

Tekmeria

Vol 9 (2008)

γεγενῆσθαι. μνηύεται οὖν ἀπὸ μετοίκων τέ τινων καὶ ἀκο-
 λούθων περὶ μὲν τῶν Ἑρμῶν οὐδέν, ἄλλων δὲ ἀγαλμάτων
 περικοπαί τινας πρότερον ὑπὸ νεωτέρων μετὰ παιδιᾶς καὶ
 οἴνου γεγενημένους, οἷον οὐκ οἶνον ἀλλὰ καὶ οἶνον ποιεῖται ἐν
 οἰκίαις ἐφ' ὕβρει· ὧν καὶ τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην ἐπληρώοντο. καὶ
 αὐτὰ ὑπολαμβάνοντες οἱ μάλιστα τῷ Ἀλκιβιάδῃ ἀχθόμενοι
 ἐμποδὼν οὐτι σφίσι μὴ αὐτοῖς τοῦ δήμου βεβαίως προεστάναι,
 καὶ νομίσαντες, εἰ αὐτὸν ἐξελάσειαν, πρῶτοι ἂν εἶναι, ἐμεγά-
 λυνον καὶ ἐβόαον ἐπὶ τὸν δήμον καταλύσει τά τε μυστικά καὶ
 ἡ τῶν Ἑρμῶν περικοπαί. **Τεκμήρια** εἴη αὐτῶν ὅτι οὐ
 μετ' ἐκείνου ἐπράχθη, ἐπιλέγοντες τεκμήρια τὴν ἄλλην αὐτοῦ
 ἐς τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα οὐ δημοτικὴν παρανομίαν. ὁ δ' ἐν τε
 τῷ παρόντι πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ κόσμον καὶ ἐτοῖμος ἦν
 πρὶν ἐκπλεῖν ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος καὶ ἀσμένους ἦν (ἤδη
 γὰρ καὶ τὰ τῆς πατρίδος ἐπεμαρτύρητο), καὶ εἰ μὲν τούτων
 τι εἴργαστο, δίκην δοῦναι, εἰ δ' ἀπολυθείη, ἄρχειν. καὶ
 ἐπεμαρτύρητο μὴ ἀπόντος περὶ αὐτοῦ διαβολὰς ἀποδέχεσθαι,
 ἀλλ' ἤδη ἀποκτείνειν, εἰ δ' αὖτις, καὶ ὅτι σωφρονέστερον εἴη
 μὴ μετὰ τοιαύτης αἰτίας, πρὶν διαγνώσι, πέμπειν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ
 τοσοῦτ' στρατεύματι. οἱ δ' ἐχθροὶ δεδιότες τό τε στράτευμα
 μὴ εὖνουν ἔχρη, ἣν ἤδη ἀγωνίζονται, ὅ τε δῆμος μὴ μαλα-
 κίζεται θεραπεύων ὅτι δι' ἐκείνον οἱ τ' Ἀργεῖοι ξυνεστράτευον
 καὶ τῶν Μαντινέων τινές, ἀπέτρεπον καὶ ἀπέσπευδον, ἄλλους
 ῥήτορας ἐνιέντες οἱ ἔλεον αὐτὸν μὲν πλεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ μὴ
 κατασχεῖν τὴν ἀναγωγὴν, ἐλθόντα δὲ κρίνεσθαι ἐν ἡμέραις
 ῥηταῖς, βουλόμενοι ἐκ μείζονος διαβολῆς, ἣν ἐμελλον ῥῶον
 αὐτοῦ ἀπόντος ποιεῖν, μετὰπεμπτον κομισθέντα αὐτὸν ἀγω-
 νίσασθαι. καὶ ἔδοξε πλεῖν τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην.
 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα θέρους μεσοῦντος ἤδη ἡ ἀναγωγὴ ἐγίγνετο

The Composition of the Peloponnesian Elites in the Roman period and the Evolution of their Resistance and Approach to the Roman Rulers

S. B. ZOUMBAKI

doi: [10.12681/tekmeria.214](https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.214)

To cite this article:

ZOUMBAKI, S. B. (2008). The Composition of the Peloponnesian Elites in the Roman period and the Evolution of their Resistance and Approach to the Roman Rulers. *Tekmeria*, 9, 25–52. <https://doi.org/10.12681/tekmeria.214>

The Composition of the Peloponnesian Elites in the Roman period and the Evolution of their Resistance and Approach to the Roman Rulers*

In 167 B.C. about 1,000 Achaean hostages arrived at Rome accused for their pro-macedonian stance.¹ Polybios from Megalopolis is to be encountered among them. After that overturning of his life Polybios was embodied into the entourage of young Scipio, son of the victor of Pydna Aemilius Paullus. He was a *Graecus captus* who had so clearly begun to be identified with his captors, that about twenty years

* Abbreviated references to ancient authors follow the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (1996³), abbreviations of journals follow *L'Année Philologique* and abbreviations of epigraphic collections follow *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*.

List of further abbreviations:

Bowersock, *Augustus: G.W. Bowersock, Augustus and the Greek world* (Oxford 1965).

Cartledge-Spawforth: P. Cartledge and A. Spawforth, *Hellenistic and Roman Sparta. A tale of two cities* (London – New York 1989).

Halfmann: H. Halfmann, *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (Göttingen 1979).

Roman Peloponnese I: A.D. Rizakis and S. Zoumbaki (with the collaboration of M. Kantirea), *Roman Peloponnese I. Roman personal names in their social context*, MEAEΘMATA 31 (Athens 2001).

Roman Peloponnese II: A.D. Rizakis, S. Zoumbaki and Cl. Lepenioti, *Roman Peloponnese II. Roman personal names in their social context*, MEAEΘMATA 36 (Athens 2004).

Spawforth, «Roman Corinth»: A.J.S. Spawforth, «Roman Corinth: the formation of a colonial elite», in: A.D. Rizakis (ed.), *Roman onomastics in the Greek East. Social and political aspects*, Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Roman Onomastics, Athens 7-9 September 1993, MEAEΘMATA 21 (Athens 1996) 167-182.

Stansbury: H. Stansbury, *Corinthian honor, Corinthian conflict: A social history of Early Roman Corinth and its Pauline community* (unpubl. dissertation Univ. of California 1990).

Zoumbaki, *Elis und Olympia*: S. Zoumbaki, *Elis und Olympia in der Kaiserzeit. Das Leben einer Gesellschaft zwischen Stadt und Heiligtum auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, MEAEΘMATA 32 (Athen 2001).

1. Paus. 7. 10, 7-11; Plb. 30. 13; Liv. 45. 31, 9.

later he was asked by L. Mummius and the ten *legati*, who worked on the re-organisation of the newly conquered Greece, to help the Greek cities to accept the new *politeia* and legislation.² Polybios was the first of a series of cultured Greeks attached to Romans³ and the first known member of a Peloponnesian elite to have developed such a close connection to the Romans. It was soon clear that the tactics of close connections between the ruling power and local elites encompassed interests of both sides: for Peloponnesian notables in order to strengthen their position within their societies and for Rome as a guarantee for the tranquillity and subversion of the towns.⁴ As time went by, the web of links of the elites and the feeling of security they provided were elaborated.

The case of Polybios is cited as a characteristic example of this tendency about two and half centuries later by a well educated Greek of the upper provincial class, who originated from another region of the province Achaia: Plutarch from Chaeronea. In his «Precepts of statecraft» it is stated that a friend among the men of great power could consolidate the position of a member of the local political elites.⁵ However, Plutarch's attitude to Romans is more level-headed than that of Polybios; it is not flattering, not even strictly positive.⁶ Despite his personal relationships with men of power, with emperors and their entourages, despite his privileges owed to these connections, in his works there is room for criticism, even for condemnation. He realizes the real role of public figures in the Greek cities of the Roman Empire and focuses on the fact that the ruling group of the *poleis* had to act in accordance with their capacity as subjects of Rome.⁷ Plutarch's political treatises certainly influenced the political thought of his contemporary elite, since many members of this elite from various cities, including cities of the Peloponnese, were moreover close friends of his.⁸

2. Plb. 39. 5, 2-3. On the new *politeia* and the role of Polybios see R.M. Kallet-Marx, *Hegemony to empire. The development of the Roman imperium in the East from 148 to 62 BC*, (Berkeley - Los Angeles - Oxford 1995) 66, 73-74, 79-80.

3. Bowersock, *Augustus*, 3-4.

4. Bowersock, *Augustus*, 87.

5. *Praec. ger. reip.* 814 C: καὶ φίλον ἔχειν αἰεὶ τινα τῶν ἄνω δυνατωτάτων, ὥσπερ ἔρμα τῆς πολιτείας βέβαιον· αὐτοὶ γὰρ εἰσι Ῥωμαῖοι πρὸς τὰς πολιτικάς σπουδὰς προθυμότεροι τοῖς φίλοις· καὶ καρπὸν ἐκ φιλίας ἡγεμονικῆς λαμβάνοντας, οἷον ἔλαβε Πολύβιος καὶ Παναίτιος τῇ Σκιπίωνος εὐνοίᾳ πρὸς αὐτοὺς μεγάλα τὰς πατρίδας ὠφελήσαντες...

6. Cf. C.P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, (Oxford 1971) 17-19 on his attitude towards Nero, 25 on his hostile attitude to the Flavians, 102 ff. and 122 ff. for his disapproval of gladiatorial sports, deification of mortals etc.

7. Cf. Jones, 112-113.

8. B. Puech, «Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque», *ANRW II* 33.6 (1992) 4889-92.

Plutarch's view of the understanding of the relationship between Greece and Rome was undoubtedly shared by individuals of the same social circles that nurtured him. The educated individuals of the Peloponnese were undoubtedly in contact and were influenced by more philosophers and men of letters in general who did not originate from the region but are attested either as officeholders there or are honoured in several towns.⁹ After Polybios, personalities from the Peloponnese who were distinguished in letters are rarely encountered in the sources; in epigraphical sources there are however Peloponnesians attested as philosophers, who always belonged to the leading group of local societies.¹⁰

9. For the role of the sophists in the Roman Empire and their political activity see B. Puech, *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d'époque impériale* (Paris 2002) and D.A. Karambelas, *Δίκαιο και θεσμοί στη Δευτέρα Σοφιστική* (Athens-Komotini 2004).

