic and Roman World*, in *Reinventing "the invention of tradition"? Indigenous Pasts and the Roman Present*, ed. by D. Boschung - A.W. Busch - M.J. Versluys, Paderborn, 95-111.
- Zevi 1969/70: F. Zevi, *Tre iscrizioni con firme di artisti greci. Saggi nel tempio dell'ara rotonda a Ostia*, «RPAA» 42, 95-116.
- Zevi 1976: F. Zevi, *Monumenti e aspetti culturali di Ostia repubblicana*, in *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien. Kolloquium in Göttingen vom 5. bis 9. Juni 1974*, I, hrsg. von P. Zanker, Göttingen, 52-83.

Abstract

Il presente articolo prende in esame l'attività delle istituzioni ateniesi negli anni compresi tra il coinvolgimento della città negli eventi della prima guerra mitridatica (88-86 a.C.) e le visite di Antonio del periodo 42-38 a.C. La trattazione si concentra soprattutto sui cambiamenti incorsi nelle forme di espressione della tradizionale vitalità politica di Atene. Lo studio dell'accresciuta attenzione per il conferimento di onori pubblici – in particolare per gli onori concessi a individui romani – fornisce l'occasione per capire come in quegli anni fu rinnovato l'aspetto dell'Agora e dell'Acropoli, dove furono eretti nuovi monumenti e furono restaurati edifici in disuso o danneggiati. Le attestazioni relative ai lavori intrapresi nel recinto sacro dell'Asklepieion – sulle pendici meridionali dell'Acropoli – recano informazioni utili per comprendere l'impegno profuso da privati cittadini e sacerdoti nel riattivare le attività sacre nel sito decenni prima dei più ampi rimaneggiamenti di età augustea. Altri testi relativi a costituzioni politiche e regolamenti giudiziari saranno discussi nel tentativo di vagliare la possibilità che in quegli anni ad Atene esistessero nuovi distretti giudiziari.

The article examines the activity of the Athenian institutions in the years between the city's involvement in the events of the First Mithridatic war (88-86 BCE) and the visits of Antony to the city (42-38 BCE). It deals particularly with the changes occurred in the forms of expression of the traditional political vitality of the city. A focus to the increased care for public honours – especially for honours bestowed on Roman men and women – is the occasion to analyse the renovated aspects of the Agora and the Acropolis, where new monuments were set up and old or damaged buildings underwent restorations. Epigraphic evidences about the works undertaken in the precinct of the Asklepieion - on the southern slopes of the Acropolis - give information about the efforts made by wealthy private citizens and priests to revitalize the ritual activities in the site decades before the extensive restorations of the Augustan age. Texts dealing with political constitutions and judicial regulations will also be discussed in order to evaluate the possible existence of new law-courts' districts in the city.