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ABSTRACT

The distribution of money as small handouts is a practice, which is attested in both the Eastern and Western provinces of the Roman Empire. These gifts can, in the East, be seen as a development of Hellenistic euergetism, but they were also influenced by a parallel practice in the West. The groups in the East which received the handouts of money, διανομαί, correspond in general to the groups in the Roman West which received sportulae, divisiones and congiarii. Thus, the distribution of individual gifts of money in the Greek cities of Asia Minor can be studied as a measure of Romanization.

However, the manner in which the distributions themselves were conducted also serves as a measurement of Romanization, as there is evidence that διανομαί were provided on different occasions and to different groups of individuals before the advent of Roman control. Thus, distributions in the East were provided on the same occasions as those in the West, and, what is most important for the study of Romanization, the gifts were given in accordance with social rank: the higher an individual stood in the social hierarchy, the more he generally received. Such a stratification does not appear in Hellenistic distributions of meat, so that it is possible to attribute stratified gifts to the Romans.

To measure Romanization is not he only value of the διανομαί-inscriptions, though. They provide an important perspective into the workings of individual cities, on both a public and a private level. Thus, they show us the efforts of wealthy individuals on behalf of their cities and regions, as well as their efforts on behalf of themselves.
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INTRODUCTION: ROMANIZING ASIA MINOR

I. Hellenization and Romanization

The Romanization of Asia Minor is a process which cannot be separated from the spread of Hellenic culture in the region, so that both Romanization and Hellenization were occurring at the same time. There is, however, a great deal of debate concerning what Romanization actually means. Obviously, there is no purely ‘Roman’ culture to which the cultures of various regions of the Empire can be compared; similarly, elements which can be said to be ‘Roman’ will not have appeared in every region of the Empire with the same frequency. Nonetheless, there were processes by which the foreign cultures of Greece and Rome were established in Asia Minor, which we shall term Hellenization and Romanization, respectively.¹

Although we cannot point to any exact point of origin, it is convenient to take the beginning of the colonizing activities of mainland Greeks in the eighth century as the time when Greek culture began to spread throughout the Mediterranean basin, though there was contact between Greece and the eastern coast of the Mediterranean before this

¹ This question has been addressed recently by both Greg Woolf (1998) and Ramsay McMullen (2000). McMullen suggests that Romanization in the East was a process which was less observable than in the West due to the fact that many institutions of the Greek cities were similar to those within which the Roman elite were accustomed to operate. Woolf provides what may be an appropriate definition: "Romanization is a convenient shorthand for the series of cultural changes that created an imperial civilization, within which both differences and similarities came to form a coherent pattern" (Woolf (1998): 7).
time. Thus, there is a great deal of evidence for the political workings of the Greek cities in Asia Minor, noticeable in the appearance of various civic organizations which are similar to those of mainland Greek cities. Similarly, the spread of Greek dialects reflects the spread of ‘Hellenic’ culture, since local inscriptions provide most of the evidence for the different dialects; this is particularly clear in the koine Greek of the Hellenistic Age.

However, the various Greek dialects had spread to the western coast of Asia Minor before the beginning of the colonization of the region.

The process of Hellenization reached its most dramatic point in the conquests of Alexander the Great and the power struggles between his successors through a series of ups and downs—the colonizing of the western coast of Asia Minor and the Persian Wars, for example. Barbarians were involved in these contests at times, but for the most part Asia Minor remained in the hands of one of the major Greek kingdoms, Antigonid, Seleucid, Ptolemaic or Attalid. Thus, Antiochus III of Syria began expanding his sphere

---

2 On colonialization, see G. Tsetskhladze and F. De Angelis, The Archaeology of Greek Colonialisation (1994) and J. Boardman (1964), The Greeks Overseas.

3 Cf., for example, Jones (1987), who collects the epigraphic evidence for the administrative bodies and political structures in Greece, the Aegean Islands, Macedonia and Asia Minor. Similarly, Jones (1940) discusses the development of the Greek city the Hellenistic to the Byzantine age.


6 For the involvement of the Celts in the affairs of Asia Minor, see Mitchell (1993): 13 ff.
of influence in Asia Minor at the end the third century BC, a century after the Seleucids had first gained control of the region by the defeat of Antigonus at Ipsus.\(^7\)

Hellenism, therefore, had been extended beyond the coastal regions, but there were still many areas of Asia Minor which remained outside the sphere of Hellenic culture. The process of Hellenization continued throughout the Hellenistic period, but by the beginning of the second century BC, the Roman republic had also begun to take an active interest in the politics of Asia Minor which resulted in a concurrent process of Romanization. Erich Gruen argues at length that the Romans were uninterested in annexing any eastern territory: Roman policy was being directed by the interest of individuals rather than by a collective interest for Roman glory or even safety.\(^8\) However, Rome had recently been victorious in the second Punic war, which was caused, in part, by the conflicting interests of Rome and Carthage, clearly a case of two expanding powers, and we have a similar phenomenon in the Roman relations with the Hellenistic kings and cities. Gruen is right in downplaying the role of Roman expansion in involving the republic in the affairs of Asia Minor, but such expansion is inextricably connected with individuals pursuing their own glory. Consequently, we cannot deny that the actions of

---

\(^7\) For Antiochus' expansion into Asia Minor after 204/3, see Gruen (1984): 532 ff; for the defeat of Antigonus by Lysimachus and Seleucus I, see Magie (1950): 3, 727; the battle is also described briefly by Diod. (21.1ff.) and Plut., Demet. 28-29.

\(^8\) Gruen (1984): 203-249 argues that there was no set Eastern policy in Roman relations with the Hellenistic kingdoms. Roman intervention was often prompted by the interests of individual politicians who saw in an Asian commission a chance to enrich themselves and to gain public recognition through military success.
Roman generals in Asia Minor in the latter part of the Hellenistic Age were motivated in part by a Roman policy of expansion.

However, we can no more say that the activities of Roman generals and armies in Asia Minor resulted in the assumption by the inhabitants of a ‘Roman’ culture than we can say that Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt and Mesopotamia became ‘Greek’ as a result of Alexander’s conquests; nonetheless, both processes were accelerated by military ventures. However, as the Bactrian revolt after the death of Alexander the Great shows, military conquest alone does not constitute acculturation. It was rather individuals who set the processes of both Hellenization and Romanization in motion and kept it moving: the people who brought particularly Roman practices to Asia Minor were, among others, merchants, retired soldiers and, later, tax collectors who became permanent or long-time residents of the region, paralleling the Greek colonists who had brought Hellenic practices before them. Consequently, the military conquests of Roman generals in Asia Minor do not in themselves reveal a great deal of information concerning Romanization; rather, they show one aspect of the process by which the activities and interests of Roman citizens became more and more popular in the Greek cities of the region.

As is the case with Hellenization, though, there is no clearly defined point in time when these activities can be said to have begun. However, we can say that the Romanization of Asia Minor began in the conflicts between the diadochi, as independent cities or even kingdoms appealed to the neutral armies of Rome for assistance; the

---

9 Sherwin-White & Kuhrt (1993): 9, 166; Diod. 18.7.1.
aftermath of such Roman involvement is perhaps much more important than the involvement itself, though.

The struggles between the *diadochi* prompted several cities to appeal for Roman assistance to guarantee or support their autonomy, and these appeals had their climax, in Asia Minor, with the battle of Magnesia on the Maeander and the defeat of Antiochus III in 191 or 190 BC. The main result of this battle was that the Seleucid ruler was expelled from Asia Minor, which fell into the hands of Eumenes, already an *amicus* of Rome. Following this battle and the peace of Apamaea in 187, Gruen notes, Roman armies withdrew from Asia Minor.\(^\text{10}\)

Despite this withdrawal, Roman interests continued in the region, not only for political stability, but also for mercantile stability. It is likely that there were Roman residents, or at the very least Roman contacts, in some of the larger cities of Asia Minor, particularly in the coastal regions. These individuals will have provided the primary means by which Romanization was firmly established and quickened.

This process, through the residence of such individuals, will have been slow, perhaps no more than a small undercurrent, before the bequest of Attalus III in 133 BC and the active conquests of Sulla and Pompey, but it is evident that there were other means by which the ‘Roman outlook’ was spread to Asia Minor and the East in general. Antiochus IV of Syria, for example, was sent by his father as a hostage to Rome in 187 BC as a part of the peace of Apamaea. Livy remarks several innovations which he

introduced to Syria based on his observations in the city of Rome, including gladiatorial games, *Romanae consuetudinis*. Antiochus is only one of the more prominent such individuals, but both Eumenes II and Attalus II are known to have visited Rome on diplomatic missions, so that they too will have been in a position to observe and be influenced by ‘Roman’ practices.

After the defeat of Aristonicus by Manius Aquillius in 129, a commission of *decem legati* was sent from Rome to arrange matters in an attempt to encourage peaceful relations in the area; one of the activities of this commission was ‘constructing, repairing, or extending the network of roads in western Asia Minor’ in order to simplify the movement of troops and supplies. We cannot separate the simplification of troop movements from the simplification of trade routes, so that in Aquillius’ campaign and the activities of the *decem legati*, we have a stimulant for Romanization similar to the role of Alexander’s conquests in Hellenization, since there will have been individuals in various cities of Asia Minor with contacts in Rome, whether Greeks or Romans, providing yet another avenue through which Roman practices could enter the region.

---

11 Livy, 41.20.11.

12 For Eumenes in Rome, see Gruen (1984): 547; Livy 37.52-53; Polyb. 21.18-21; for Attalus in Rome, see Gruen (1984): 573; Polyb. 30.1; kings and royal ambassadors, though, were not alone in initiating contacts with Rome, as we also find smaller states opening relations with the Republic through the establishment of cults of Roma (Gruen (1984): 187). Polyb. 30.4ff. notes three ambassadors of Rhodes in Rome. Similarly, the citizens of Abdera appealed to their mother-city of Teos to send an embassy to Rome when Cotys, the king of the Thracians, encroached on their territory in the second century BC (Sherk (1984): 25, n. 26; SIG 656; IGR IV 1558; Robert, OMS I 320-326).

II. Romanization

As we have said, individuals, whether Greeks, Romans, or barbarians, were responsible for the establishment and spread of a Roman culture in Asia Minor. In order to trace this process, it is necessary to examine an action or an attitude which can be said to be distinctly 'Roman'. One obvious example of this is the presentation of gladiatorial games, which quickly became accepted and common in almost every major city in the East.  

Romanization, however, was not accomplished through the persistent application of a single 'Roman' practice, so that a complete understanding of Romanization cannot be obtained from a study focused exclusively on one of these practices. As elements of a 'Roman' culture, they cannot be entirely separated from one another, and should, therefore, be studied in conjunction: gladiatorial games, for example, under Roman rule, were provided by priests of the Imperial cult. Despite this interrelation, a detailed study of a single practice can show Romanization in a specific sphere. For the purposes of this thesis we shall focus on only a single element of 'Roman' culture, though we will not omit other aspects when they arise, as they must.

Public benefactions were used in part by numerous Hellenistic kings to gain public approval for themselves and their rule; these benefactions were usually on a large

---

14 Public games were not, of course, a uniquely Roman phenomenon. Greeks had been commemorating festivals with games long before they had any significant contact with Rome—the Olympic and Pythian games, for example. There is a distinction, however, between ludi and munera, the latter of
scale. Antiochus IV of Syria, for example, is praised by Livy for a series of benefactions to Greek cities on the mainland and in Asia Minor, which were designed in part to regain some of the foreign influence lost in the treaty of Apamaea. On a smaller scale, there is a great deal of evidence for the establishment of grain and education foundations. Such energetic behaviour, though, was not limited to Hellenistic kings. Throughout the Hellenistic period there is evidence for foundation funds and endowments by private citizens, though the kings and queens of the major dynasties naturally appear in inscriptions recording such benefactions much more often than do private citizens.