Apart from Plutarch cf. for example Herodes Atticus who was also a sophist and his contact with the educated circles of several Peloponnesian towns was certainly not limited to political or economic matters (i.e. holding of municipal offices, beneficial activity, possessing of land property in Peloponnesian towns). It is significant that he was praised as an orator, as «New Demosthenes» in Olympia (Paus. 6. 20, 9; Philostr., VS 1. 25); for his presence in the Peloponnese cf. *Roman Peloponnese* I, ARC 63, COR 169, EL 143; *Roman Peloponnese* II, LAC 270. Further M. Aurelius Olympiodoros from Larissa is attested as *logistes* in Troizen (*IG* IV 796; cf. *Roman Peloponnese* I, ARG 49). Several non Peloponnesian men of letters are attested in Olympia: the orator Aurelius Septimius Apollonios from Antiochia on Maeander (*SEG* 17, 1960, 200, cf. *Roman Peloponnese* I, EL 90), the author of «*Vitae sophistarum*», Flavius Philostratos (*IvO* 476, cf. *Roman Peloponnese* I, EL 207), the historian C. Asinius Quadratus who wrote «*Χίλιετηρίς*», a history from the foundation of Rome to the reign of Alexander Severus (*IvO* 356, cf. *Roman Peloponnese* I, EL 56). Olympia was certainly an attractive point for the educated people because of the famous panhellenic sanctuary and the Olympic games, cf. the description of the philosopher Epictetos who had most probably visited the sanctuary (Arr., *Epict.* 1. 6, 23-29; 4. 4, 24). For the presence of poets, orators, philosophers in Olympia cf. I. Weiler, «Olympia – jenseits der Agonistik: Kultur und Spektakel», *Nikephoros* 10 (1997) 191-213.

10. L. Peticius Propas from Corinth is attested as a Stoic philosopher in the inscription of the statue erected in his honour in Olympia by his mother (*IvO* 453, cf. *Roman Peloponnese* I, EL 298). In the Pseudo-Julian, Letters 198 (see below n. 23) two philosophers are mentioned, Diogenes and Lamprias who most probably originated from Argos. One more letter (no. 199) is addressed to the aforementioned Diogenes by the emperor Julian. What remains unclear is whether Diogenes is to be identified with a further namesake, brother of the philosopher Hieron and uncle of a certain Aristophanes from Corinth (Lib., *Ep.* 14. 5-7, cf. also the letter no. 97 of Julian). A further philosopher was Iulius Philocratidas from Sparta (*IG* VI 1, 116, cf. *Roman Peloponnese* II, 497). Q. Aufidenus Quintus, son of Sidectas, was also most probably a native of Sparta (*SEG* 11, 1950, 807; cf. *Roman Peloponnese* II, 44). His

The interaction between Peloponnesians and Romans in the whole period extending between Polybios and Plutarch can be described as a process of gradual approach with certain breaks of a multiform opposition. My purpose is on the one hand to draw attention to some elements of the evolution of the relations between Peloponnesian elites and Rome and on the other hand to attempt a sketch of those elites that played their role in the melting pot of the Roman rule.

Resistance and approach to the Roman rulers

The biography of Polybios and the abundance of honorary inscriptions for Roman magistrates, emperors and members of their families would give the impression that local elites of the Peloponnese and consequently local populations were merely inclined towards an approach to the Roman rulers without any resistance to them. A careful look at the sources reveals that there were some occurrences of opposition to Romans in the Peloponnese. The various instances of such difficulties that arose here and there, as it will be shown through the examples cited below, were actually not revolts against Roman government generally, but resistance against some concrete political choices of Roman magistrates or emperors. Even the events that display some elements which may be characterized as revolutionary actions against Roman order can admit of different interpretations. It is characteristic, however, that the instigators of those events were always individuals from the highest strata of local societies. In several cases the local elites functioned as the means of expressing discontent or diplomatically overwhelming undesirable policies of the ruling power. Cases of disapproval against certain handlings of the rulers were either expressed through complaints formed by official embassies or were covered under a religious facade and did not end up becoming real instances of opposition. Problems could also arise because of a coiling up a Roman notable in cases where tensions arose within political life in Rome; the initiative to support one of the rivals also originated from citizens of a considerable status. In some cases, what looks like resistance to Roman control is nothing but the choice of the local aristocrats to support the wrong side in a rivalry between Roman patrons or their arrogance that dictated a wrong behavior; both such kinds of conduct had to be punished.

brother Sextus is called in the same inscription φιλοσωφώτατος and Cartledge-Spawforth, 180 suggest that he was named after the Platonic philosopher Sextus, a nephew of Plutarch. The adjective φιλοσωφώτατη is also used for women: Aurelia Heraclea, daughter of Tisamenos (*IG V 1*, 599, cf. *Roman Peloponnese II*, LAC 61) and Aurelia Oppia, daughter of the equally φιλοσωφώτατος Callicrates or Callistratos (*IG V 1*, 598, cf. *Roman Peloponnese II*, 64).

Following are some characteristic examples of different types of resistance to Roman rule, in which the most prominent citizens of the Peloponnesian towns always play a central role either as inciters of an action of protest or as «channels» conveying complaints of the towns to the Roman authorities.

The first event which is often interpreted as a revolutionary action against Roman rule is some disorder in Dyme¹¹ dated to 144/143 B.C. and known to us from a letter of the proconsul Q. Fabius Q. f. Maximus addressed to the archons, the council and the people of Dyme. Some councillors laid information before Fabius Maximus about a disruption in the town, accusing specific individuals as guilty of this. The archives and public records of the town had been burnt, two *nomographoi* had proposed laws which were regarded as contrary to the «*politeia*» restored to the Achaeans by the Romans, whilst a *damiorgos* also conspired with the others. Fabius Maximus decided that two of them deserved a sentence of death, whilst the third one had to proceed to Rome in order to be judged by the *praetor inter peregrinos*. This text of unique importance has given rise to a lengthy debate about the nature of this inconvenience. In the view of some scholars it is to be interpreted as a social-revolutionary or democratic struggle against Roman-sponsored oligarchs, against the timocratic constitution imposed by Rome, and a kind of debtors' revolt traced mainly through the burning of the archives. The recent study on this subject, by R. Kallet-Marx, stresses the similarities of the whole situation with revolts that were clearly an attack on the Roman order. However, he finds it difficult to characterise the situation at Dyme confidently because of the fragmentary evidence and accepts that political, economic and social factors may have caused a «struggle among an elite divided by defeat and the opportunities afforded by the proximity of Roman power».¹²

Leaving aside the problem of the interpretation of the Dyme events, we focus on the elements most interesting for our present study: On the one hand the elite of the town was not a unified group but there was a struggle among its members, where a part of them was driven by an anti-Roman ideology or so it is presented in our document; in any case a part of the elite uses this argument in order to approach the Romans and seize control of the town. On the other hand, the Roman

11. Syll³ 684; R. Sherk, *Roman documents from the Greek East*, (Baltimore 1969) no. 43; A. D. Rizakis, *Les cités achéennes: épigraphie et histoire*, MEAETHMATA 55 (Athènes 2008) 54-60, no. 5.

12. R. Kallet-Marx, «Quintus Fabius Maximus and the Dyme affair (Syll³ 684)», *CQ* 45 (1995) 129-153, esp. 150. In this article and in Rizakis (n. 11 above) are to be found all the basic previous bibliography and a summary of the main interpretations.

commander, regardless of whether he regarded the events as being of minor importance or a real threat for Romans, found an ideal opportunity for an intervention in the internal affairs of a Greek town and indeed to demonstrate Rome's authority to punish the plotters.

In the period that followed, no further events of such nature and no Roman intervention in the type of such cruel punishment are reported in the sources of the Peloponnese. Romans usually preferred an indirect control of the towns: they assisted their loyal friends to raise their prestige in their home towns; this was used in the struggle among political rivals of Greek towns. The family of Euryclids at Sparta illustrates an eloquent example of this situation. Information is availed by literary sources concerning the fiction-like life of Eurycles and his descendants. Eurycles sided with Octavian even before the battle at Actium, since his father, Lachares, probably a partisan of Caesar, was executed by M. Antonius on the pretext that he had supported piracy.¹³ As emperor, Augustus rewarded Eurycles with Roman citizenship and made him Λακεδαιμονίων ἡγεμόνα (Str. 8. 5, 1; Dio Cass. 54. 7, 2). In the last years of the 1st c. B.C. Eurycles behaved oddly and caused troubles throughout the cities of Greece, so Augustus had to banish him. It is significant that Josephus describes these troubles as στάσις (sedition), while Strabo speaks about ταραχή (inconvenience, trouble).¹⁴ G. Bowersock, in an important article that gave rise to a further discussion,¹⁵ interprets these difficulties as an indication of Eurycles's choice of Tiberius, when Livia's son and Augustus went separate ways.¹⁶ This would also explain Eurycles's full rehabilitation in Sparta in the early years of the

13. Plu., *Ant.* 67. 2-4. On this charge against Lachares, which had perhaps some ground, see Cartledge-Spawforth, 97-98 (with previous bibliography).

14. J., *BJ* 1. 531: ...κατηγορηθῆς ἐπὶ τῷ στάσεως ἐμπλήσαι τὴν Ἀχαΐαν καὶ περιδύειν τὰς πόλεις... Str. 8. 5, 5 [365]: νεωστὶ δ' Εὐρυκλῆς αὐτοὺς ἐτάραξε, δόξας ἀποχρησασθαι τῇ Καίσαρος φιλίᾳ πέρα τοῦ μετρίου πρὸς τὴν ἐπιστάσιαν αὐτῶν, ἐπαύσατο δ' ἡ ταραχή ταχέως, ἐκείνου μὲν παραχωρήσαντος εἰς τὸ χρεῶν, τοῦ δ' υἱοῦ τὴν φιλίαν ἀπεστραμμένου τὴν τοιαύτην πᾶσαν.

15. G. Bowersock, «Augustus and the East: the problem of the succession», in: F. Millar – E. Segal (eds.), *Caesar Augustus. Seven aspects*, (Oxford 1984) 169-188, esp. 177 ff., dates these difficulties to 7-2 B.C.; his view is rejected by H. Lindsay, «Augustus and Eurycles», *RhM* 135 (1992) 290-297, who dates the events to between 7 B.C. and A.D. 15. On this subject see also Cartledge-Spawforth, 101.

16. On more individuals and cities attested as loyal supporters of Tiberius even in the difficult phase of his self-banishment on Rhodes, see Bowersock, «Augustus and the East» (see above n. 15), 177 and S. Zoumbaki, «Tiberius und die Städte des griechischen Ostens: Ostpolitik und hellenisches Kulturleben eines künftigen Kaisers», in: Y. Perrin (éd.), *Neronia*

reign of Tiberius.¹⁷ It remains, in any case, unclear whether the punishment of Eurycles was brought about by his arrogance or by his support to Tiberius.

Internal conflicts and struggle of local elite of Sparta for appropriating the power, especially in the changeable first phase of the Principate, became sharper on this occasion. There was a dispute between the parvenu Eurycles and the old notable Brasidas in Sparta.¹⁸ The old aristocrats, who indeed had not yet obtained Roman citizenship, overlooked the newcomers. This is obvious in an anecdote recorded by Plutarch (*mor.* 207 F), where Brasidas, as one of Eurycles's accusers and present at the latter's trial before Augustus, is said to have referred to Thucydides's account of his glorious namesake ancestor.

The relationship of Eurycles's descendants with Roman emperors was equally turbulent. His son, C. Iulius Laco, may have been condemned to exile after the revelation of the conspiracy of Seianus, in which Pompeia Macrina, wife of Laco's son Argolicus, was in some way involved (Tac., *Ann.* 6. 18, 2). Laco's son, Spartiaticus, was also exiled under Nero.¹⁹ The reputation of the family was certainly restored both times,²⁰ since both, Laco and Spartiaticus, are later to be found holding equestrian procuratorship at Corinth and the grandson of Spartiaticus, C. Iulius Eurycles Herculanus, entered the senate under Trajan.²¹

Further indirect indications of troubles of Peloponnesian cities with the Roman governors are to be traced in an honorary decree from Mantinea dated to the Augustan age, where Euphrosynos, son of Titus, is praised among others for his embassies to the senate, where he behaved himself politely and presented a praise and not complaints for the treatment of his town by the governors of the prov-

VII. *Rome, l'Italie et la Grèce. Hellénisme et philhellénisme au premier siècle ap. J.-C.*, Collection Latomus 305 (Bruxelles 2007) 158-169.

17. For a *lex sacra* from Gytheion concerning the organisation of the festival *Caesareia* and *Euryclea*, one day of which was named in honour of Eurycles and a further one in honour of his son C. Iulius Laco, see S.V. Kougeas, *Hellenika* 1 (1928) 16-38; L. Wenger, *ZRG* 49 (1929) 309-312; S.V. Kougeas, *Hellenika* 2 (1929) 207-211 and 445-446; V. Ehrenberg-A.H.M. Jones, *Documents illustrating the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*, (Oxford 1955²; revised repr. 1976) 87-89, no. 102a; for a detailed bibliography and a short comment see also *Roman Peloponnese* II, 281-282.

18. Cf. Bowersock, *Augustus*, 105, 108.

19. For these events see Cartledge-Spawforth, 103 and 107; *Roman Peloponnese* II, LAC 509, p. 328-329.

20. Cf. for Laco *Roman Peloponnese* I, COR 345 and Cartledge-Spawforth, 102; *Roman Peloponnese* II, LAC 468, p. 297.

21. For the individual see *Roman Peloponnese* II, LAC 462.

ince.²² This statement implies that there were cases of reactions and complaints against the Roman government and the undoubtedly prominent envoys to the senate were the channels transporting this attitude to Rome. This is also obvious in a letter of a Greek notable to the Roman governor on behalf of Argos concerning payments of the town to Corinth for the organisation of spectacles that also included wild-beast shows. The Argives requested a hearing and stated that the case had already been discussed before a Roman court without a desirable result.²³

On some occasions opposition used to be hidden under a religious cover. There was, for instance, certainly a degree of disconstent in the face of the decision of the Emperor Caligula to remove the famous statue of Zeus, a work of Pheidias, from the temple of Zeus at Olympia, to transport it to Rome and to substitute the god's head with his own portrait.²⁴ The removal of this masterpiece, counted among the «miracles» of the ancient world, would be a great loss for Elean people, not only for religious but also for economic reasons, given that Olympia was one the most frequented places especially during the period of the Olympic games. The local nobility preferred not to openly resist the emperor's intention but to let the god himself handle the delicate matter, with a little help from the popular governor of the province P. Memmius Regulus. Roaring laughter was heard within the temple as the workmen were about to dismantle the statue and the whole process was interrupted by the horror caused by the miracle.²⁵ It was the priesthood, namely a privileged part of local society, which undoubtedly crafted this miracle.

Despite the above mentioned difficulties arising here and there, the connec-

22. *IG V 2*, 268+ cor. (*SEG XI* 1088; *XV* 230; *XIX* 326). Cf. also A.J. Gossage, «The date of *IG V 2* 516 (*SIG³ 800*)», *ABSA* 49 (1954) 51-56, who argues, citing also the above mentioned honorary decree for Euphrosynos, that the cities of Arcadia and consequently more generally cities of the Peloponnese had begun by the beginning of the 1st c. A.D. to experience the effects of their punishments after the battle of Actium. Among others, the punishment is indicated, according to Gossage, in the use of the Actian era for dating purposes.

23. The letter is preserved in the correspondence of the Emperor Julian but A.J.S. Spawforth, «Corinth, Argos and the imperial cult. Pseudo-Julian, Letters 198», *Hesperia* 63 (1994) 211-232 following some previous scholars argues for a date to the late 1st c. A.D.

24. Suet., *Cal.* 22 and 57; J., *AJ* 19. 8, 10.

25. For the role of similar miracles as well of shrines and temples as mechanisms of opposition to Roman rule see G. Bowersock, «The mechanics of subversion in the Roman provinces», in: *Oppositions et résistances à l'Empire d'Auguste à Trajan*, Vandoeuvres-Genève, 25-30 août 1986, *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* XXXIII (Genève 1987) 291-320, esp. on Olympia p. 297. Bowersock speculates on the local temples and shrines as sources of sedition

tions between ruling power and local elites were firmed in the course of time, as literary and especially epigraphical sources testify. Literary sources reporting personal relationships of such nature are extremely rare and concern as a rule exclusive personalities that acted a special role in a larger scale, such as Polybios or Eurycles. Therefore, the investigation of the gradual approach to Romans of individuals belonging to the local elites of a lower range can be based almost exclusively on inscriptions. Although epigraphic sources hardly permit a «behind-the-scenes» insight, as in the case of the aforementioned tensions caused by the Euryclids, they imprint a vital picture of the degree and the various aspects of participation of local elites in the life of the Roman Empire. In these texts their relations to Roman magistrates and emperors are either directly reported, as in the case of the honorary monuments for Romans, or can be indirectly assumed through the study of onomastics or through the exclusively successful careers of certain individuals in the imperial hierarchy, which presupposes some support among Roman powerful patrons. From this aspect it is indicative to have an overview of the honorary monuments for representatives of Roman power, which were set up not by state authorities but by private individuals. In order to produce a clearer imprint of the situation, we have deliberately left aside some monuments, which, though either based on private initiative or funded by private local magnates, were erected officially by a *polis*. Despite the fortuitous character of the preserved material, honorary monuments offer a picture of the evolution of personal ties between Peloponnesians and Romans. An analysis of the politics and connections of certain Roman commanders or emperors with Peloponnesian towns in general and with each region separately mainly on the basis of onomastics and on the contribution of literary sources has been already done in previous works.²⁶ For this reason we focus on the honorary

because of the asylum they offered and the pulse and rhythm provided to the provincial life by the priesthood.

26. For a sketch of these politics embracing the whole Peloponnese see A. Rizakis, «Ηγετική τάξη και κοινωνική διαστρωμάτωση στις πόλεις της Πελοποννήσου κατά την αυτοκρατορική εποχή», in: V. Mitsopoulos-Leon (ed.), *Forschungen in der Peloponnes, Akten des Symposions anlässlich der Feier «100 Jahre Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut Athen»*, Athen 5. 3.-7. 3. 1998 (Athen 2001) 181-197; for each region separately see contributions in A.D. Rizakis (ed.), *Roman onomastics in the Greek East. Social and political aspects*, Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Roman Onomastics, Athens 7-9 September 1993, *ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ* 21 (Athens 1996), for Argolid by L. Mendoni, «Η διάδοση των ρωμαϊκών ονομάτων στην Αργολίδα (1ος αι. π.Χ.-3ος αι. μ.Χ.)», 183-190; for Eleia by S. Zoumbaki, «Die Verbreitung der römischen Namen in Eleia», 191-206; for Arcadia by Chr. Hoët-van Gauvenberghe, «Onomastique et diffusion de la citoyenneté romaine en Arcadie», 207-214;

monuments for Romans erected by individuals as a supplementary element to the framework which is already outlined by these works.