Several centuries later, both Plutarch and Dio Chrysostom note the importance of acting as a benefactor to one’s fatherland, reflecting a tradition in which Imperial priests and other wealthy citizens decorated their cities with buildings and statues; the benefactions of such citizens could also take the form of handouts of money, for example, to their fellow citizens or to other individuals. These handouts, διανομαί, are similar, but not identical, to the divisiones or sportulae of the Roman West. However, although such benefactions appear to have earned for their donors public approval, we cannot say that this was the only, or even the main, reason for the donations in eyes of the benefactors.

which were always ἐκ τῶν ἄνω—paid for by the agonothete himself rather than ἐκ τῶν κοινῶν. Such munera were ‘Roman’ events.

15 Livy, 41.20.5-9.

16 For example, Bagnall (1981): 113-4=SIG 3 578 (Education).


18 Plut. Prae. Ger reip.29, 821f-822a; Dio Chrys. Or 43.2.
A διανομή, as we shall note in Chapter One, could refer to a distribution of various materials before the establishment of Roman rule in Asia Minor, but after the end of the Hellenistic Age, it refers only to distributions of money. This change is one means of perceiving the Romanization of Asia Minor; though it is late when compared to the establishment of gladiatorial games or the worship of Roma and the Emperors, the shift in meaning is nonetheless important in assessing the influence of Roman culture on Greek euergetism. This being said, though, these handouts did not replace the large-scale euergetism of the Hellenistic age characterized by the funding of buildings, but rather appear concurrently with other donations, constructions and benefactions.

Διανομαί, during Roman times, are distributions of money; prior to Roman control, διανομαι were distributions, but not always of money. There is epigraphic evidence of these handouts of money in eleven different regions of Asia Minor dating from the principate of Augustus to the early fourth century, which provides strong evidence for the Romanization of the region. Distributions and other benefactions are common before the Imperial period. We shall see, though, that διανομαι in the epigraphic evidence are always distributions of money in the imperial period; distributions of meat or of land, could, in the Hellenistic age, also be described as διανομαι, but this use of διανομη does not appear after the Hellenistic age.

III. Chapter Organization

The literary evidence for διανομαι is sparse. What testimony there is, though, establishes the fact that the handouts which we will be examining were a Roman practice,
which is a necessary starting point for this thesis. The epigraphic evidence provides a much more detailed account of διανομαὶ, so that this body of evidence forms the basis of this thesis.

Sportulae have been studied in detail by both Richard Duncan-Jones and Stanislaw Mrozek, upon whom we shall rely for a brief summary of the practice of handing out sportulae in the West. Following this, we shall consider the literary evidence concerning διανομαὶ, which will reveal that there was a fundamental difference between the two types of handouts in the eyes of Roman authorities. The epigraphic evidence for διανομαὶ is abundant, and will be summarily introduced in the second half of Chapter One. This introduction will consist of a critical analysis of those inscriptions in which διανομή has been restored, with the intent of omitting incorrect or uncertain supplements. Closely connected with this examination will be a consideration of the chronology of the inscriptions.

Chapters Two and Three will be concerned exclusively with the Greek epigraphic evidence. We shall first attempt to analyze the language of these inscriptions. Subsequently, we shall discuss the categories into which they can be divided on the basis of the frequency with which the distributions are repeated. Chapter Two will also consider the occasions on which distributions were provided and the other benefactions with which they could be and were associated.

The most important elements of these distributions in demonstrating the Romanization of Asia Minor are the benefactors and the recipients. Imperial priests were active in the provision of διανομαὶ, but a variety of magistrates and civic officials also
appear among our benefactors. Several of these offices will be identified and briefly
discussed in Chapter Three, as will the recipients. The discussion of the recipients will
lead to a consideration of the question of how the handouts were actually distributed.

The primary purpose of the analysis of the inscriptions and the practice of handing
out διανομαί itself is to identify what is being done by the benefactors, and what
similarities and differences there between the διανομαί of the East and the sportulae of the
West. We will see that διανομαί and sportulae are, in fact, similar, though clearly not
identical—the two terms are not translations of one another. This similarity will become
clear through the summary of sportulae which we will provide in Chapter One, and the
more detailed analysis of the Greek epigraphic evidence which will follow. Thus, we will
see that the benefactors responsible for both διανομαί and sportulae are often of
equivalent social standings, as are the recipients. The differences between διανομαί and
sportulae will be seen to consist of the manner in which the distributions were conducted
and what was actually distributed: διανομαί will be seen to always refer to money, while
sportula will be seen to refer to money or food.
CHAPTER ONE: Διανομή in LITERATURE AND EPIGRAPHY

I. Literary and Epigraphic Evidence for Sportulae

A. Literary Evidence of sportulae

Distributions of money in the Roman West were offered on official or unofficial occasions. Magistrates during the Republican period and Emperors after the death of Julius Caesar provided distributions to the people of Rome on occasions such as a public office, while individual patrons provided distributions to their clients on a more personal basis. There is evidence of both types in literary sources, but only official distributions appear in honorary inscriptions.¹ We will not attempt in the following pages to examine the relationship between official and unofficial distributions in great detail, but only to introduce both types of distributions.

Public distributions are first attested in Livy, who tells us that Publius Cornelius Scipio and Marcus Cornelius Cethegus distributed congi olei during their aedileship in 213 BC; however, this is only the first attested distribution.² According to Dio, Caesar

¹ In the pages which follow, we shall consider distributions offered during a magistracy public or official distributions, and distributions offered by patrons to clients private or unofficial distributions. Within the second category, we will also include distributions which are not connected with any public service.

² Livy, 25.2.8: ludi Romani pro temporis illius copiis magnifice facti et diem unum instaurati, et congi olei in vicos singulos datt; van Berchem (1939): 119-20.
may have been the first to give money instead of grain or oil to his soldiers and the citizens of Rome in 46 BC on the occasion of his triumph.\(^3\)

The practice of handing out money during and after the reign of Augustus was so strictly controlled that in Rome private citizens were not allowed to provide such distributions: gifts to the entire plebs became an Imperial prerogative.\(^4\) These handouts, however, were not exclusively of money; instead, as Fergus Millar notes, the gifts were at the discretion of the Emperor; Gaius, for example, distributed coined money in person, while Nero distributed tokens which could be exchanged for the actual gifts.\(^5\)

The gifts provided by the Emperors could take various forms, but there is an uncertainty when we are told that sportulae are distributed. These were originally small baskets of food,\(^6\) but they could also be gifts of money. Suetonius tells us that Nero replaced the public banquets of his predecessors (cenae publicae) with simple ‘doles’ (sportulae),\(^7\) but it is unclear what exactly is being distributed here. Rolfe, in the Loeb translation, takes ‘sportulas’ to be a ‘distribution of food;’ this is possible, but it is not

\(^3\) Dio 43.21.3, using εὐερείας; cf. van Berchem (1939): 120-1.

\(^4\) van Berchem (1939): 123: Les empereurs se sont réservé le monopole des distributions d'argent à la plèbe de Rome. En dehors de Rome, ils surveillent jalousement les distributions que les notables des colonies ou des municiipes font en diverses circonstances à leurs concitoyens. The distributions studied by van Berchem come from a variety of sources: the Acta Urbis, numismatics, historians, biographers and the Chronographe de 354. He lists the public distributions provided by the Emperors from Caesar to Severus Alexander on the occasions on which they were provided (142-161).

\(^5\) Millar (1984): 137; Suet. Cal. 37.1 (personal distribution of money); Suet. Nero 11.2 (missilia); such missilia are also attested in an inscription from Cirta in Numidia (see below, p. 16 n. 16). These missilia could be exchanged for food, clothing, and gold, among many other things (Dio 58.4.4).

\(^6\) Hug, RE, 3.2, 1883-1886, s.v. sportula; Marquardt (1886): 207-8.
clear that this is what Suetonius means. In the *Life of Claudius*, Suetonius does use *sportula* of a distribution of food, but in this case he clearly specifies that it is food which is being distributed.⁸

Private or unofficial gifts appear in Martial and Juvenal, who use the term *sportula* in cases where it is clearly meant to refer to distributions of money,⁹ but they also use the term to refer to distributions of food. These distributions were given by a patron to his clients:

```
nunc sportula primo
limine parva sedet turbae rapienda togatae;
ille tamen faciem prius inspicit et trepidat ne
suppositus venias ac falso nomine poscas:
agitus accipies. iubet a praecone vocari
ipsos Troiugenas, nam vexant limen et ipsi
nobiscum. "Da praetori, da deinde tribuno."
sed libertinus prior est. "Prior" inquit "ego adsum."
```

---

⁷ Suet. Nero 16.2: *multa sub eo et animaduersa severe et coercita nec minus instituta: adhibitus sumptibus modus; publicae cenas ad sportulas redactae.*

⁸ Suet. Cl., 21.4 *quodque appellare coepit "sportulum," quia primum daturus edixerat, velut ab subitam condicamque cenuam invitere se populum.* This uncertainty is also apparent in the literary and epigraphic usage of *epulum*, as is the case in *CIL XI.6117: earumque dedicat(ione) Rufus epulum dedit decurionibus singul(is) HS XXX sex viris et augustalibus sing(ulis) HS XII plebis sing(ulis) HS III, and Petr. Sat. 71.10: scis enim quod epulum dedi binos denarios. faciuntur, si tibi videtur, et triclinia. fascias et totum populum sibi suaviter facientam.* In both cases, values listed may refer to the value of the *epulum*, to a gift of money to be used to buy the *epulum*, or a gift of money in addition to the *epulum*. Cf. also Donahue (1999).

⁹ For example, Juv. I.117-20; Mart., III.14, 30, 60.

¹⁰ Juv. I.95-102: ‘Now the tiny dole sits on the first threshold to be seized by the toga-clad mob; but he first inspects your face and he fears that you may have come as a substitution or that you may ask under a false name; once recognized, you will receive. He orders that those of Trojan descent be called by the herald, for they have gathered at the door along with us. “Give to the praetor, and then give to the tribune.” But the freedman is first in line. “I was here first!” he cries.’ The translations, both of the inscriptions and of literary sources, are my own, except where noted.
The handout was received at the home of the patron rather than in a public location, with a specific order in which the clients received their shares. The more important clients, such as the praetor and the tribune in Juvenal's satire, received their shares before all others. The *sportulae* which Juvenal and Martial describe are distinct from the *sportulae* which Claudius and Nero offered and the *congiarii* provided by the Emperors, distributions of which form van Berchem's evidence, in that they are given to small groups of clients rather than to the majority of the *plebs*.

B. Epigraphic Evidence of *sportulae*

In order to examine the practice of distributing *sportulae* outside of Rome, we must turn to honorary inscriptions. Richard Duncan-Jones and Stanislaw Mrozek have both conducted studies of foundations and donations, including *sportulae*, in Africa and in Italy outside of Rome during the early Empire.\(^{11}\)

Mrozek's study indicates that the term *sportula* was not used in inscriptions in Italian towns outside of Rome until the middle of the second century AD; even within Rome, though, the term is rare, reflecting the control exercised by the Emperors over official distributions of money.\(^{12}\) The earliest attestation of a distribution of money contained in Duncan-Jones' study records a distribution in Herculaneum in 48/9 AD.\(^{13}\)

\(^{11}\) Duncan-Jones (1982); Mrozek (1987).


\(^{13}\) Duncan-Jones (1982): 196, cat. 999=*CIL* X.1416; this records the donation of four sestertes to the *municipes* of Herculaneum by Claudius, but does not use the term *sportula*. 
but all of the other dated inscriptions in his collection belong to the reign of Hadrian or later.

The inscriptions collected by these two scholars were in part intended by the benefactors to publicize their generosity; Duncan-Jones notes that the distributions offered in towns and cities outside of Rome were a simple extension of the gifts provided by Emperors: that is, citizens of these cities were imitating the practices of the Emperors. The most visible result of such benefactions was a public monument, or, more specifically, the right to erect a public monument in order to glorify the donor. A typical *sportula* inscription from Cirta in the second century reads:

Genio populi. / M(arcus) Roccius Felix / M(arcii) fil(ius) Quir(ina) eq(uo) publ(ico) / IIIvir, sac(erdos) urb(is), fl(amen) divi / M(arcii) Antonini statuam, quam / ob honorem IIIviratus promisit ex HS VI mil(ibus) n(ummum) sua pecunia / posuit, ad cuius dedicationem / sportulas denarios singulos / secundum matricem publicam / civibus de suo dedit, itemque / ludos scaenicos cum missilibus [edidit].