Private honours for Roman magistrates are extremely rare in the Republican period. The first signs of an approach are to be dated to the beginning of the 2nd c. B.C. In such an early period it is an exaggeration to speak of close connections between both sides and even more risky to speak of «clientela» relationships. There were some personal communications between Roman officers and Greek statesmen focusing on their common interests in the local politics. Rome and its notables began to replace Hellenistic Kings as benefactors who guaranteed for freedom, stability and prosperity.²⁷ The earliest known case is the fragmentary inscription of the monument erected by the Achaean statesman Aristaenos, son of Timokades, for T. Quinctius T. f. (Flamininus) in Corinth.²⁸ In the view of some scholars this honour is to be dated immediately after Flamininus's declaration of the «freedom» of the Greeks at Isthmia.²⁹ Literary sources allow us, however, to see that a close association of Aristaenos with Flamininus already existed before spring of 196 and the announcement of Flamininus at the Isthmia Games: Aristaenos, as strategos of the Achaean League in 199/198 B.C., made a long and dramatic speech in order to convince the Achaean assembly to accept the proposal of envoys from Flamininus, that the league should abandon its traditional pro-Macedonian stance and join Rome's war against Philip.³⁰ It is unknown how far back in time Aristaenos's personal relationship with Flamininus extended. What is merely inferred is that there were previous contacts between them and that Flamininus's policy for Greece was already familiar to Aristaenos.³¹

The next known honour is to be dated to 143 B.C. or shortly afterwards: a

for Laconia see H. Box, «Roman citizenship in Laconia I», *JRS* 21 (1931) 200-214 and id., «Roman citizenship in Laconia II», *JRS* 22 (1932) 165-183.

27. Chr. Böhme, *Princeps und Polis: Untersuchungen zur Herrschaftsform des Augustus über bedeutende Orte in Griechenland*, (München 1995) 126 sq. for bibliography on this topic.

28. *Corinth* VIII 1, 72.

29. J. Bousquet, «Inscriptions grecques concernant des Romains», *BCH* 88 (1964) 609 (*SEG* XXII 214) suggests that the inscription most probably derives from Aristaenos' strategia of 196/5. Cf. also G. A. Lehmann, *Untersuchungen zur Glaubwürdigkeit des Polybios*, (Münster 1967) 224 n. 157.

30. Liv. 32. 21; Cf. A.M. Eckstein, «Polybius, Aristaenus and the fragment "On Traitors"», *CQ* 37 (1987) 140 ff.; id., «Polybius, the Achaeans and the "Freedom of the Greeks"», *GRBS* 31 (1990) esp. 52 ff.

31. For a bibliography on that topic see Eckstein (see above n. 30), 63 n. 55. G. A. Lehmann, *Untersuchungen zur Glaubwürdigkeit des Polybios*, (Münster 1967) 216 ff. on Aristaenos and esp. 224 on his previous contacts with Flamininus.

bronze statue was erected in Olympia in honour of the consul of the year Q. Caecilius Metellus by a certain Damon, son of Nicanor, from Thessaloniki.³² The phrase ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν καὶ εὐνοίας ἧς ἔχων διατελεῖ εἰς τε αὐτόν betrays a personal relationship between Damon and Metellus. The long and glorious activity of Metellus in Macedonia³³ as well as in southern Greece³⁴ explains his personal connections with Greeks and especially Macedonians. We do not know anything more concrete about Nicanor and his relation to Olympia. It is unknown whether he was settled in the region or he chose Olympia as a very frequented panhellenic sanctuary, where a monument could be seen not only by large numbers of pilgrims and spectators of the Olympic games but also by Roman notables who visited Olympia, like Aemilius Paullus and L. Mummius.³⁵

The remaining two private dedications for Romans in the Republican period are dated to the 1st c. B.C. An *agoranomos* named Aristagoros erected a monument for C. Pompeius Magnus ca. 63 B.C. at Argos.³⁶ Although the connection of Aristagoros with the Roman commander cannot be further detected, it is certainly to be placed into the network created in the Peloponnesian towns in order to support Pompeius and his policy.³⁷ The last known honour is perhaps not to be included here, since it was apparently paid not by a Peloponnesian notable, but it was set up at the colony of Dyme for Octavian (before he held the title of Augustus, between 30 and 27 B.C.) by his *libertus* Philomusus Epiroticus.³⁸

32. *IvO* 325; *IG* X 2.1, 1031.

33. For a general presentation of Metellus's activity in Greece and a collection of literary and epigraphic sources on him see Th. Sarikakis, *Ρωμαῖοι ἄρχοντες τῆς ἐπαρχίας Μακεδονίας. Μέρος Α. Ἀπὸ τῆς ιδρύσεως τῆς ἐπαρχίας μέχρι τῶν χρόνων τοῦ Αὐγούστου (148-27 π.Χ.)*, (Thessaloniki 1971) 27-38. For Metellus see also T.R.S., Broughton, *The magistrates of the Roman republic (99 B.C.-31 B.C.)* I, (1951, repr. Cleveland, Ohio 1968) 430, 450, 461, 464, 471-2, 474, 488, 500.

34. For further civic honours for Metellus from Southern Greece cf. *IG* VII 3490 from Megara; *IG* IX 2, 37 from Hypata.

35. Zoumbaki, *Elis und Olympia*, 153, 155.

36. G. Vollgraff, *Mnemosyne* 47, 1919, 260-261, no. XXVII (*AnnÉpigr.* 1920, 375, no. 81); cf. *Roman Peloponnese* I, ARG 210.

37. A. Rizakis, «Ηγετική τάξη και κοινωνική διαστρωμάτωση στις πόλεις της Πελοποννήσου κατά την αυτοκρατορική εποχή», in: V. Mitsopoulos-Leon (ed.), *Forschungen in der Peloponnes, Akten des Symposions anlässlich der Feier «100 Jahre Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut Athen»*, Athen 5. 3.-7. 3. 1998 (Athen 2001) 181-182.

38. *IG* IV 581; cf. *Roman Peloponnese* I, 19.

During the Imperial period the number of private honours for Roman magistrates and emperors increases.

**Private honours in the Peloponnese for Roman emperors and magistrates
in the Imperial period³⁹**

	Emperors and their family	Magistrates	Total
Augustan to Neronian period	14	8	22
Flavians			–
Trajanic-Hadrianic period	6	10	16
Antoninus Pius to Commodus	4	3	7
Severi	2	3	5
second half of 3rd c.-4th c.	2	3	5

39. Leaving aside a number of uncertain testimonies, for private honors for Roman magistrates, emperors and members of their family in the Peloponnese see:

Messenia: *IG V* 1, 1450 (Nero), *SEG XLI* 353 (Nero), *IG V* 1, 1451 (L. Verus), *SEG LII* 405 (Faustina).

Laconia: *SEG XLI* 315 (Nero or Claudius), *SEG XI* 932 (M. Latinus Pandusa, 1st half of the 1st c. A.D.), *SEG XLIX* 400 (Hadrian), *SEG XLIX* 405 (Severus, Caracalla, Geta, Iulia Domna, Fulvia Plautilla), *IG V* 1, 538 and an unpublished inscription, see *Roman Peloponnese* II, LAC 489[2] (Iulius Paulinus, 2nd quarter of the 3rd c. A.D.).

Argolid: *IG IV*² 1, 602 (Claudius and Agrippina), unpublished inscription from Argos, see Zoumbaki, n. 53 below (Claudius or Nero), *IG IV*² 1, 604 (Messalina), *IG IV* 795 (Cn. Cornelius Pulcher), *SEG XXII* 289 (Cn. Cornelius Pulcher), *ILS* 8863 (A. Pomponius Augurinus T. Prifernius Paetus), *IG IV*² 1, 694 (Cn. Claudius Leonticus, Severan period), *IG IV* 1608 (Phosphorios, A.D. 379-382), *SEG XVI* 261 (Proculianus, mid. 4th c. A.D.).

Corinthia: *Corinth VIII.* 3, 52 (Augustus), *Corinth VIII.* 2, 120 (Augustus), *Corinth VIII.* 3, 69 (Augustus), *Corinth VIII.* 2, 65 and 66 (P. Caninius Agrippa, Augustan period), *Corinth VIII.* 2, 54 (L. Aquilius C. f. Florus Turcianus, Gallus, Augustan period), *Corinth VIII.* 3, 74 (Claudius), *Corinth VIII.* 2, 67 (C. Iulius Laco, under Claudius), *Corinth VIII.* 3, 164 (A. Pomponius Augurinus T. Prifernius Paetus), *Corinth VIII.* 3, 135 (C. Caelius C. f. Ouf. Martialis, A.D. 107-114), *Corinth VIII.* 3, 105 (Hadrian), *Corinth VIII.* 3, 125 (L. Antonius Albus, under Hadrian), *Corinth VIII.* 1, 82 and 83 (Cn. Cornelius Pulcher), *Corinth VIII.* 3, 137 (Caius cerialis, under Hadrian), *Corinth VIII.* 3, 124 (Flavius Arrianus, mid. 2nd c. A.D.), *CIL III.* 1, 7269 (Antoninus Pius), *CIL III.* 1, 537 (Q. Villius Titianus Quadratus, under Antoninus Pius), *Corinth VIII.* 2, 56 (C. Iulius Iuli Quadrati f. Severus, under Antoninus Pius), *Corinth VIII.* 3, 112 (Commodus), *Corinth VIII.* 3, 506 (Theodosius and Arcadius), *Corinth VIII.* 2, 23 (Diocletian).

Eleia: *IvO* 220 (Tiberius, before his adoption by Augustus), *IvO* 369 (Tiberius, before his

From the table given above it is obvious that the vast majority of private honours are to be dated during the 1st c. A.D. and till the reign of Hadrian. During the 1st c. A.D. Peloponnesian notables aspire to create more and more personal bonds with Augustus and members of his family, with Claudius and Nero and also with popular governors and officers holding further posts of the provincial administration. For example, Greek towns and their foremost citizens developed a special tie with P. Memmius Regulus who governed Moesia, Macedonia and Achaia as a *legatus Augusti pro praetore* from A.D. 35 till 44. In the long period of his government there were quite a few monuments erected by individuals and *poleis* in his honour and even in honour of his son, who accompanied him during his sojourn in the East.⁴⁰ The considerable number of Memmii attested in the Peloponnese forms one more indication of close connections of Peloponnesians with Regulus.⁴¹ His beneficiary services for the region are also partly reported in literary sources.⁴²

The absence of private honours for Flavians is significant for the orientation of these emperors mainly to the West.⁴³ Several private honours are encountered for Trajan and Hadrian and magistrates of the provincial administration under them. Both emperors visited the Peloponnese and it was perhaps a good chance for the indigenous aristocracy to see them and develop a personal relationship with

adoption by Augustus, Drusus the older and Drusus the younger), *IvO* 221 (Germanicus), *IvO* 337 (P. Memmius Regulus), *IvO* 338 (C. Vatinius Pollio), *IvO* 426 (C. Iulius Laco), *IvO* 373 (Nero), *IvO* 386 (Caracalla), S. Zoumbaki, «Einblick in das spätantike Elis: eine unpublizierte Inschrift zu Ehren des Prokonsuls Flavius Severus», *ZPE* 164 (2008) 123-130.

Achaia: Rizakis (n. 11 above), 192-193, no. 132; cf. *Roman Peloponnese* I, ACH 32 (a proconsul, whose name is not preserved, 2nd/3rd. c. A.D.).

Arcadia: *IG V* 2, 124 (Trajan), *BCH* 88, 1964, 180-183 (Trajan), *IG V* 2, 127 (Hadrian), *IG V* 2, 302 (Hadrian), *SEG* XI 1062a (M. Pompeius Neos Theophanes Macrinus, under Hadrian).

40. For honours for P. Memmius Regulus see: *IG IV*² 1, 667 (Argolid, near Ligurio, probably transported from Epidauros); *IG IV*² 1, 665 (Epidauros); *IG IV*² 1, 669 (Epidauros); *IG IV* 1, 668 (Epidauros); *Corinth* VIII. 2, 53 (Corinth); *Corinth* VIII. 3, 306 (Corinth); *IvO* 470 (Olympia).

For honours for his son C. Memmius P. f. Regulus see *IG IV*² 1, 667 (Argolid, near Ligurio, probably transported from Epidauros).

41. For Memmii in the Peloponnese see *Roman Peloponnese* I, ARC 122, ARG 190, COR 421, EL 273, 274, 275, 276; *Roman Peloponnese* II, LAC 537-587.

42. Cf. above n. 24.

43. Cf. for example A.N. Sherwin White, *The Roman citizenship*, (Oxford 1973²) 252-253.

them. In the period after Hadrian the number of honorary monuments erected by individuals is reduced.

This phenomenon is not surprising, if it is put in its historical framework. In the troubled times before the establishment of Augustus's monarchy, with the great external threats, the civil wars in Rome and the piracy in full action in the Aegean sea, local aristocracies apparently looked for a new identity, new economic balances and sources of benefit as well as for a support in order to ensure their privileges, given the new landscape created by the Roman conquest. The monocracy of Augustus put an end to this uncertainty and created the necessary conditions for a re-encouragement of local elites.⁴⁴ At about the end of the 1st c. B.C. and the first half of the 1st c. A.D. the most prominent and well educated citizens had the opportunity to get to know the rulers personally, since they are recorded as members of several embassies of Greek cities to the emperors in order to present their requests to them.⁴⁵ A characteristic example is offered by Ti. Claudius Nicoteles from Epidauros, who was at the head of an embassy to the Emperor Claudius recorded in a fragmentary imperial letter to his hometown. Nicoteles simultaneously worked for his native town and also gained benefit for himself by obtaining Roman citizenship and creating a personal relationship with the emperor reflected in a monument erected by him for Claudius and Agrippina.⁴⁶ It is a common fact that during the 1st c. A.D., Peloponnesian elites aspired to form close bonds with the emperor, his family and with the magistrates of the administration of the new province and urged to advertise their loyalty to them. As time went by, this promptitude calmed. Romans were not complete strangers anymore. The patronage nets were consolidated. Besides the increased financial obligations of the elite and the first signs of the so-called «crisis» of the following century may also have played some role in the reduction of the private honours for Romans.

The increase in closer personal relationships with Roman Emperors and representatives of Roman rule is also to be indirectly inferred from the study of onomastics. An analysis of the diffusion of the various imperial gentile names in the Peloponnesian *poleis* could give a first picture of the attitude of each emperor towards individual cities, although bearing an imperial gentilicium does not neces-

44. Cf. Bowersock, *Augustus*, 2.

45. Cf. Bowersock, *Augustus*, 86-87.

46. M. Mitsos, *AE* 1974, 79-83, no. 11 (cf. *BullÉpigr* 1976, 259). For the honorary monument erected by Nicoteles for Claudius and Agrippina see *IG* IV 1403; *IG* IV² 1, 602; cf. *BullÉpigr* 1976, 259.

sarily imply personal contact with the emperor in question, since a new citizen often assumed the gentile name of the reigning emperor and not that of his patron. Moreover, as a comparison of the above quoted and the following tables show, the number of honorific monuments erected by private individuals for an emperor is not always in step with the diffusion of his gentile name. The granting of Roman citizenship depends both on the general policy of an emperor regarding this matter and on personal relationships with individuals; thus, every case is to be investigated taking both of these parameters into account.

	Iulius	Claudius	Flavius	Ulpus	Aelius	Aurelius
Achaia	10	4	1		2	4 (1st c. B.C.-2nd c. A.D.) 1 (2nd/3rd c. A.D.)
Arcadia	18	17	3	1	1	40
Argolis	15	34	3	2	11	36
Corinthia	31	28	15		9	7
Eleia	15	49	30		9	34
Laconia	135	116	6	8	19	149
Messenia	13	43	16		4	59

Obtaining Roman citizenship and consequently a Roman name was still rare in the Republican period. The first Roman citizens of the Peloponnese, leaving aside the colonies, are attested in the first decades of the Imperial period and belonged to the most prominent groups of their hometowns.⁴⁷ The relatively large number of Antonii, a great deal of whom probably go back to enfranchisements of Marcus Antonius, mark the change in the reluctance in granting Roman citizenship in the East. The majority of the Greek *poleis* and individuals indeed opted for Antonius during the period before Actium.⁴⁸ It was an exception that the Spartan Eurycles chose the rival camp. The Antonians seem to have been as a rule tolerated by Augustus after his victory and in some cases they even seem to have been

47. For example the first Roman citizen of Elis is to be encountered after 20 B.C. (Tib. Claudius Apollonius, who obtained Roman citizenship through Tib. Claudius Nero, the future Emperor Tiberius, see Zoumbaki, *Elis und Olympia*, K 52 and ead., «Tiberius» [see n. 16 above]), in Sparta the first attested citizen is the above mentioned Eurycles, son of Lachares; P. Caninius Agrippa (see *Roman Peloponnese* I, ACH 64) who perhaps originated from the Achaean Pellene, obtained citizenship in the early Augustan period.

48. Cf. e.g. *Roman Peloponnese* I, COR 318, 320.

favoured by him as his own clients.⁴⁹ Although there are links of Peloponnesians with Antonius, known especially from literary sources, the vast majority of the Antonii attested in inscriptions are their descendants and are to be dated in the early Imperial period. This is the case of M. Antonius Aristocrates, son of Anaxio, from Argos, encountered in the inscription of a monument erected in his honour by the *σπατοληασταί* dated to about the end of the Republican period.⁵⁰ He is considered to be a descendant, most probably a grandson, of Aristocrates, a *ρητορικός* who was a friend of M. Antonius.⁵¹ The family owes the Roman citizenship to this connection to Antonius, as their gentilicium implies.

In the early 1st c. A.D. obtaining Roman citizenship was still rare in the Peloponnese. The increasing numbers of the attested imperial gentilicia testify that Roman citizenship was more widely diffused during the 1st c. A.D. This also implies a progress in the relationships between Greeks and Romans.

In some cases personal ties with a Roman commander or with the imperial family are not implied by the use of the Roman patron's gentile name but by the use of his cognomen, as in the case of P. Caninius Agrippa, whose proper name allows us to connect him with M. Vipsanius Agrippa,⁵² Augustus's close friend, and Tib. Julius Regulus, son of Sianthos, from Argos, whose cognomen betrays a relationship of his family with the governor P. Memmius Regulus who was very popular in Argolid.⁵³ An analysis of the diffusion of Latin cognomina in the Peloponnese, as the most detectable aspect of a more profound contact with the Roman culture, leads us to the conclusion that their use was limited mainly among powerful individuals.⁵⁴ As Greek notables sought out ways to rise in the Roman hierarchy, they

49. Bowersock, *Augustus*, 43-44; Stansbury, 164-165. Cf. also Stansbury, 251 for the Antonii attested as civic magistrates. It was Augustus's steady tactics to appropriate for himself the former supporters of his defeated rivals. A striking example is offered by the fact that Ti. Claudius Nero's clientela of long standing in Sparta appears on Augustus's side after the latter's marriage with Livia (D.C. 54. 7, 2; cf. Suet., *Tib.* 6. 2).

50. *IG* IV 581.

51. Plu., *Ant.* 69; cf. P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste* (Le Caire 1927) 236.

52. Spawforth, «Roman Corinth», 173, 176-177.

53. S. Zoumbaki, «Ένας Ἀγγλος εὐγενής τοῦ 17ου αἰ. στὰ ἔχνη μιᾶς ἐπιφανοῦς οἰκογένειας Ἀργείων τῆς ρωμαϊκῆς ἐποχῆς: μιὰ νέα ἐπιγραφὴ καὶ μιὰ νέα ματιά σὲ γνωστὰ ἐπιγραφικὰ κείμενα ἀπὸ τὸ Ἄργος», in: *Πρακτικά Β' Πανελληνίου Συνεδρίου Ἐπιγραφικῆς στὴ μνήμη τῆς Φανούλας Παπάζογλου*, Θεσσαλονίκη 24-25 Νοεμβρίου 2001 (in press).