Most of the providers of cash-distributions, or benefactions of any other kind, in Africa and Italy, are high-ranking Roman citizens: decurions, *Augustales*, and occasionally wealthy freedmen or merchants; in the case of Marcus Roccius Felix, we

---


15 Duncan-Jones (1982): 139; on pp. 162-166 (cat. 491-549a), Duncan-Jones has also collected the inscriptions recording the dedications of statues, paid for by the benefactors themselves; Hands (1964): 29-35.

16 *CIL* VIII 6948: 'By the genius of the people. Marcus Roccius Felix the son of Marcus of the tribe Quirina, *equo publico*, triumvir, priest of the city, *flamen* of the divine Marcus Antoninus has dedicated this, which he promised on account of the triumvirate, worth six million *sesterces* from his own
have a triumvir and Imperial priest. More rarely, women also fund distributions, but usually with a male representative.\(^{17}\) It is often the case that the higher the social rank of the recipient, the larger the gift received, though there are a few inscriptions which record the opposite.\(^{18}\) Women are only occasionally among the recipients, and when they are, they are explicitly emphasized.\(^{19}\)

The epigraphic evidence indicates that public *sportulae* were used by wealthy citizens in their pursuit of public honor and fame in connection with public service. Private *sportulae* provided by patrons to their clients do not appear in the epigraphic evidence; the inscriptions record only the public distributions offered on official occasions.

II. *Literary Evidence for διανομαί in the East*

Originally and most simply, διανομή referred to a distribution or a dealing out, being derived from the verb νέμω, which Homer uses in reference to the dispensing of money, at the dedication of which he gave *sportulae* of *one* denarius according to the public list of his own country, and he also gave theatrical spectacles with *missilia.*


\(^{18}\) For example, *CIL XIV* 431: *Augustales* receive HS 20 each, while the *Decurions* receive HS 12 each; cf. also Mrozek (1987): 78, 87.

\(^{19}\) Mrozek (1987): 99; Donahue (1999): 73. The inclusion of women and other groups of lesser status are often intended to be a testament to the extensive generosity of the benefactor (see below, Chapter Three, pp. 102-106).
meat and wine in feasts and sacrifices. In later authors, the verb generally refers to allotments of various sorts, though it is also the verb used by Cassius Dio to describe Caesar's distribution in 46 BC. Aristotle refers to διανομή of land, while Plutarch refers to διανομή of money in addition to διανομή of land. It is evident that διανομή can refer to the action of distributing rather than, like sportula, only to that which is distributed. However, we also find examples in the inscriptions in which a διανομή is distributed.

The literary evidence of cash-distributions indicates that the practice was not always looked upon approvingly by wealthy upper class Greeks; despite this, though, it is from this class that most of the benefactors must have come. Plutarch, for example, does not recommend the use of distributions for a young politician: fame and reputation gained from these, he says, are 'ephemeral and unreliable'. He does not condemn the act itself, though, but only the exploitation of the act for demagogic purposes.

---


21 Dio 43.21.3; see above, pp. 12-13.

22 Ar. Pol., 1329b40; Plut. Per. 34.2. Ti. Gracch. 13.1, 21.1, 31.1, Caes. 14.3 (land); Ant 71.3.2 (food); Per. 9.1, 9.2 (money). Aristotle does use the verb διανείμασθαι of money (Ath. Pol. 22.7.31: τὸ δήμος διανείμασθαι τὸ ἀργύριον). Lucian uses the term relatively frequently, applying it to both money and food (Phal 1.3.18, Gal. 22.3, Deor. Conc. 3.5, Nav. 24.6, Fisc. 41.3).

23 For example, Cat. # 3.c.1 ill. 9-14: [καὶ] ἡλλὰ τοῖς ἀρχαῖς βεβαιό ἄρα ἰσορία μόροι, ἵνα ἐκ τοῦ τόκου αὐτῶν κατ’ ἐτος ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῇ Κατασταθλωσοτι καὶ τῇ ὑποκαινικάτῃ παντί ἐλευθέρῳ θηνίῳ ἡ κατ’ ἀναλογίαν τοῦ συνενεσμένου πλήθους μερίζεται διανομῇ.

24 Plut. Prae. Ger. reip. 5. 802d; 29, 821f-822a. Cf. also Dio Chrys. Or. 66, in which the orator discusses the difficulty of acquiring a public reputation, and the dangers associated with it.

25 Cf. Dio Chrys. Or. 7.49, 48.10.
Pliny the Younger, during his service in Bithynia, expresses concern about the local custom of providing gifts of money to the members of the βουλή and groups of the people on private occasions in one of his letters to Trajan, but for a very different reason.²⁶ It is not the practice itself which Pliny is concerned about; as we know from Martial and Juvenal private distributions were not uncommon in Rome itself; in Rome, though, the gifts were given ex notitia. However, Pliny describes gifts offered to the public on private occasions, like weddings and coming-of-age celebrations. He is concerned about the extent and, specifically, the publicity of these gifts: it is a concern that private citizens are providing public gifts of cash on private occasions, a practice which was forbidden to private citizens in Rome.

Trajan’s response supports Pliny’s distinction.²⁷ He does not recommend or even suggest that Pliny should forbid all distributions, but he does recognize and share Pliny’s

²⁶ Pliny Ep. x.116: ‘Qui virilem togam sumunt uel nuptias faciunt uel ineunt magistratum uel opus publicum dedicant, solent totam bulen atque etiam e plebe non exiguum numerum uocare binosque denarios uel singulos dare. Quod an celebrandum et quatemus putes, rogo scribas. Ipse enim, sicut arbitror, praesertim ex sollemnibus causis, concedendum ius istud inuitationis, ita uereor ne ii qui mille homines, interdum etiam plures uocant, modum excedere et in speciem διασωσιης incidere uideantur.’ (Those who are assuming the toga viriIis or who are getting married or who are entering upon a magistracy or who are dedicating a public work are accustomed to assemble the entire boule and even a not-inconsiderable number of the populace and to give them one or two clenarii. I am asking you to tell me what you think of this custom and to what extent it should be permitted. For myself, I believe that principally on ceremonial occasions this type of invitation ought to be permitted, but I am afraid that those who summon a thousand or even more men, will appear to exceed moderation and to turn it into a kind of διασωσιης.)

²⁷ Pliny Ep. x.117: ‘Merito ueris, ne in numero modum excidet et quasi per corporea, non viritium singulos ex notitia ad sollemnes sportulas contrahit. Sed ego ideo prudentiam tuam elegi, ut formandis iis praefeceris et ea constitueres, quae ad perpetuum eius provinciae quietem essent profutura.’ (You are rightly fearful that an invitation which both exceeds moderation in number and provides traditional sportulae as it were to collective bodies rather than to individuals of personal acquaintance, may turn into a kind of διασωσιης. But indeed I have chosen your prudence so that you would moderate the established customs of that province and so that you would settle those matters which will be useful for the continuing peace of the province.) Knibbe (1981):
concern about those which in numero modum excedit, that is, those which are similar to the Imperial distributions in Rome.

The relationship between sportulae, congiarii, divisiones and διανομαί is obviously complex. For the remainder of this thesis, though, we will focus primarily on διανομαί. However, there are similarities between these distributions, so that we will in places make comparisons between διανομαί and sportulae.

III. Epigraphic Evidence of Διανομή in Asia Minor

A. The Catalogue

Ninety-nine published inscriptions from Asia Minor and the islands of the Aegean Sea use the term διανομή. These inscriptions have been collected from the Packard Humanities Institute Disc Seven (PHI 7), and supplemented from the standard corpora where possible. Eighty-seven of these inscriptions have been appended to this thesis in a catalogue arranged by geographical provenance, following the order established in le Bulletin Épigraphique. Within the larger regional and municipal categories, the inscriptions are organized on a chronological basis. Several of these inscriptions are extremely long, and include διανομή more than once. In these cases, each section of the inscription pertaining to the distribution is included as a separate catalogue entry; this means that an inscription published in its entirety elsewhere may here appear twice. Such entries are naturally listed sequentially, with a note indicating their continuity. Other

55 n. c notes that the provision of διανομαί in Bithynia, citing these two letters, could be used as political tools, in discussing a kouretes list from Ephesus (FiE IX/1/1 no. 54; cf. cat. # 4.b.11).
inscriptions describe multiple διανομαί within a few lines, but have not been catalogued separately. Still others are virtually identical, surviving in two or more copies. Each inscription in this case has been included separately, again with the result that the same διανομή may be described several times. 28

i) Διανομή and Some of its Synonyms

As is the case with sportulae much of the evidence for διανομή comes from inscriptions. The most common meaning of διανομή in an epigraphic context is that which Pliny gives it—a distribution of money. However, the act of handing out money is not always described as a διανομή, nor is a synonym inevitably used. An inscription from Lagina, for example, reads 'καὶ τε Ἡραίω πάσαις / γυναιξί καὶ τοῖς γενομένοις ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀνδράσιν ἐξάων καὶ θυσίας (δησίας) β'. 29 The benefactors in this case gave two denaria to every woman and to the men in the temple on the occasion of the festival of Hera, but the distribution is not termed a διανομή, even though we read further in the same inscription 'καὶ τοῖς πλήσιοις τῶν παλαί/τῶν τῶν διανομαῖς ἐδώκαμεν / ἐν τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ ταύτῃ γυμνα/αστικούς κυνα'. 30

Similarly, Satyrus the son of Philinus made arrangements to give one denarion to every free citizen of Tenos taking part in a meal. Although διανομή does appear in this inscription it is not used of this initial distribution, despite the fact that in all three

28 The inscriptions split and included sequentially are Cat. # 4.b.6-7 and 7.b.1-6. Cat. # 4.d.7-9 and 10.a.3-7 are copies of the same inscription.

29 Cat. # 6.f.1 ll. 5-8.

30 Cat. # 6.f.1 ll. 18-21: and to many of the citizens we gave διανομαί in the same priesthood, being
distributions, the interest of a capital sum was intended to pay for the gifts. Why this is the case is not clear from the inscription, but the provision of the first gift ‘τοῖς εἰκοχεθησομένοις ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἔλευθεροῖς Τηρίοις’ may indicate that the *denarion* was intended to pay for a part of the meal and was not in fact an unrestricted gift of money.31

An inscription from Ephesus from the reign of Commodus honors a certain Nicomedes for a similar benefaction. In this case, a gift of one Attic drachma was given to the diners ‘εἰς τὸ ἀνάλωμα τοῦ δείπνου;’ διάνομη is not used for this gift, but we read in the same inscription that all future διανομαί to the citizens from this foundation are to take place in the buildings around the temple of Artemis.32 The drachma is clearly meant, as we have suggested in the case of Satyrus’ benefaction, to be spent on the feast, but it is not clear that the διανομαί were given with the same intent: they may have been unrestricted gifts which could be taken away; like the feast-cost, though, these were meant only for those who were present.

A Hadrianic inscription from Didyma, furthermore, honors a benefactor who gave ‘διανομή’ to the women and girls and ‘κόσμος’ to the *boulh* and men; in addition, each of the citizens received two *denaria* and 3 ξέρτα of wine.33 Therefore, it is clear that the διανομή does not refer to a portion of a sacrifice or meal; rather, it is a gift parallel to the κόσμοι for the *boulh* and the men. What is meant by ‘κόσμος’, however, is more

---

31 Cat. # 3.c.1 ll. 8-9.

32 Cat. # 4.b.12 l. 11 (εἰς τὸ ἀνάλωμα τοῦ δείπνου), l. 18 (διανομᾶς).

33 Cat. # 4.d.5 ll. 5-8.
uncertain than what is meant by διανομή; nonetheless, we can say that these were ornaments or decorations of some value, so that we may also suggest that 'διανομή' here refers to gifts of cash which are of less value than the κόσμοι.