For honours for P. Memmius Regulus in Argolid see n. 40 above.

54. S. Zoumbaki, «Choosing a new name between Romanisation and persistence: the

found it more suitable to cover their Greek origin under a more Roman profile that could be also created through their Latin names.

The composition of the Peloponnesian elites in the Roman period

The question arises as to what people composed the local elites of the Peloponnese. Hitherto thorough examinations concern only the colonies of the region.⁵⁵ The results of these investigations made it clear that despite the differentiations between the three colonies of the Peloponnese, the common element is that the most important role was played in all of them by non indigenous individuals, either by well established freedmen among the colonists and businessmen, as in Corinth, or by veterans, as in the case of Patras; there is no sign of an older aristocracy.

It is interesting to know what happened to the rest, old towns of the Peloponnese. In some cases it is obvious that the prominent families of the first two centuries of the Imperial period already used to play an important role in public life of their home towns for several generations. Their nomenclature often stresses the continuity of their noble lineages and sometimes indeed claims descent from figures of myth or ancient history.⁵⁶ The noble descent could be of course easily fabricated, if the interested person possessed wealth and power. It is however significant that names are used to underline the stability and continuity of prominent families.

evidence of Latin personal names in the Peloponnese», in: C. Grandjean, *Le Péloponnèse d'Épaminondas à Hadrien*, Colloque de Tours 6-7 octobre 2005 (Bordeaux 2008) 145-159.

55. For the nature of Caesarian and Augustan colonies see Bowersock, *Augustus*, 62-72.

Especially for the formation of the elites of the Roman colonies of the Peloponnese, all of them situated on the northern coast of the peninsula, see Spawforth, «Roman Corinth», 167-182; A.D. Rizakis, «La constitution des élites municipales dans les colonies romaines de la province d'Achaïe», in: O. Salomies (ed.), *The Greek East in the Roman Context*, Proceedings of a Colloquium Organised by the Finnish Institute at Athens, May 21 and 22, 1999 (Helsinki 2001) 37-49. Patras is a military colony, where veterans played the main role in social and political life. Both Caesarian colonies, Corinth and Dyme, were constituted mainly by freedmen. Especially for Corinth, the presence of businessmen is also important. Their integration took place probably simultaneously at the *deductio* of the colony. A military element, though present, does not seem to have played an important role in public life of both Caesarian colonies.

56. For some examples cf. names within the family of Euryclids at Sparta, who claimed Heracles and Rhadamanthys among his forebears, cf. Cartledge-Spawforth, 98, 110. Cf. also the names of M. Antonius Oxylos in Elis (S. Zoumbaki, *Elis und Olympia*, 216, A 98 and 360-361, Σ 2).

Some of these families can be traced back even to 4th c. B.C. and in some cases linked with intermarriages with other important lineages, creating huge trees of power with branches that sometimes extend beyond the limits of their home towns.⁵⁷ A characteristic example is offered by the stemma of the family of Claudius Nico-teles,⁵⁸ which is to be traced from the 3rd c. B.C. to the 2nd c. A.D. The prominent Messenian family of Saethidae, whose members became senators in the 2nd c. A.D., is to be regarded as descendants of a certain Saethida, leader of the Messenians during the invasion of Demetrios of Pharos in 214 B.C.⁵⁹ Impressive stemmata are also to be reconstructed for Laconian families, which are linked with marriages between their members.⁶⁰ Epigraphical evidence testifies that the family of M. Antonius Samippos in Elis can be traced back to the 4th c. B.C.⁶¹ This family is linked in about the middle of the 1st c. B.C. with a further leading house of Elis, namely that of Telemachos, son of Leon, whose first known members are also to be dated to 4th or 3rd c. B.C.⁶² Certainly there are also families that appear for a short period in the leading group of their poleis and then they disappear. This may most probably be explained through the distribution of their properties among more heirs, as it has been argued.⁶³ The families that maintain their foremost role in the public life over generations apparently possessed enormous wealth, deriving mainly from huge land properties.

There are also cases of links between eminent local families and Romans

57. Cf. for example the prosopographical studies of A.J.S. Spawforth, «Families at Roman Sparta and Epidaurus: some prosopographical notes», *ABSA* 80 (1985) 191-258.

58. For the stemma see *IG IV²* 1, p. XXV. For newly discovered members of the family see Zoumbaki, «Ένας Ἀγγλος ἐγγενὴς τοῦ 17ου αἰ.» (see n. 53 above).

59. C. Habicht, *REA* 100 (1998) 491-494; cf. also Paus. 4. 32, 2. The names Saethida and Niceratus are typical names in the family and are borne by several members in the Imperial period. The first Roman citizen of the lineage was T. Claudius Theo, son of Niceratus, who may have acquired citizenship under Claudius (*Roman Peloponnese* II, MES 161), and the first Roman senator was Claudius Frontinus, who reached the senatorial rank under Hadrian (for him see *Roman Peloponnese* II, MES 142). For a stemma of the family see *Roman Peloponnese* II, Stemma XVI based on C. Settiani, *Continuité gentile et continuité familiale dans les familles sénatoriales romaines à l'époque impériale. Mythe et réalité* (Oxford 2000) 116.

60. *Roman Peloponnese* II, e.g. Stemmata I, VII.

61. Zoumbaki, *Elis und Olympia*, 361, Σ 2.

62. Zoumbaki, *Elis und Olympia*, 372 ff, T 9 and ead., *Prosopographie der Eleer bis zum 1. Jh. v. Chr.*, *MEΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ* 40 (Athen 2005) 424-425.

63. A. Rizakis, «Ηγετική τάξη και κοινωνική διαστρωμάτωση στις πόλεις της Πελοποννήσου κατά την αυτοκρατορική εποχή», in: V. Mitsopoulos-Leon (ed.), *Forschungen in der Peloponnes. Akten des Symposions anlässlich der Feier «100 Jahre Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut Athen»*, Athen 5. 3.-7. 3. 1998 (Athen 2001) 190 (with bibliography).

settled in the Peloponnese, for example the Elean family of Ti. Claudius Agias, which was united by intermarriage with the family of Vettuleni, descendants of Romans settled at Elis,⁶⁴ perhaps developing an agricultural activity, which was the most profitable enterprise in this region. The engagement in agriculture and stock-breeding, attested for the so-called 'Ρωμαῖοι ἐνγαίουντες in Eleia⁶⁵ and for Romans in Messene,⁶⁶ requires a larger investment and a longer, if not permanent, attachment to a place. This created apparently closer connections between those Romans and their new residences and sometimes led clearly to a permanent settlement, to possession of the cultivated land, in cases of obtaining the right of *enktesis*, and to intermarriages with members of the local elites. Some members of those new prominent families are attested to have reached the equestrian and even senatorial rank.⁶⁷

There are also further indications of western businessmen, sometimes only

64. S. Zoumbaki, «Zu einer neuen Inschrift aus Olympia: Die Familie der Vettuleni von Elis», *ZPE* 99 (1993) 227-232; for a stemma of both linked families see also Zoumbaki, *Elis und Olympia*, 248.

65. S. Zoumbaki, «'Ρωμαῖοι ἐνγαίουντες. Römische Grundbesitzer in Eleia», *TYCHE* 9 (1994) 213-218.

66. The inscription of the extra-ordinary eight-obols taxation (*octobolos eisphora*) shows that there were Romans who were engaged in agriculture; for the text see *IG V* 1, 1432, l. 36; A. Wilhelm, «Urkunden aus Messene», *JOEAI* 17 (1914) 1-120; for several comments on the text cf. J.A.O. Larsen, Roman Greece, in: T. Frank (ed.), *An economic survey of ancient Rome* (New York 1975, repr. of the edition 1938) vol. IV, 419-421 (*SEG XI* 1033); U. Kahrstedt, *Das wirtschaftliche Gesicht Griechenlands in der Kaiserzeit*, (Bern 1954) 220-221 (*SEG XV* 226); A. Giovannini, *Rome et la circulation monétaire en Grèce au IIe siècle avant Jésus-Christ*, Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 15 (Basel 1978) 115-122 (*SEG XXVIII* 415); P. Marchetti, *RBN* 125 (1979) 193-194 (*SEG XXIX* 396); K. Hopkins, *JRS* 70 (1980) 121, n. 59 (*SEG XXX* 415); P.A. Brunt, «Review articles», *JRS* 71 (1981) 166; C. Grandjean, *REG* 109 (1996) 689-695 (*BullÉpigr* 1997, 247); L. Migeotte, «La date de l'octôbolos eisphora de Messène», *Topoi* 7.1 (1997) 51-61 (*SEG XLVII* 383; *AnnÉpigr* 1998, 1256; *BullÉpigr* 1998, 177). For several suggestions on the chronology of this inscription, which has been dated from ca. 100 B.C. till A.D. 35-44 see relevant remarks of *Roman Peloponnese II*, MES 266.

A further taxation list from Messene forms one more indication for Romans engaging in agriculture: *IG V* 1, 1434, l. 7; A. Wilhelm, «Urkunden aus Messene», *JOEAI* 17 (1914) 116-119 (*SEG XI* 1035).

67. Cf. for example L. Vettulenus Laetus, of equestrian rank, as his *cursus honorum* reveals (Zoumbaki, *Elis und Olympia*, 243, B 9); for a part-Italian ancestry of the Messenian Ti. Claudius Dionysios Crispianus see A. Spawforth, «Italian elements among Roman knights and senators from Old Greece», in: Chr. Müller et Cl. Hasenohr (eds), *Les Italiens dans le monde Grec, IIe siècle av. J.-C.-Ier siècle ap. J.-C. Circulation, activités, intégration*, Actes de la

temporarily settled in the area, who were often more or less embodied in the life of their residences,⁶⁸ as their participation in the institution of the ephebic training and their impact on the economic life of Greek towns testify.⁶⁹ The most powerful members of the Roman communities of men of business formed part of the elite of local societies regardless of whether they constituted a permanent or a transitory group of powerful businessmen. Moreover, since they were often agents of important patrons in Rome engaged in overseas business, they could be on the one hand ideal business-partners and on the other hand ideal political links for ambitious Greeks.⁷⁰ Several honorary inscriptions set up by the Roman *conventus* of towns for certain individuals, who always belong to the highest social layers of their towns, are very enlightening for the debit-credit, the «*do-des*», which was developed between these two groups, which constituted the driving force behind the financial activity.

table ronde, École Normale Supérieure, Paris 14-16 mai 1998, *BCH Suppl.* 41 (Paris 2002) 102-103.

68. Cf. S. Zoumbaki, «Die Niederlassung römischer Geschäftsleute in der Peloponnes», *TEKMHPIA* 4 (1998/1999) 112-176.

69. As enlightening examples we can quote ephebic catalogues of Messene of the last decades of the 1st c. B.C. and throughout the 1st c. A.D., where Romans are listed as ephebes either under the heading of one of the local tribes or under the heading *Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ ξένοι*, cf. for example *Roman Peloponnese* II, *MES* 5, 95, 101, 110, 114, 116, 117 etc.; for Romans who seem to be enrolled in a local tribe see *ib.*, *MES* 10, 11.

We can quote more examples of settled Romans offering financial aid to the towns when special circumstances arise, like the bankers Cloatii at Gytheion, who helped the town with loans and paid off its debts in periods of crisis, see *IG V* 1, 1146; for further bibliography see *Roman Peloponnese* II, *LAC* 331. Further Romans are attested as contributors for repairs to public buildings of Messene between A.D. 3 and 14, see L. Migeotte, *BCH* 109 (1985) 597-607, fig. 1-3 (*SEG XXXV* 343); for further comments and bibliography see *Roman Peloponnese* II, *MES* 20. There are also cases of donations made by settled Romans for the whole town, such as the huge donation of oil for the gymnasium at Gytheion by Faenia Aromation, probably a freedwoman engaged in the chain of the cosmetic commerce of the Faenii in Italy and Gaul, see *IG V* 1, 1208; see also *Roman Peloponnese* II, *LAC* 351. We can further cite the financing of the erection of a bridge over the river Alpheios by T. Arminius Tauriscus in return for privileges which he acquired from the town of Megalopolis in the Augustan period, cf. *IG V* 2, 456 = *CIL III* 1 Suppl. 7250; *III* 2 Suppl. 13691; see also *Roman Peloponnese* I, *ARC* 10.

70. For such agents at Corinth see Stansbury, 253-255.

**Honours offered by Roman communities
to distinguished individuals of the Peloponnese**

P. Caninius Agrippa	honoured by	Romans settled in Pellene
Euphrosynus, son of Titus	->-	Romans settled in Mantinea
Ti. Claudius Diodotus, son of Diodotus	->-	Romans settled in Argos
C. Iulius Eurycles, son of Lachares	->-	Romans settled in towns of Laconice
->-	->-	Romans settled in Boiai

Connections of the upper Peloponnesian class with the most prominent colonists, especially of Corinth, could be equally useful both for economic and political benefit. It is not a mere coincidence that wealthy and ambitious Peloponnesians, who obtained Roman citizenship as a first step necessary for the fulfilment of their dreams of pursuing a Roman career, were in closer contact with the colony of Corinth, where they indeed held colonial offices.⁷¹ The Achaean (?) P. Caninius Agrippa, the Spartans C. Iulius Laco, son of Eurycles, and his son Spartiaticus, all attested as *procuratores* in Corinth, followed this way in the 1st c. A.D.⁷² Cn. Cornelius Pulcher from Epidauros held important offices of Corinth under Trajan, secured immunity for the town and also embarked on an equestrian career.⁷³ He is regarded to be the grandson of a Cornelius Pulcher attested in the first half of the 1st c. A.D. as Isthmian agonothet.⁷⁴ Non-Peloponnesian individuals, like C. Iulius Polyaeus (IIvir A.D. 57/8 or 58/9),⁷⁵ P. Memmius Cleander (IIvir A.D. 66/7)⁷⁶

71. On this topic see also Spawforth, «Roman Corinth», 173-174; Rizakis, «La constitution des élites» (see n. 55 above), 45-46.

72. For P. Caninius Agrippa see *Roman Peloponnese* I, COR 135, for C. Iulius Laco COR 345, for C. Iulius Spartiaticus COR 353; cf. also *Roman Peloponnese* II, LAC 509.

73. For the colonial career of Cn. Cornelius Pulcher see *Roman Peloponnese* I, COR 228; for immunity of Corinth see *IG* IV 1600; *Corinth* VIII.1, 80: ...ἄλλας τε μεγάλας δωρεὰς ἐπιδόντα καὶ τὴν ἀτέ[λειαν] τῇ(ι) πόλει παρασχόντα...; for his equestrian career see *Roman Peloponnese* I, ARG 117.

74. He is attested in inscriptions of Epidauros (*IG* IV² 1, 101; 653), Corinth (*Corinth* VIII 3, 173) and Delphi (*Syll*³ 802); for him see also *Roman Peloponnese* I, COR 226; ARG 116; Spawforth, «Roman Corinth», 174; Stansbury, 268.

75. Spawforth, «Roman Corinth», 174 regards his origin as Sicyonian; Rizakis, «La constitution des élites» (see n. 55 above), 46, n. 39 refers to him as «probablement originaire de Delphes»; *Roman Peloponnese* I, COR 350.

76. For P. Memmius Cleander, of Delphic origin, see Spawforth, «Roman Corinth», 174; *Roman Peloponnese* I, COR 421.

and P. Memmius (?) Critolaus Theocles,⁷⁷ left their hometowns to pursue colonial offices of Corinth. The fact that some of these officers also undertook the expensive *agonothesia* of the Isthmian and other games or offered other benefactions to the colony⁷⁸ is significant for their willingness to pay for being appreciated by the colonial authorities and the Roman officers sojourning there.

The carefully cultivated relations with the most powerful members of the ambience of colonists and business communities could be an introduction of the Peloponnesians to Roman culture, which was expected as a passport for the indigenous elites to advanced Roman careers. Especially for individuals who were enrolled as Roman knights a fluency in Latin would have been expected.⁷⁹ If we can speak about the notion of «romanisation» of the Greek population— a topic which has caused a lengthy debate among the specialists—, then it would be clear that the most «romanised» part of the society of the Greek towns of the Peloponnese is to be identified with the members of the elite with close connections to Corinth and Roman men of business.⁸⁰

People having close contacts with Corinth belonged to the most powerful groups within local elites of the Peloponnese, who had the required qualification to socially ascend within the Roman society and reach the highest offices of a Roman career. Several prominent individuals from the Peloponnese did succeed their target and were raised on equestrian rank. Some of these new Roman knights were the individuals that functioned as *procuratores* at Corinth, since *procuratores* were normally of equestrian rank and their influence increased as the Principate developed.⁸¹ If that is to be accepted, then the first Peloponnesian who reached equestrian rank was P. Caninius Agrippa, son of Alexiades, who held the office of imperial procurator in Corinth under Augustus. The remaining aforementioned non-Corinthian *procuratores* are therefore also to be regarded as Roman equites: the Spartans C. Iulius Laco and C. Iulius Spartiaticus, apparently raised to equestrian

77. For P. Memmius (;) Critolaus Theocles, of Delphic origin, see Spawforth, «Roman Corinth», 180, no 17.

78. e.g. an Eurycles from Sparta was the donor of the «baths of Eurycles» named by Paus. 2. 3, 5. There is no agreement about his identification either with Eurycles of Augustan period (e.g. Stansbury, 217-218) or with Herculaneus (Cartledge-Spawforth, 104).

79. Plu., *Dem.* 2. 2; Suet., *Cl.* 16. 2.

80. Spawforth, «Italian elements» (see n. 67 above), 107.

81. G. G. Pflaum, *Les procurateurs équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain* (Paris 1950) 10 (for Caninius Agrippa), 151 (for Cornelius Pulcher); P. Garnsey and R. Saller, *The Roman Empire. Economy, society and culture*, (London 1987) 22-25.

order under Claudius,⁸² and the Epidaurian Cn. Cornelius Pulcher,⁸³ who reached high equestrian offices in the early 2nd c. A.D. The old glorious Peloponnesian cities also produced important personalities following Roman careers, and for these personalities no connection with Corinth is attested so far. However, a closer examination of their families shows for some cases attested till beginning of the 2nd c. A.D., that a link with the Roman ambience of their regions is assumed with great probability, as for the Messenian Ti. Claudius Dionysios Crispianus Quir., son of Aristomenes and the Elean L. Vettulenus Laetus.⁸⁴ For the remaining individuals of equestrian rank no further details can be detected.⁸⁵

Senators of Peloponnesian origin are encountered from the period of Trajan onwards.⁸⁶ They originated from Laconia and Messenia.⁸⁷ The first known senator is C. Iulius Fab. Eurycles Herculanus L. Vibullius Pius, a descendant of Eurycles of the Augustan period, who probably entered the senate under Trajan.⁸⁸ A descen-

82. *Roman Peloponnese* I, COR 345 for Laco and 353 for Spartiaticus. *Roman Peloponnese* II, LAC 468 for further bibliography and discussion on the identification of Laco; cf. also Halfmann, 29 b. LAC 509 for bibliography on Spartiaticus; cf. also Halfmann, 29 a.

83. *Roman Peloponnese* I, ARG 117, COR 288.

84. For Ti. Claudius Dionysios Crispianus Quir., son of Aristomenes see *Roman Peloponnese* I, EL 148 and *Roman Peloponnese* II, MES 136; he is attested as *tribunus militum* of the *legio XII Fulminata* and *praefectus cohortis I Bosporianae*. For his eventual part-Italian ancestry see Spawforth, «Italian elements» (see n. 67 above), 102-103.