As we have noted, διανομή is not the only term used to refer to distributions; there is a variety of terms used in the inscriptions of Asia Minor which cannot be discussed extensively here. However, in the euergetic context, διανομή was used of cash-distributions only in the Imperial period rather than distributions of meat or oil. Other terms can be more general or equally specific, but separate studies of these would be necessary to reveal their exact meanings. Some of these terms, though, are used in the διανομή-inscriptions, so that it is possible to make some distinctions.

A large-scale public donation or subscription, for example, seems to have been termed an ἐπίδοσις.34 It is used of grants rather than specifically of distributions, so that it is possible for a διανομή to be included under the heading of an ἐπίδοσις. When this is the case, though, it is usually implicit that the benefactor gave διανομαί among other gifts or services to the city or country, as is the case with Satyrus the son of Philinus, who donated sums of money to support διανομαί, ἑν ἄλλαις δὲ πολλαῖς / καὶ ποικίλαις ὑπηρεσίαις τε καὶ ἐπίδοσεσιν.35 Διανομαί could be a part of an ἐπίδοσις, but an ἐπίδοσις was not necessarily a διανομή. An honorary inscription from Oenoanda, for example, records the donation of ἑπιδοσεσι / κρομμάτων ἐς τε νομᾶς καί / τέρψεως παρηγορικάς, in which the νομαι

34 Veyne (1976): 189 discussing Theophrastus describes ἐπιδοσεις in Athens as souscriptions volontaires.

35 Cat. #3.c.1 lI. 22-23.
are similar to if not identical to διανομαί and the τέρψεις are prizes or novelties.\textsuperscript{36} Although there are only a few occurrences of ἐπίδοσις in the διανομή- Inscriptions, it does seem in every case that a διανομή could be grouped with other distributions and benefactions which are referred to collectively as ἐπίδοσεις.\textsuperscript{37}

A σπυρίς, or σφυρίς, may be the closest synonym of the Latin sportula in the Greek inscriptions, in terms of what is distributed. The two instances of σπυρίς in our catalogue, though, are fragmentary, with the term entirely supplemented in one case and partially supplemented in the other; the aspirated σφυρίς appears in a single inscription in our catalogue.\textsuperscript{38} Since the two cases of σπυρίς are fragmentary, editors have disagreed on the correct reading, with Robert preferring με[ρίδα to σπυρίδα in the second case. However, σπυρίς is occasionally used in epigraphic sources in reference to the distribution of money, while μερίς is used exclusively of distributions of sacrificial victims—it is, quite literally, a portion of an animal.\textsuperscript{39} Σπυρίς, therefore, should be preferred in IDid 269.

Σφυρίς appears in a single inscription which is not supplemented. An honorary decree from the island of Syros dated to the reign of Commodus reads:

\textit{τῇ ἔνεσιν ῥήματος κυρίου Αὐτοκράτορος παρέσχεν τούτων [μεν]}


\textsuperscript{37} Διανομή and ἐπίδοσις both occur in Cat. # 3.c.1 l. 23, 4.b.4 l. 12, 4.d.6 l. 5, 5.a.1 l. 7, 6.a.1 ll. 20-21, 6.c.5 l. 38, 6.e.4 l. 7, 7.b.4 ll. C8-9, and 7.e.1 l. 4.

\textsuperscript{38} [σπυρίδα]. Cat. # 4.d.7 l. 9; [σπυρίδα]. Cat. # 4.d.8 ll. 9-10; σφυρίδα. Cat. # 3.b.1 l. 15.

\textsuperscript{39} Cf. Robert, Hellenica 11-12, 480; σφυρίς cf. IDid 286 (ἐδόθηκεν ἡ σφυρίδα [--τα]ς γυναικῶν), IKErh 10 (ἐβδομηκοῦση σφυρίδας κατὰ προέλευσιν), and IMagnesia 149.a (ἐδόθηκεν τῇ φιλοτεθαμένῃ βουλῇ διὰ τῶν γυναικῶν ἐν κατακλήσει τῶν σφυρίδας [το]ύποτα μερίς, cf. IG XII, 5 647 (κρεών μερίδα), and IKMylassa 119 (μερίδα ἐκ τῶν δυστών).
Antaeus celebrated the birthday of the Emperor Commodus with a public meal and distributions of cash. The σφυρίς appears to be distinct from the two διανομές, both in value and in its recipients, as the members of the γερουσία are to receive a σφυρίς of five denaria, while the women and youths are to receive wine and a διανομή of eight asses and four asses respectively.

Clearly διανομή is used here to describe a gift of cash, but not cash distributed expressly for the purpose of taking part in a meal. The syntax suggests that the σφυρίς is a part of the meal mentioned previously in the inscription. However, we cannot be sure whether the σφυρίς consists of a gift of five denaria in addition to the meal, or five denaria to pay for the meal, or even five denaria to pay for wine to accompany the meal.

In σφυρίς, consequently, we seem to have a direct translation of the Latin sportula, with all of its uncertainties.

The same uncertainty applies in this case to διανομή for the same reason: the conjunction καί could be a connecting conjunction or an explanatory conjunction: the διανομή could be in addition to the wine, or it could be intended to pay for the wine.
Nonetheless, it is clear that both terms refer here to the distribution of money; the constructions are parallel, but since διανομή is used again at the end of the quoted portion of the inscription, there does seem to be a difference between them.

'Επίδοσις and σπωρίς are, of course, only two of the terms used in the honorary inscriptions of Asia Minor for public munificence. There are many others, one of which will appear in Chapter Three, but these two are the most common in the διανομή-inscriptions collected here. While each of these is related to διανομή, it is clear that neither is quite the same as or quite as specific as διανομή. Similarly, although the verb διανέμω is also frequently used in euergetic inscriptions, we will simply note here that it is used of distributions in general, and not only of cash handouts.

ii) Geographical Distribution of the Διανομή-inscriptions

Thirty-six sites are included in this survey (Appendix 4, Maps 1-3), though διανομαί have been provided in many of the other cities of Asia Minor despite the lack of epigraphic evidence. Διανομαί are not limited to the larger regional centers of

40 Cat. #3.b.1 ll. 12-23.

41 κλάσος; see below, Chapter Three, pp. 111-115; cf. also Chapter Two, p. 61.


43 Dionysiopolis, Pentapolis, Augusta Traiana, Odessus (Moesia and Thrace); Istrus (Black Sea/Scythia Minor); Cos, Syros, Tenos (Aegean Islands); Teos, Ephesus, Magnesia ad Maeander, Didyma,
Asia Minor; they also appear in smaller inland or mountain cities. Larger cities, such as Ephesus, naturally provide abundant evidence for διανομαι, but this abundance is due to their size rather than to the relative frequency of διανομαι provided in these cities. Almost all of these cities had some degree of contact with Rome, ranging from the construction of public buildings by an Emperor to an Imperial visit.

The most abundant evidence comes, naturally, from the more populated regions along the western coast, namely Ionia and Caria. However, the predominance of these regions, particularly Ionia, is due to the preponderance of the larger cities. Ephesus and Didyma account for twenty-eight of the thirty-two attested distributions in that region, while Stratonicea and its associated sanctuary sites account for half of the attested distributions in Caria. Aphrodisias, which provides five of the distributions in Caria, certainly provided marble for some of the other cities, so that this may also be a factor in the numerous inscriptions in general from Caria and Ionia. The less populated regions of Asia Minor also provide substantial evidence, particularly Lycia, which has provided, to date, ten διανομη- inscriptions, but cities from these regions tend to provide only individual attestations, a result of a combination of fewer inscriptions in total and damaged or lost inscriptions.
iii) Omissions from the Catalogue

The ninety-nine διανομή-inscriptions include those which are virtually complete, but also several which are fragmentary. In both cases, διανομή has been on occasion either partially or entirely restored; many such supplements are almost certain, supported by the grammatical and contextual usage of διανομή in other inscriptions. There are several, however, in which the restoration is much less certain. These inscriptions will be discussed briefly here, but omitted from the main catalogue.\(^{45}\)

Four Hellenistic inscriptions use the term διανομή. One of these, which is dated to about 120 BC, has been supplemented by Hiller von Gaertringen to read:

\[
\text{βουλήμενος καὶ [ἀποδείξαι ὅν ἔχει] προαιρέσιν, ἐκ[ἀστ]ωι}
\]
\[
τῶν πολιτῶν ἐμέτρησεν [διανομή] πυρῶν τε〈τά〉ρτεις δύο. \(^{46}\)
\]

The restoration of [διανομή] is odd for several reasons. First, it is never used with the verb μετρέω in any other inscription available for comparison. Second, I have found no other connection between διανομή and πυράς. Furthermore, a second Hellenistic inscription from Priene reads:

\[
\text{παρεμέτρησεν δὲ τῇ πόλει [με-}
\]
\[
\text{τὰ τā]δελφοῦ πυρῶν μεθύμνους πεντακοσίους πεντήκο[ντα. \(^{47}\)
\]

\(^{44}\) An inscription from Ephesus, for example, specifies the use of Aphrodisian marble for a statue (Cat. # 4.b.16 II. 7-9: ἀνθρώπας μαμαλήνου τοῦ ιὸν μον ἀφροδισικοῦ ἀλβαστάξαι).\(^{45}\) The relevant portions of these inscriptions have been catalogued in Appendix 2.\(^{46}\) *Priene* 109.213-4; Appendix 2, 2.c.1.\(^{47}\) *Priene* 108.97-8.
Although we have here a compound of μετρέω, the construction is almost exactly identical. Consequently, we have the donation of a quantity of wheat to the city rather than a distribution of wheat to individuals. The term πυρός does appear elsewhere in the catalogue, but, as we have said, not in connection with διανομή. The other instance, from Sebastopolis in Caria, records the sale of wheat, split into κύπροι.\(^{48}\) However, since μεδίμνος is used in the same context in Priene, this term should be preferred to κύπροι.

The second Hellenistic inscription quoted above records the activities of Moschion the son of Kydimus in Priene. It describes the honours voted to Moschion by the βουλή and δῆμος in consideration for his role as a saviour of the city in its times of shortage. The inscription records several gifts of grain and a distribution of money by Moschion. This distribution is described by the verb διανέμω which is almost entirely supplemented,\(^{49}\) but there is also a διανομή later in the inscription:

\[\text{ἐπὶ δὲ στεφα[ν]ηφόρου Κέκροπος οὐ μόνον διαφόρων γενομένης τῇ [π]όλει χρείας, ἀ[λλὰ] καὶ παραστά-} \]
\[\text{σεως ἐνεχύρων, διαλαβ[ῶν] κ]οινὴν εἰναι τὴ[ν] οὔσιαν πάν-} \]
\[\text{των τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τ[ῶν καθηκοντῶν δ]ανομώ[ν] [σ]ω[.] [σ]ω[c.2.]}^{50}\]

However, Hiller von Gaertringen treats the restoration of ‘διανομῶν’ as uncertain. He suggests that Moschion declared that all of the property of the citizens was common during a time of crisis for the city. In such a time, a declaration of the common plight or

\(^{48}\) Cat #. 6.a.1 II. 10-13: καὶ παραστάσεως πυρὸς κύπροις / Β (ὅπως) Β', τοῦ κύπρου πωλ/συμβαίνον (ὅπως) Β'.


\(^{50}\) IPriene 108.89-92; Appendix 2, 2.c.2.
danger of the citizens would be just as likely. With the reading of ‘τὴν υἱόν’, though, ‘διανομῆ’ in the following line makes little sense. If it is the ‘customary διανομαί’ which are being declared to be common, these must have been διανομαί provided by Moschion himself rather than by earlier benefactors: the inscription describes Moschion’s benefactions so that we should expect a new benefaction rather than a diversion of earlier funds. In place of the postulated ‘καθηκουσῶν διανομῆ[ν]’ we would expect either a second group of people complementing ‘πάντων τῶν πολείτων’, or the end of the clause and the beginning of a new one. Due to this uncertainty, this inscription will be omitted from the catalogue and this survey.

An Imperial inscription from Astupalaca has also been omitted from the catalogue. This inscription has been significantly restored to record distributions of grain to the citizens:

\[\piονοσάμε]-
νόν τε καὶ σε(είτον διανομάς]
οίκ ἀλίγας [ἐκάστῳ πολείτᾳ(?)]\textsuperscript{51}

Διανομῆ appears eight times in the inscriptions of Asia Minor in association with a form of the verb ποιέω; three inscriptions use διανομῆ as an indirect object, while five read or have been supplemented to read διανομῆ as a direct object. The only instance of ποιέω διανομῆ which is securely attested and certainly refers to a distribution of money comes

\textsuperscript{51} IG XII (3) 219; Appendix 2, l.a.1 II 7-9.
from Istrus;\textsuperscript{52} the verb or \textit{diənomh} itself has been restored in every other instance in which \textit{diənomh} is a direct object of the verb. There are, consequently, grounds for questioning the readings of three of the inscriptions in which \textit{diənomh} is supplemented as the direct object of \textit{poiēw}, including that from Astupalaea.

However, this rare usage of \textit{poiēw} is not the only reason for reconsideration. \textit{Diənomh}, as we have noted above, most commonly refers to a distribution of money; there is, to my knowledge, no other instance of ‘\textit{seitou diənomh}s’, with \textit{poiēw} or any other verb. Consequently, we have omitted this inscription from the catalogue.

Two other cases of \textit{poiēw} \textit{diənomh} have also been omitted. \textit{IKEphesos} 618 contains a supplement reading \textit{dékak}s \textit{diənomh} \textit{ēpoine}se \textit{τη}. Such an adverb can be used when describing numerous distributions, but is not thus attested in Ephesus; furthermore, this supplement makes the line as it is transcribed appear significantly longer than any other in the inscription does. This does not, of course, mean that the supplement is necessarily wrong, but Oliver does have grounds for preferring \textit{dékak}s \textit{obēnta} \textit{τη}.\textsuperscript{53}

Similarly, an inscription honoring a \textit{hydrophorus} in Didyma has been supplemented as

\begin{quote}
\textit{diənomh}s \textit{peponhē}
\textit{νν η τη β}ουλή και τισι
\textit{τών πο}\textit{λειτω[ν]}.\textsuperscript{54}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{52} Cat. # 2.a.2 ll. 25-29: \textit{ēpoine}se...\textit{diənomh}; a Hellenistic inscription does read \textit{poiēw}...\textit{diənomh}, but the inscription clearly indicates that this is a distribution of meat rather than of money (Cat. 3.a.1 ll. 90-92; see below, pp. 37-38).

\textsuperscript{53} Oliver (1941): 91-2, no. 9; Appendix 2, 2.a2 l. 19.

\textsuperscript{54} \textit{IDidyma} 329; Appendix 2, 2.b.1 ll. 7-9.
Hydrophori are prominent in the inscriptions of Didyma as providers of διανομαί, but there is no other inscription honoring a hydrophorus of Artemis which uses ποιεω in this manner.

One of the longest inscriptions referring to διανομαί is from Rhodiapolis in Lycia, adorning the mausoleum of Opramoas. This is a collection of public decrees and honorary inscriptions commemorating Opramoas’ euergetic actions, which are also known from other Lycian inscriptions. Although parts of it are very fragmentary, the geographical region over which Opramoas extended his euergetism is broad enough and well published enough that much can be restored. Furthermore, the parts with which we are concerned are quite repetitive, so that although διανομή itself is sometimes restored, there is no reason to question it. However, Christina Kokkinia, the most recent editor of this inscription, has tentatively restored διανομή in one of the fragments. Due to the uncertainty with which she treats this supplement, we too shall be skeptical and omit the διανομή described in this part of the inscription, but we will include those in the remainder of the inscription.

A very fragmentary Imperial inscription from Ephesus, which has no surviving verb and reads δι[ανομων], has also been omitted. Δ[ανομαίς] is restored in the same way in a second Ephesian inscription, as part of the benefactions performed during service as γραμματέας. Although the plural dative διανομαίς is used in nine other cases


56 IKEph 1968a; Appendix 2, 2.a.3 l. 6.
with a participle suggesting official or municipal service (Table 2.1, V), the remaining ‘δ’ in this case may be too tenuous for the restoration to be considered certain.\(^{57}\)

The single inscription from Olymos recording a διανομή honors Phaedrus the son of Moschion, but this inscription is also very fragmentary. Phaedrus is known from ten other inscriptions from Olymos, but none of these describe him as the provider of διανομαί. Although several of these inscriptions refer to the interest on a sum of money, they do not seem to refer to or describe a distribution or a large scale donation to support distributions, nor is Phaedrus alone among those individuals named.\(^{58}\) The other ten inscriptions concerning Phaedrus do not support the restoration of ταῖς διανομαῖς in IKMylasa 869.

The only inscription to use διανομή as the object of ἀποδίδωμι will be omitted for the same reason: διανομή is entirely restored and there is no parallel usage that I have found to support this.\(^{59}\) Nollé and Schindler have restored a second century inscription from Selge to record διανομαί to the councilors and members of the ecclesia and their children:

\[\text{ἀργυρίου [.....] μυλη]άδας τριάκοντα | χαρισμένην \varepsilon\iota\varsigma\upsilon\alpha\nu\gamma\omega σιναύξεσιν | τῆς πατρίδος [καὶ εἰς διανομαῖς βουλευτῶν καὶ ἐκκλησιαστῶν καὶ τέκνων αὐτῶν]}\(^{60}\)

\(^{57}\) IKEph 4342; Appendix 2, 2.a.1 ll. 15-16.

\(^{58}\) IKMylasa 806, 808, 810, 811, 812, 814, 815, 819, 848, 870; interest: 810, 814, 819; IKMylasa 869=Appendix 2, 3.a.1 ll. 19-20.

\(^{59}\) IKStrat 299; Appendix 2, 3.b.1 ll. 4-5.

\(^{60}\) IKSelge 17; Appendix 2, 6.a.1 ll. 20-21.
The restoration of \( \text{διανομής} \) is supported by the use of the participle \( \chiαρισμένης \), but it is nonetheless questionable. The recipients of the distribution are listed in the genitive; however, \( \text{διανομής} \) is never followed by an objective genitive. When the genitive is used to describe the recipients of the \( \text{διανομής} \), it is preceded by a pronoun such as \( \text{ἐκάστῳ} \) or \( \piλίστοις \). Consequently, although the verb \( \chiαριζω \) is used in five other cases for sums of money given for \( \text{διανομής} \) (εἰς \( \text{διανομής} \); see Table 2.1, G.1), the supplement, which is based only on two certain letters, should in this case be rejected.

Finally, \( \text{διανομής} \) is used in a Hellenistic inscription from Pergamum to record the distribution of land; in this case, \( \text{διανομής} \) has been read by Fränkel. Since it is the only inscription in which \( \text{διανομής} \) is used of a distribution neither of food nor of money, and since it is partially restored, this occurrence has also been omitted from the catalogue. 62

Eleven inscriptions, therefore, have been omitted from the catalogue, which contains ninety-three entries, consisting of eighty-seven inscriptions. 63 Each entry has been categorized as an honorary decree or inscription, a public decree, an Imperial letter, or a passing mention. Table 1.1 enumerates the entries of each type.

---

61 For example, Cat. # 6.f.3 l. 6: \( \text{ἐδωκεν διανομής ἐκάστῳ τῶν πολιτῶν} \); cf. below, Chapter Two, pp. 44-45.

62 \textit{IPerg} 8(1) 245c; Appendix 2, 5.a.1 ll. 46-47. We should note here that although this inscription does use \( \text{διανομής} \) to refer to a distribution of land—not of money—it is a Hellenistic inscription, which indicates that \( \text{διανομάτικα} \) could refer to distributions of various materials in epigraphic as well as literary texts (above, pp. 17, no. 22) prior to Imperial Roman governorship of Asia Minor.

63 One of the omissions discussed above is a fragment of the Ophranaos-inscription from Rhodiapolis, which mentions \( \text{διανομαί} \) several times; only one of these occurrences has been omitted, but the remainder of the inscription will be considered in the following pages.
The honorary decrees are quite simply those which honor a benefactor for the provision of distributions of cash, often among other benefactions. Into this category fall those inscriptions which may be considered career inscriptions, detailing the public services over a lifetime of the benefactor, and those which commemorate a specific benefaction, such as the dedication of a building accompanied by a distribution. Consequently, most of the inscriptions are concerned with more than διανομέαί.

Although the honorary decrees and inscriptions are by far the most numerous in this survey, inscriptions in the other categories will not be ignored. As Table 1.1 indicates, the inscriptions which we have categorized as public decrees are the second most numerous. In this category we have placed six inscriptions which make arrangements for distributions, and one which is very fragmentary.65

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honorary</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Decree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Letter</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing Mention</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1. Categorization of the Catalogue Entries.

64 The honorary category consists of both honorary inscriptions and honorary decrees. A distinction between these two is made in the catalogue, but for the purposes of discussion, we have considered them together. The honorary inscriptions are those which simply honor the benefactor, while the decrees are those inscriptions which reflect a part or all of the decree which was passed by the βουλή and δήμος; the phrase ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δήμος ἐτύμησεν, however, does not constitute such a reflection. Instead, the honorary decrees have been separated from the honorary inscriptions by the appearance of, for example, ἔδεξε τῇ βουλῇ. Following this criteria, there are 69 honorary inscriptions, and 12 honorary decrees. When it is possible to make this distinction, though, the two types of inscriptions still follow, for the most part, the formula which we shall outline in the first part of Chapter Two.

65 Provisions: Cat. # 4.b.3, 4.b.6, 4.b.7, 4.b.14, 4.b.16, 4.c.2; Fragmentary: Cat. # 4.b.13.
The Imperial letters are those documents which have come from provincial governors or their agents to individuals or an entire city. One permits the continuance of the διανομαί according to the local custom, and a second appears to have been written in recognition of the fulfillment of civic obligations to the Emperor; the final letter is a rebuke to the magistrates, βουλή and δήμος of Ephesus for their failure to properly honor and acknowledge one of their benefactors.66

The two which have been categorized as 'passing-mentions' deserve a note: each refers very briefly to a διανομή. The first of these, from the island of Cos, is discussed at more length below, but is simply a religious inscription which makes arrangements for a distribution as a small part of the celebration. The second is a κοινητεύς list from Ephesos recording a διανομή during the initiation.67

iv) Chronology of the Inscriptions

The earliest διανομή-inscription from Asia Minor, to my knowledge, dates to about 300 BC and the latest to the beginning of the fourth century AD. Many of these inscriptions have been dated with a reasonable degree of accuracy to within a few years or to the reign of an Emperor through supplementary evidence such as lists of Imperial high-priests; others, however, are approximately dated only, on the basis of various details: onomastics—such as the presence of an Imperial praenomen and nomen—, the titulature of a local festival, or the use of a superlative adjective to describe the city or βουλή-τη.

66 The Imperial letters are: Cat. # 1.c.1 (continuance), 4.b.8 (recognition) and 4.b.10 (rebuke).

67 Cos: Cat. # 3.a.1 and below pp. 37-38; Ephesos: Cat. # 4.b.11.
Consequently, while it is possible to assign to some inscriptions a specific date, others can only be said to be from the first, second or third centuries; still others are so fragmentary that it is not possible to group them even into these broad categories. These, and others, have been categorized as 'Imperial' only in Table 1.2, which summarizes the chronological distribution of the catalogued inscriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>Early</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Late</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus (27-14)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius (14-37)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trajan (98-117)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadrian (117-138)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 [2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoninus (138-161)</td>
<td>6 (5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius (161-180)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodus (176-192)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd century</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caracalla (198-217)</td>
<td>3 (4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 [4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd century</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th century</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No date</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81 (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2: Chronological distribution of the διανομη-inscriptions.