85. A fragmentary text from Argos (*IG* IV 596) concerning a military tribune is to be dated apparently to about the end of the 1st/beginning of the 2nd c. A.D. The next attested cases are of a later date in the 2nd or 3rd c. A.D. The Spartan M. Aurelius Stephanos is attested as ἱππεὺς Ῥωμαίων, without any more concrete reference to an office held by him (*IG* V 1, 596; cf. also *Roman Peloponnese* II, LAC 188). In a similar way, two further individuals, father and son, C. Iulius L--- and his father C. Iulius Philippos, are to be found in an inscription from Methone as Roman knights without any further details, see *IG* V 1, 1417; cf. *Roman Peloponnese* II, MES 225 and 227. It is not clear whether their origin was from Methone, where the son is attested as patron of the town, or more probably from Argos, where he held important offices.

86. This delay is understandable, since the admission to the senate presupposed that the father of the new senator was already a Roman knight and consequently there was a long experience of the Roman citizenship in the family. Cf. Halfmann, 24.

87. The Corinthian origin of Veturius Paccianus is not to be regarded as certain, as it is based on the fact that the name Paccianus is twice attested in Corinthian inscriptions, which is indeed a weak argument. For Veturius Paccianus see *Roman Peloponnese* I, ARG 264 and Halfmann, 40 and no. 118; for attestation of the name Paccianus at Corinth see *Roman Peloponnese* I, COR 448.

88. *Roman Peloponnese* II, LAC 462, for entering the senate see p. 289; cf. Halfmann, 29.

dant of the rival of the older Eurycles, Brasidas, is a further Roman senator from Sparta, Ti. Claudius Brasidas.⁸⁹ He is not attested as senator in any preserved inscription but he is to be recognised in a passage from Digest (XXXVI. 1, 23: *Brasidas quidam Lacedaemonius vir praetorius*) in connection with a legal matter concerning a family dispute dated to the period of Marcus Aurelius. The other known Peloponnesian senators originate from Messene. They belong to the most prominent family of the area linked with other Peloponnesian *poleis* and with Italy, where—specifically in Abellinum—the family also possessed some property. Claudius Frontinus,⁹⁰ the first member of the lineage who entered the senate under Hadrian, became consul suffectus under Antoninus Pius. His sons, Ti. Claudius Frontinus Niceratus⁹¹—married with (Gavia) Cornelia Cethegilla and father of Ti. Claudius Quir. Saethida Cethegus Frontinus⁹²—and Ti. Claudius Saethida Caelianus,⁹³ held important imperial offices in the second half of the 2nd c. A.D.

A close look at the individuals of considerable status in the Peloponnese shows that there was a graduation within these groups reflecting probably a graduation of wealth and influence, which is clearly imprinted in their careers and the networks of relationships. Thus, apart from the local elites of the various towns, an upper class Peloponnesian elite was now created, which actually formed part of a provincial elite and had further links with corresponding social groups of other eastern provinces. It belonged therefore to a common web of the new elite of the East which shared enormous wealth, political influence and connections with the Roman ruling class.⁹⁴ This upper class elite maintained simultaneously at home

89. *Roman Peloponnese* II, LAC 274, where also bibliography on the identification of the individual is to be found; cf. Halfmann, 111.

90. *Roman Peloponnese* II, MES 142; cf. Halfmann, 93.

91. *Roman Peloponnese* II, MES 150; cf. Halfmann, 126.

92. More about the family see Chr. Settiani, *Continuité gentile et continuité familiale dans les familles sénatoriales romaines à l'époque impériale. Mythe et réalité*, (Oxford 2000) 116.

93. *Roman Peloponnese* II, MES 157; cf. Halfmann, 127.

94. Eurycles of Sparta had contacts with Herodes the Great of Judaea and Archelaos of Cappadocia (cf. Cartledge-Spawforth, 100). The Euryclids were connected with the family of the descendants of Theophanes of Mytilene, Pompeius's notorious friend, through the marriage of Pompeia Macrina with Iulius Argolicus, son of Iulius Laco. The Euryclids were also connected with the dynasty of Commagene as A.J.S. Spawforth, «Balbilla, the Euryclids and memorials for a Greek magnate», *ABSA* 73 (1978) 249-260 pointed out. The consul of A.D. 108 Q. Roscius Coelius Murena Silius Decianus Vibullius Pius Iulius Eurycles Herculanus Pompeius Falco (Halfmann, 39 and 211) had certainly some tie with the family. C. Iulius Eurycles Herculanus was a friend of Plutarch, cf. C.P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford

their own local «clientelae», their links with the lower nobility.⁹⁵ Interstate relations between elites are attested in inscriptions both on the level of the upper class and on the level of the lower aristocracy.⁹⁶ This had already permanently left behind the limited activity within their hometowns. Now they are more «present» in foreign towns, where they are honoured, hold magistracies, possess property or donate works for public utility. Moreover, they entered a wide network of eastern clientelae of Roman patrons.

Conclusions

From all above it arises that it was the group of the most prominent citizens of the Peloponnesian towns that gave the tone of the relationships with the Roman rulers. Resistance to the Romans or approach to them was always pioneered by the foremost members of local societies. Yet resistance is not to be perceived as a widespread revolution against Roman rule but rather as isolated cases of opposition or complaints regarding certain policies. At the same time the same social circles tended towards an approach to the representatives of Roman authority aiming at their support in order to gain political power and social prestige in their hometowns as well as to obtain certain privileges, such as Roman citizenship and an eventual climbing in imperial hierarchy. An approach of the elites of Peloponnesian towns to the most powerful Roman businessmen and to the colony of Corinth could be equally useful both for economic reasons and for social ascend.

The elite of the Roman Peloponnese was a mélange of prominent groups of various origin. Several prominent families of the Greek towns of the first two centuries of the Roman empire seem in many cases— as far as the preserved evidence permits an insight into the evolution of the lineages— to have maintained

1971) 41 n. 9; 46. Another friend of Plutarch was Cn. Cornelius Pulcher, to whom the treatise «De capienda ex inimicis utilitate» is dedicated.

95. For example, the aforementioned Cn. Cornelius Pulcher is honoured in Troizen by his friend Cn. Cornelius Philiscus, in Corinth by L. Gellius Menander (I) and L. Gellius Iustus, posthumously in Epidauros by a certain Xenocles. M. Pompeius Neos Theophanes Quirina Macrinus from Lesbos was honoured by M. Pompeius Eisas Aelianus in Tegea, see *Roman Peloponnese* I, ARC 137 and 138.

96. Connections through marriages of Spartan prominent families with other families of the Peloponnese have been studied very profoundly by A.J.S. Spawforth, «Families at Roman Sparta and Epidauros: some prosopographical notes», *ABSA* 80 (1985) 191-258. A further characteristic example offers the family of the above mentioned M. Antonius Alexio from Elis, which had some ties with Messene, cf. Zoumbaki, *Elis und Olympia*, 216-219.

this important role in public life over generations. There was of course some access to newfangled notables with wealth and connections. In general, however, we cannot speak of a gap or of a disappearance of the old aristocracy and establishment of a new elite. The Peloponnesian elite of the Roman period was therefore consisted of members of an old aristocracy, individuals that appear for a short period as leading members of the society and then they disappear like comets, of families that rose to power in the circumstances of depression of the late Republic and of descendants of well-established *negotiatores*. This new Peloponnesian elite no longer takes account of the old *polis* territories. Local nobilities are united through marriages, friendships, common interests and above all common Roman patrons.

Summary

This paper examines the composition of the Peloponnesian elites during the Roman period and traces the interaction between them and the Roman ruling power. The period under examination extends roughly from the time of Polybios, who was the first known cultured Greek and Peloponnesian attached to Romans, to the time of Plutarch, whose attitude to Romans certainly influenced educated individuals of the Peloponnese who were evidently in contact with him. The process of gradual approach between Peloponnesians and Romans includes also certain breaks of opposition, which—even its most violent instances, such as the events of Dyme (144/143 B.C.)—were, however, actually not revolts against Roman government generally, but resistance against certain policies of Roman magistrates or emperors. The most prominent citizens of the Peloponnesian towns always played a central role either as inciters of a «revolutionary» action and protest and as «channels» conveying complaints of the towns to the Roman authorities, or as links between local circles and the Roman central power. Their personal connections with Roman magistrates and emperors were in any case firm in the course of time. The increase of such connections, which is also to be indirectly inferred from the study of onomastics, is also vitally imprinted in an overview of the honorary monuments for representatives of the Roman power, which were set up not by state authorities but by private individuals. It arises that private honours for Roman magistrates are extremely rare in the Republican period. They increase during the Imperial period and their vast majority is to be dated during the 1st c. A.D. and till the reign of Hadrian, when Peloponnesian notables aspire to create more and more personal bonds with emperors and their families and with functionaries of the provincial administration. In the period after Hadrian the number of honorary monuments erected by individuals is reduced, which probably reflects a consolidation of the patronage nets, the increased financial obligations of the elite and the first signs of the «crisis» of the 3rd c.

The elites of the old towns of the Peloponnese —the three Roman colonies of the

region are left aside—are composed of prominent groups of various origins. In some cases it is evident that the prominent families of the first two centuries of the Imperial period already used to play an important role in public life of their home towns for several generations. Although there were also cases of newfangled notables with wealth and connections, we cannot speak of a gap or of a disappearance of the old aristocracy and establishment of a new elite. Thus, the Peloponnesian elite includes the old aristocracy, individuals that appear only for short periods as leading members of local societies, individuals that rose to power in the circumstances of depression of the late Republic and descendants of well-established *negotiatores*. Connections with Roman settlers and ties with Roman colonies, especially Corinth, were important for advancing the careers of Peloponnesian notables. Some of them were indeed embarked on the equestrian and senatorial ranks of the Roman society. Local nobilities are united through marriages, friendships, common interests and common Roman patrons creating nets of power beyond the limits of their home towns.