The Hellenistic example stands out as an oddity among so many Imperial examples. This is a religious document from Cos concerning temple lands and the

---

68 Cat. # 4.d.14 ll. 4-5.

69 The inscriptions enumerated in the Hellenistic, Imperial, 1st century, 2nd century, 3rd century, 4th century and No Date categories are only those which have not been dated more specifically to the reign of an Emperor. The numbers in brackets indicate those occurrences which appear in continuous inscriptions but separate catalogue entries. Thus, the distributions of the Opramoas-inscription from Rhodiapolis appear in six catalogue entries (Cat. # 7.b.1-6), so that we have bracketed five of them, and there are a total of thirteen catalogue entries from the reign of Antoninus Pius. Inscriptions which are duplicates and appear twice in the catalogue have been counted once and the repetitions have been included in square brackets. Catalogue entries which record more than one διανομη have not been counted repeatedly.
celebration of a local festival which served as the object of the generosity of Diomedon in about 300 BC. A ritual marriage is to be completed in the month of Petagitnus and is to include a public feast on the sixteenth and a διανομή on the seventeenth. However, this is not a distribution of cash. The διανομή is here a distribution of the sacrificial victims offered in the customary manner to Heracles.

The latest inscription available for this thesis, from Ephesus, is dated to approximately AD 301. Table 1.2 suggests that there was a decrease in attestations of διανομαι following the reign of Caracalla, but there is no reason why these distributions should have come to a complete halt at this time. Of course, this was a period of political upheaval, which may have made some wealthy citizens less inclined to consume their own resources in helping their fellow citizens and earning public prestige for themselves; the instability may also have made an endowment less reliable as a source of income. However, such a time would also have made it more probable that the citizens would demand a distribution or a benefaction of some sort, as was entirely possible.

---

70 Cat. # 3.a.1. There is no evidence that διανομή was used to describe distributions of gifts other than of money. Benefactors could and did offer shares in meals, but the identification of such a distribution as a διανομή rests on the translation of 'καί' (Cat. # 3.b.1 II. 14, 17; cf. above, Chapter One, pp. 24-26; below, Chapter Three, p. 103, n. 74); if the καί is translated as 'that is', we have an indication that διανομή of meat had to be explicitly said to be of meat. There are several indications that when meat was distributed, it was termed a κρεανομία, both in epigraphic and literary evidence (for example, Lib. Decl. 23.1.38.5: εἴσαιν αὐτῶν δείκτων, ἐπιτάσεις, κρεανομίαι, διανομαί, χορηγίαι, τριγυραί, συνεκδοσεις ἄγωτας, αἵμαλώτων λύσεις, καὶ ταῦτα ἀναθάν λίτων τῶν μετὰν ἐπεδείξαντο.).

71 Cat. # 4.b.16.

However, from the appearance of only two διανομή-inscriptions in the late third century and the beginning of the fourth century, we may conclude that the practice of handing out cash was not as common as it had been in the two preceding centuries. Mrozek notes an analogous pattern in the Latin inscriptions of Italy: in the third century, we begin to hear less often of cash-distributions. While this may be a consequence of their no longer being given, it cannot be taken as proof of such. These were honorary inscriptions, commemorating the generosity of a benefactor; fewer inscriptions indicates that the practice was no longer considered worthy to be or simply was not commemorated, not necessarily that it was no longer taking place.

There is, of course, a great variety of reasons which may account for such a change of perception, but an obvious one is Christianity and its spread through the Roman population. Paul Veyne notes that Christian giving was significantly different from the distributions with which we are concerned. Assisting the poor became more important than it had been earlier, so that more benefactors directed their euergetism towards the lower and more needier classes; nonetheless, Pliny the Younger does tell us that Trajan was active in the establishment grain funds to assist the poor, and he himself was responsible for an education fund in Comum. However, the Roman Empire was not

---

73 Mrozek (1987): 17-27; Mitchell notes a general decline in the willingness of magistrates to fulfill the roles which had formerly been honorary (Vol. II 75-6).


75 Pliny, Pan. 28.4-7 (Trajan's alimentary fund), Ep. 4.13 (Pliny's education fund); Pliny also established an alimentary fund worth HS 500,000 for the children of Comum (7.18.2).
converted to Christianity all at once, so that we may expect other διανομή-inscriptions to be found dating beyond the late third century and well into the fourth century.\textsuperscript{76}

Although the inscriptions recording cash-distributions are universally Imperial, there does not seem to be an even spread during the Empire. The majority of the first century AD is absent from this survey, in the certainly dated material, though it is possible that several of the unassigned Imperial and first century inscriptions fall within the reign of one of the later Julio-Claudian or Flavian Emperors. A thorough analysis of the frequency of inscriptions recording διανομή would be misleading because of the incomplete material evidence, but it is nonetheless possible to draw another significant conclusion from Table 1.2: there is a notable increase in the second century, particularly

\begin{center}
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\textsuperscript{77} Chart 1.1: Frequency of Distributions According to the Reigning Emperor.

\textsuperscript{76} For a discussion of the Christianization of parts of Asia Minor, see Mitchell (1993): vol. II 53 ff.
during the reigns of Hadrian, Antoninus Pius and Caracalla. The inscriptions of Ephesus and Didyma, the two cities which appear most frequently in our catalogue, account for a significant portion of this swelling in the second century, but the pattern remains similar when these two cities are omitted (Chart 1.1). Overall, it is possible that this pattern is merely an accidental one owing to the survival of the inscriptions.

It is possible that the peaks under Hadrian, Antoninus and Caracalla are due simply to the survival pattern of the inscriptions, but the peaks may also be due to an increase in the epigraphic habit. Such an explanation does indeed seem plausible for the peak in the second century, but we will consider these increases at greater length below in Chapters Two and Three.

IV. Chapter Conclusions

We have seen that διανομή were provided in various cities of Asia Minor during the first three centuries AD, and that these distributions consisted of cash-handouts. The primary body of evidence is honorary inscriptions, but other types of inscriptions and literary sources also refer to the practice. Consequently, we have two distinct perspectives of cash-distributions: that of the benefactors themselves, presented in the inscriptions, which naturally presents the action in a positive light, and that of the civic and provincial leaders, presented in our limited literary evidence of διανομή, which provides a glimpse of the opinion of the Roman rulers on this practice. As we shall see in

---

77 The data contained in Chart 1.1 is that of Table 1.2. However, only those inscriptions which can
Chapter Three, though, these two groups were closely connected. The inscriptions suggest that διανομαί were similar to sportulae, in that both terms describe gifts, but they were not entirely interchangeable: διανομαί are gifts of money, whereas sportulae are gifts of money as well as gifts of food. Furthermore, literary evidence, particularly that of Pliny the Younger, tells us that there was a second, more important, difference between διανομαί and sportulae. Διανομαί could be gifts to a small number of people of high-social standing, such as the members of the βουλή, in which case a διανομή is virtually the same as a sportula of money as it is used in the Latin inscriptions collected by Mrozek and Duncan-Jones; however, διανομαί could also be gifts on a much larger scale to a large number of people of various social standings, which is what we find Pliny concerned about.78 Just as he seeks Trajan's advice on the matter, there are several hints in the epigraphic evidence that permission was required from Imperial authorities before any distributions could take place.79

---

78 The more common recipients of διανομαί in Asia Minor are discussed below in Chapter Three, pp. 99-115.

79 See below, Chapter Two, pp. 76-77, Cat. # 6.d.1 ii. 5-9; cf. Cat. # 1.c.1.
CHAPTER TWO: EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE FOR ΔΙΑΝΟΤΗΤΗ

I. Introduction

The majority of the epigraphic evidence for διανοτήτη in Asia Minor comes from honorary inscriptions. Although they vary over the three centuries from which they come, they are nonetheless very formulaic and frequently tell us on which occasions the handouts of money were offered. Both of these factors permit the restoration of many inscriptions which have been damaged, even though the longer and more elaborate inscriptions could and did extend and adapt the basic formula. As we have seen, though, such supplements should be treated with caution.¹

II. Formulae and Verbs

The simplest inscriptions, which are not always among the earliest attestations, record simply that the βουλή and δήμος of a city have honored a benefactor who has provided διανοτήτη for the city, the citizens or a specific group of citizens. Occasionally, the γερουσία is included among the commemorators; however, even when this is the case, the verb of honoring—usually an aorist third person verb such as ἔτυμνησε— is usually, but not always, singular.²

¹ See above, Chapter One pp. 28-34.

² For example, Cat. # 1.d.1 l. 19, 3.c.1 ll. 1, 24-25; cf. Mitchell (1993): I.201, who reasonably concludes from this tendency that the δήμος was declining in importance throughout the Imperial period; however, he may over-emphasize the importance still enjoyed by the collective βουλή, as it became common for individual families, such as the Vedit Antonini in Ephesus, to take a prominent, if not dominant, role not
The name of the benefactor, or benefactors, most often appears in the accusative as the object of this verb. However, several inscriptions give the name of the benefactor in the nominative, in which case we usually find a verb such as ἔδωκεν or a form of the participle δοῦς. Δίδωμι is not, of course, the only verb used to refer to the provision of cash handouts, but it is the most common; Table 2.1 (p. 47) summarizes all of the relevant verbs attested in our inscriptions.

The benefactions performed by the honorand are commonly reported with aorist participles. Many inscriptions record in addition to these benefactions the public offices held by the benefactor, so that it is possible to identify with which offices διανομαί were commonly associated. It is common, therefore, for a benefactor to be honored as having fulfilled, for example, the office of hydrophorus, or having been gymnasiarch. Naturally, this also applies to the provision of distributions: benefactors, when they are listed in the accusative, are honored as ‘having provided’ or ‘having given’ διανομαί.

Recipients of the distribution are usually listed in the dative, commonly in descending order of social rank if necessary; the members of the βουλή thus appear before the members of the γερουσία, who in turn appear before the δῆμος, paralleling the typical

---

3 See below, Chapter Three, pp. 86-99.

4 For example, Cat. # 4.d.2 1.3: πληρώσασα δὲ καὶ τὴν ὄδροφορίαν, Cat. # 4.b.15 1. 6: γυμνασίας καὶ παντῶν τῶν γυμνασίων.
Latin ordering of *decuriones*, *Augustales* and *plebs*. There are instances of the recipients in the genitive plural where a dative adjective such as ἐκάστῳ precedes the group.

Within this listing of the recipients, the sum of cash given to each individual are, in certain inscriptions, listed, most likely with the intent of emphasizing the generosity of the donor. If this is the case, we may expect that the larger the sum given to each individual or the greater the number of the recipients, the more likely this information is to be mentioned; on the other hand, the lack of a specified sum may, but need not necessarily, indicate that the διανομή was not as large as others in the same city or region, or that it was of a standard size. There is insufficient evidence to permit us to establish a common amount in Asia Minor as a whole or even for an individual city. This deficiency may be an indication that διανομαί were distributed in standard amounts which were relatively steady in each city, so that there was no need to mention the value of the gift except in the case of above average gifts.

As we have noted, though, this is only a general formula. Given the geographical spread of the provenance of these inscriptions—which is only emphasized by the mountainous nature of Asia Minor—we must expect variations to occur from region to region. Similarly, the precise role of the citizens in various cities naturally varied, so that...
neither the δῆμος nor the νερουσία are universally attested among the bodies responsible for voting honors to the benefactor or benefactors. Of course, there are also variations within cities.

One variation between cities seems to have been the use of the accusative or the nominative for the name of the benefactor. We have noted that the use of the accusative is more common in the honorary inscriptions. However, the benefactors of Didyma who most often provided διανομαί were either the prophets of Apollo or the hydrophori of Artemis; in all but one case, these benefactors appear in the nominative.⁷

A. One Time Distributions

The formula used in the inscriptions also varies as a reflection of the nature of the distribution. Such variations are apparent when we consider the διανομαί according to the frequency of the distributions; for this, we will consider distributions which were not repeated, distributions which were arranged in the testament of the benefactor, and distributions which were to be recurrent events.

Table 2.1 summarizes all of the verbs used with διανομή in its various cases. The table indicates that a form of the verb δίδωμι was most commonly used in our inscriptions, though this tells us only that the benefactor gave a διανομή (Table 2.1, A.1-4). When this verb is used, διανομή is the direct object in three-quarters of the cases. In general, it is these inscriptions which, despite their numerical majority, tell us the least about the practice of handing out gifts of money—the verb δίδωμι usually tells us only that a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participle of Office</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V.1 + διανομής</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.2 + ἐπὶ διανομῆς</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.3 + ἐπὶ διανομῆς</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.4 + μετὰ διανομῆς</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.5.a εὐδοκημεῖον καὶ ἐν διανομῆς</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.6.a τριμικροπόρει διανομή</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W No Verb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1.: Verbs used with Διανομή in the Inscriptions.³⁶

³ Cat. # 4.d.11 II. 8-9, in which the *hydrophoros* of Artemis, Statilia Julia, δώσαν [δὲ ταῖς πταῖς ἔνδον τὰς διανομάς.

³⁶ A similar use of *παίδος διανομῆς* occurs in the Hellenistic distribution of meat (Cat. #3.a.1).
distribution was given, rather than how it was funded and how much each individual received.

The size of the individual gift is given in only one entry when the accusative διανομήν is used with a form of διδωμί.\(^9\) This information is more often given when διανομή is an indirect object, either in the genitive or preceded by the preposition εἰς. The genitive διανομῆς is usually followed by the size of the individual gifts in the form ‘ἀνὰ δημόσια δῶν’,\(^1\) so that this use of the genitive, which only appears in connection with διδωμί, is best explained as a partitive genitive.\(^12\)

Three of the four inscriptions in which εἰς διανομήν follows διδωμί are clearly meant to describe διανομαί repeated at regular intervals.\(^13\) The fourth instance is in the benefaction of an anonymous benefactor of Xanthos.\(^14\) The size of this donation, 25,000

---

\(^9\) A full version of this table with all of the attested forms of each verb is located in Appendix 3.

\(^10\) Cat. # 7.g.1 ll. 16-17: δῶντα διανομὴν πάσι ἀνὰ (δημόσια) τρία λίρου.

\(^11\) Cat. # 6.f.3 l.7.

\(^12\) As we suggested above, διανομή can refer to the total amount from which the distributions were made rather than to the individual handouts (Chapter One, p. 18, n. 23).

\(^13\) Cat. # 4.b.6 l. 221-226, and 4.b.7 (x2).

\(^14\) Cat. # 7.a.1=Balland (1981) no. 66; Balland identifies the benefactor of this inscription, whose name has been lost, with Opramoas of Rhodiapolis based on the similarity of the gifts in Balland (1981): nos. 66 and 67 and the on find-spot of the inscription, near the statue base of Opramoas. Coulton (1987): 171-8, however, disputes this identification, since the same benefactions are not recorded in Opramoas’ mausoleum and because of the fact, among others, that the inscription was not found in situ. Large benefactions to cities in Lycia are far from uncommon during the second century, so that there is not reason to assume that an individual known to us from other donations must have made such a benefaction. Similarly, Opramoas was not necessarily alone in making a donation to the Lycian κοίλων; therefore, in the pages which follow, we, like Coulton, will consider this donation the work of a now-anonymous benefactor.
denaria, suggests that it was intended to be a capital fund, but we will discuss capital funds at greater length below.\textsuperscript{15}

The use of \textit{eις διανομήν} or \textit{διανομᾶς}, however, is not limited to \textit{δίδωμι}. This phrase is used in twenty-six cases with nine other verbs, almost always indicating a donation made by the benefactor \textit{for the purpose of} distributions. If a specific sum is not mentioned in these entries, it is usually because that part of the inscription has been damaged and cannot be restored, or because a noun such as \textit{δωρεάς} was used.\textsuperscript{16}

Only three of the nine verbs which use this phrase also appear without it: \textit{δίδωμι}, \textit{ποιέω}, and \textit{κατάφημι}. We have noted that the combination of \textit{ποιέω} and \textit{διανομήν} is uncommon, occurring only in Istrus (Table 2.1, E.1).\textsuperscript{17} The genitive \textit{διανομῶν} is used differently with \textit{ποιέω} than the partitive genitive with \textit{δίδωμι} (Table 2.1, E.2). It appears in a decree honoring a prophet of Apollo in Didyma who provided distributions for the \textit{βουλῆ} and \textit{πᾶσι τοῖς πολίταις} during his priesthood;\textsuperscript{18} in this case, it is the subjective genitive of \textit{ἐπιδόσεις}, so that it refers to donations consisting of \textit{διανομαί}. The two cases in which \textit{ποιέω} takes the prepositional phrase \textit{eις διανομᾶς} (Table 2.1, E.3), however, both occur in the Opramoas-documents, which record the donation of interest-bearing sums to

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{15} See below, p. 50-55.
\item\textsuperscript{16} Damaged amount: Cat. # 7.a.1 ll. 10-11: (δηναρίων) µ[ύρια.....]–]a πεντακ[υσία]; δωρεάς: Cat. # 7.a.1 l. 1.
\item\textsuperscript{17} Cat. # 2.a.2 ll. 25-29; cf. above, Chapter One, p. 30, n. 52.
\item\textsuperscript{18} Cat. # 4.d.6 l. 5.
\end{itemize}
support annual distributions, as we shall discuss below. Consequently, although these two uses of *eis diανομάς* are not accompanied by an indication that they were intended to be annual occurrences, it is possible that this is in fact the case.

**B. Testamentary Distributions**

The verb (*κατά*)λειπω, we see, occurs as often with the phrase *eis diανομάς* as without it, but the occasional omission does not seem to alter the meaning of the testament (Table 2.1, B.1-2). In all but one usage of *κατάλειπω*, the distributions are clearly meant to be lasting; that is, this verb refers to the bequeathal of a capital sum whose interest would be distributed. The uncertain instance is the Imperial statue base of Gaius Julius Bassus from Pontus: Bassus was honored posthumously with a statue by the βουλή and δήμος of Sebastopolis Heracleiopolis because he had made arrangements for distributions to the πατρίς. However, the sum of money which was given to support these distributions does not appear to have been inscribed. Since *κατάλειπω* is used elsewhere of annual or repeated distributions which took place after the death of the benefactor, though, it is reasonable to suggest that this is also the sense here.

Thus, we may suggest that *'eis diανομάς'* has a similar sense in many of its appearances to *'eis αἰωνίους διανομάς'* which indicates a testamentary foundation from

---

19 Cat. # 7.b.4 ll. C7-9, and 7.b.6 ll. C10-11; cf. below pp. 50-55.

20 Cat. # 4.d.13 ll. 4-6: ἀν ὁ τὸν τόκον ἵνα οὐκ ἐλθῇ τῇ διανομῇ. 5.b.1 l. 4: *eis diανομήν ἐτήσιον; 5.c.1 l. 9: ξύνει διανομής. 7.c.2 ll. 19-21: αἰωνίους δοκεῖς... *eis... diανομάς. 7.h.1 ll. 12-18: ἐξ ἐμίσουσιν *[μέ*]ε[ρ']ουσι... *eis te diανομάς. 

21 Cat. # 9.a.1: Γ. Ἡσιλίου Βάσσωλάπο στορατηνον φιλατιπτον γενόμενων, ἐκ θαυμάσον τῇ πατρίδι δει καθ' ἂν ἐδοξήν τῇ ἐν Βουλῇ καὶ δήμῳ ἀνδρίας αὐτῶν ἀνασταθεῖν.
which the cash-gifts were paid out.\textsuperscript{22} However, such distributions were probably not in fact distributed ‘forever’, but rather only so long as the capital provided sufficient interest and the ἐπιμελήτης honored the instructions of the deceased founder. There are no inscriptions which tell us that money donated to provide διανομή was diverted to another purpose, but there are several which established penalties for anyone who attempted to divert the funds.\textsuperscript{23}

A phrase similar to ‘ἐἰς αἰώνιος διανομᾶς’ appears in a second century AD inscription from Sardis: ‘ἐἰς διανομήν ἐτήσιον’.\textsuperscript{24} As in the case of Julius Bassus, Tiberius Claudius Silanius left a foundation, the size of which has been lost, to provide διανομαί. Table 2.1 indicates that five verbs, ἀνατίθημι, χωρέω, χαρίζομαι, δορέω and δηλόω are also followed by ‘ἐἰς διανομᾶς’, but never by διανομή without the preposition or by any other form of διανομή, so that these verbs refer to the establishment of foundations to support cash-gifts (Table 2.1, C, F, G, H, and L, respectively). Of these five, χαρίζομαι and χωρέω

\textsuperscript{22} This phrase appears only in Aphrodisias and always of distributions which are clearly testamentary; Cat. # 6.c.1 il. 19-20; 6.c.2 il. 3-4; 6.c.3 il. 5-6; 6.c.4 il. 6, 8; 6.c.5 il. 33-34; cf. Robert (1965): 179.

\textsuperscript{23} An inscription from Ephesus contains a clause specifying a fine for anyone who alters any of the provisions of the decree (Cat. # 4.b.3; Table 2.1, Q), and the decree of Nicomedes of Ephesus does tell us that a ritual was interrupted for many years due to a lack of funding (Cat. # 4.b.12 il. 8). Similarly, a prophet in Didyma is honored for renewing διανομαί for the βουλή, πολίται and γυναῖκες (Cat. #4.d.1 il. 14-16; Table 2.1, U). A benefactor of Perge specifies a fine of one thousand denaria to be paid by anyone who violates his arrangements for a festival in honour of himself (IKPerge 77 il. 9-13). There is also evidence of temple funds being mis-appropriated for the purpose of διανομαί in a letter from Hadrian to the inhabitants of Delphi (Fouilles de Delphes, III.4.302): [μὲν κ]ελεύ[ς καὶ τὸ ἐπιδεικτ[α] τῶν τευμάτων 5 ὧν διακ[α][μενος] παρατέθε[ί] Θεσσαλ[ο]ύς ἀποδέο[μ] τῷ βεβ. ὧν τῶν [ἀγνωθε[ν]] ἀνεόματα ἄφο[ν δι[α]νομ[ά]ς γενόσθαι πυλῶν μοι, καὶ ταύτα δουλ[α] καὶ το[ύτως τῷ βεβ] ὑ[π] ρήσθαι[ν] ἀμ[ε]ρωμε[νός κελεύ[ς] ὦ ὧν ὑ[μ] ὧν θεο[ῦ χρήματα ἐλέος διάνομαι τί [με] κελεύ[ς τῷ] βεβ ἐπιστρ[ε] καὶ τά τῶν διανεμισ[τῶν ἀνεόματα Λαγανούνται] μοι τῶν παρ[ιστάμ] περιπλοκήτων.

\textsuperscript{24} Cat. 5.b.1 l.4.
alone are used of foundations which first provided distributions during the lifetime of the benefactor.

Δηλώχ and ἀνατιθήμι occur only in Aphrodisias, always with ‘εἰς αἰωνίους διανομάς.’ 25 Δωρέω is used in a similar manner, though not exclusively of cash sums, and only with ‘εἰς διανομήν’ (or διανομάς). This verb appears only in two entries from Lycia, describing large-scale donations by Opramoas and a benefactor whose name is not known. Opramoas’ donation consists of interest-bearing land, the proceeds of which were to provide handouts for the σείτομετρούμενοι on the occasion of penteteric games. The second inscription records a gift of 61,000 denaria for distributions and the celebration of a festival. 26

C. Repeated, Non-testamentary Distributions

The final two verbs which are followed only by ‘εἰς διανομήν’ are, like those which use ‘εἰς αἰωνίους διανομάς,’ geographically restricted in their appearance: χωρέω εἰς διανομήν appears only in the mausoleum of Opramoas, while two of the three attestations of χαρίζωμαι occur in documents pertaining to his donations; the final inscription to use χαρίζωμαι in this connection also comes from Rhodiapolis. 27 In each of these cases, the

---

25 Cat. # 6.c.1-5. Note, however, Cat. # 6.c.5 II. 32-34: τῇ λαμπροτάτη δὲ βουλή καὶ τῇ ἱερωτάτῃ γερουσίᾳ ἀνατεθειτά τα χρήματα εἰς αἰωνίους / κλήρους διανομάς, where we again have a subjective genitive, though in this case it is διανομαί consisting of a lasting lottery.

26 Σείτομετρούμενοι: Cat. # 7.d.1 II. 24-30: διωρισμένοι καὶ κατὰ δια[βή]/κην ἀγρόν ἐν τῇ Κοσσάδακι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ Χαράδρας καὶ Παθάλγος ἑρωτα ἐπείδα, αὐτῖ εἰς τὰ σειτομετρούμενοι / ἄνω, α; 61,000 denaria: Cat. 7.e.1 II. 18-19: δεδωρισμένον τῇ πάλ[ε] ἄργῳ[ν] / (ἐναργίων) σειτομετρούμενοι / ἄνω, α; 61,000 denaria: Cat. 7.e.1 II. 18-19: δεδωρισμένον τῇ πάλ[ε] ἄργῳ[ν] / (ἐναργίων) σειτομετρούμενοι / ἄνω, α; 61,000 denaria: Cat. 7.e.1 II. 18-19: δεδωρισμένον τῇ πάλ[ε] ἄργῳ[ν] / (ἐναργίων) σειτομετρούμενοι / ἄνω, α; 61,000 denaria: Cat. 7.e.1 II. 18-19: δεδωρισμένον τῇ πάλ[ε] ἄργῳ[ν] / (ἐναργίων) σειτομετρούμενοι / ἄνω, α; 61,000 denaria:

27 Χωρέω: Cat. # 7.b.1 II. H6-9; 7.b.2 II. B10-12; 7.b.3 II. F2-4; 7.b.4 II. B7-10; χαρίζωμαι: Cat. # 7.b.5 II. G5-6, 7.e.1 II. 8-10 (Opramoas), and 7.b.7 II. 21-24 (Heracleitus).
benefactor donated (κεκαρισμένον) a sum of money which was to be invested; in four cases, we are told that the interest on this sum of money was to go towards (χωρεῖν) a cash distribution. Although the χωρέω-phrase is omitted from two of the Opromoas-documents, καρίζωμαι is still used for the donation of a capital sum, so that we may suggest that in the third use of this verb, also in Rhodiapolis, the sense is the same—a capital fund was donated to support repeated distributions.

There is a variety of verbs which are attested only once, as Table 2.1 indicates. Four of these verbs, εἰμί, τηρέωμαι, ἐπιτέλλω, and ἀποτίνω (Table 2.1, K, N, O, Q) appear in public decrees or letters, so that they make arrangements for distributions. One of the διανομαί is to be funded with fines exacted from anyone who violates the provisions of the decree, the first portion of which has been lost,

28 while a second is to be administered (ἐπιτελεῖ) by the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς of Ephesus.29 Both of these distributions, like most of those which are described by verbs in this category, are intended to be recurrent events. Two other verbs, ὅριζω and καλέω (Table 2.1, S, T), may also be used to refer to repeated distributions, but there is no certain evidence for this.30

Although we have noted that there is a pattern in the honorary decrees and inscriptions, it is not universally followed, so that some of these are very similar to the public decrees in that they record specific instructions for the διανομή. Two Ephesian

---

28 Cat. # 4.b.3 I. 2.

29 Cat. # 4.b.6 II. 223-226.

30 In the second case (Cat. 5.e.1 II. 10-11), arrangements are made πάν τὸ πλῆ[θος καλεῖν τῶν ἔλευθερον καὶ] τῶν δούλων ἐπί τε τῶς ἄλλοις καὶ ἐπὶ διανομὴ ἀφροδίσου, but the verb is entirely restored.
inscriptions from the early first century AD honoring Gaius Stertinius Orpex in particular
deivate from the formula outlined at the beginning of this chapter to describe the donation
of money to a civic body which will act as ἐπιμελήτης (Table 2.1, D: λαμβάνω). 31 These
inscriptions record the donations of Gaius Stertinius Orpex to the βουλή and γερουσία for
annual διανομαί; the two inscriptions probably record the same distributions. The sum of
money was dedicated for the purpose of funding distributions. But the verb καθιερώω
suggests that these funds were entrusted to the temple of Artemis, which Orpex may have
provided with statues. 32 However, instead of the preposition εἰς, we have a purpose
clause following καθιερώω in each case:

καθιερώων δὲ καὶ τῇ βουλῇ
ἀργύριον, ὡς ἐκ τῆς προσόδου κατ᾽ ἐν[ιαυ]-
tῶν πρὸ τῶν τειμῶν αὐτῶν ἐν [τῇ] ἄγνο(ε)ψ λ[αμ]-
βάνως(ι) διανομὴν ἀμοίως καὶ τῇ γερουσίᾳ,
ὅπως λαμβάνωσι ἐν τῷ ρυτίδι πρὸ [τῶν]
tειμῶν αὐτῶν διανομῆν. 33

Clearly, these are meant to be annual distributions, but as in the case of ‘αἰώνιοι διανομαί’, they would have continued only if the capital funds were not diverted to
another purpose. However, that this foundation was administered by the cult of Artemis
should not be taken as an indication that it could not be diverted. 34

31 Cat. # 4.b.1 ll. 9-14 and 4.b.2 ll. 9-15.

32 This is a conjecture, based on the incomplete restoration of the first portion of the decree
honoring Orpex (Cat. # 4.b.1 ll. 1-5): [-]τῇ ἐλ [- ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς 'Αρτέμιδος / [- σύν τοῖς] ἐνδείκτην / [καὶ] παντὶ τῷ [-]οὐ κάσημι καὶ / [-]ῷ καταστρόφωσαι.

33 Cat. # 4.b.1 ll. 9-14.

34 See above, p. 51, n. 23.
Finally, Table 2.1 shows two occurrences of διανομή μερίς (Table 2.1, I). Both occurrences of διανομή μερίς appear in a single inscription from Tenos.\(^{35}\) This is an archaic use of μερίς, probably reflecting a tradition in which διανομή could still be interchanged with μερίς, a distribution of meat or food, since the only other διανομή in Tenos is the object of the participle δώντα.\(^{36}\) The verb is used of distributions eight times in Asia Minor and the Aegean islands, occasionally of money.\(^{37}\) It is clear in this case that money is being distributed from a capital fund so that the appearance of this verb here is unusual, but not unprecedented. The inscription also records an endowment to support a balaneion, so that we cannot eliminate the possibility that this money was allocated for the purchase of oil.

III. Funding διανομαί

As we shall see and as Pliny the Younger says, διανομαί were public and official events. The division of the distributions into the categories which we have just discussed is summarized in Chart 2.1 and Table 2.2, for the purposes of which, each occurrence of the term διανομή has been enumerated.

---

35 Cat. # 3.c.1 ll. 14, 17-18. Le Bas (1839): 8-14 no. 14, has dated this inscription, due to the lack of Imperial titulature, to the end of the first century BC when ‘la taxe de la capitation étais devenues si onèreuse pour les pays soumis à la domination romaine.’ Consequently, though this inscription is not strictly speaking Imperial, it is Roman.

36 Μερίς: above, Chapter One, pp. 24, n. 39; δώντα διανομής: Cat. # 3.c.2 ll. 12-14.

37 For example, SIG\(^5\) 577, an early Hellenistic inscription from Miletus.
Chart 2.1: Types of Distributions by Frequency and City.
A. Διανομείς offered only once

Despite the fact that Διανομείς which were intended to be repeated annually or at a regular interval clearly required a great deal more funding than those which were provided only on a single occasion, the distributions are almost evenly divided between these two categories. The one-time distributions were, for the most part, offered on the occasion of a magistracy or an Imperial visit, which we shall discuss below. However, these tell us very little about the funding of the distributions.

Obviously, a large sum of money was donated by the benefactor, which would have been spent on the distribution and, usually, on a statue or similar monument. Occasionally, these monuments were paid for from the funds of the city. Since these statues were entirely honorary and served only to bring public attention to the donor, we may assume that a statue paid for by the city or another group of citizens was all the more indicative of honor, so that mention of such a gift would not have been omitted from one of these inscriptions. Therefore, unless we are told that the benefactor did not pay for the statue himself, we may assume that the benefactor or another private individual paid the

---

38 This category contains a single Imperial letter, which we shall discuss below (Cat. # 4.b.10; pp. 68-69, nn. 59-60). This describes benefactions in place of Διανομείς. Consequently, it does not describe distributions which took place, so that we have no way of knowing whether these were a regular feature of Vedius Antoninus' office.
cost of the statue. In fact, there are only two instances, to my knowledge, of a statue being paid for by the city and being accompanied by διανομαί. There is no mention of a sum of money in an inscription recording a διανομή which was certainly intended to be a one-time offering. The majority of our inscriptions describe διανομαί which were provided before the erection of the statue, so that we cannot be certain why a total sum was not specified in these cases.

We have slightly more information on the amount which was to be given to each recipient. Five inscriptions specify a rate at which the distributions were to be given, as summarized in Table 2.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate at which each distribution was provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 <em>denaria</em> (Cat. # 6.a.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 <em>denaria</em> (Cat. # 7.f.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 <em>denaria</em> (Cat. # 6.h.3, 7.g.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 <em>denarion</em>, 3½ asses (Cat. # 7.g.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 <em>denarion</em> (Cat. # 6.a.1, 7.f.1, x3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 <em>assaria</em> (Cat. # 3.b.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 <em>assaria</em> (Cat. # 3.b.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3.: Rates attested in inscriptions recording one-time distributions.

The two largest handouts were both presented to the βουλή; both handouts of two *denaria* and two of the handouts of one *denarion* were given to the citizens. The γυναικία, the sebastophori and the masteigophori received the other gifts of one *denarion*. The two smallest distributions were provided to the women and children of Syros, while the gift of one *denarion* 3½ *assaria* was given to an unknown group. Although this

39 See below, pp. 63-78.
is a very limited body for comparison, we can suggest that, as in the Latin West, the amount received by the recipient was, in most cases, dependent on his or her social rank.\textsuperscript{41}

Such a stratification of the recipients does not appear in the epigraphic evidence before the Imperial period. This may in part be due to the absence of the term \textit{διανομή} in Hellenistic inscriptions, but it is also related to the fact that there was a stratification in the West. Distributions in the Hellenistic age do not appear to have been dependent on the social rank of the recipient; in the Imperial age, social rank is a factor, at least in those cases for which we have any evidence. This stratification reflects the 'Roman-ness' of \textit{διανομαί} in the Greek East more than the presence of \textit{διανομαί} themselves.

B. \textit{Διανομαί} offered on recurrent occasions

The recurrent distributions were funded in virtually the same manner—a sum of cash or a quantity of land was donated whose interest would bear the costs of the distributions. This interest could be spent entirely on cash handouts, or only partially. Thus, an unidentified benefactor of Apollonis left an unspecified sum of money in his testament for a \textit{διανομή} to the \textit{βουλή}, and an \textit{άλειμμα} (a distribution of oil) to the city;\textsuperscript{42}


\textsuperscript{41} Mrozek (1987): 83-104; see above, Chapter One, pp. 16-17.

\textsuperscript{42} Cat. # 5.c.1 II. 8-11: καταλαμάνοντα τῇ κρατίστῃ βουλῇ [Ἀ/π]ολλονεῖων ζώντα διανομήν καὶ τῇ / πόλει ἀλειμμα τῇ γενεθλίῳ αὐτ[οῦ] / ἐμέρας κατέ ἔτος.
similarly, Heraclitus is honored by the city of Rhodiapolis, ἑαρισώμενον τῇ πατρίδι εἰς
dιανομὰς καὶ ἀγώνας Ἀσκληπίων καὶ ἀργυρίου / (δηναρίων) μύρια.⁴³

Fifteen διανομή-inscriptions record an amount which was donated; however, there
are several in which there was once a mention of a value which has now been lost and
cannot be restored. Table 2.4 summarizes those amounts which remain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Sum Donated</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61,000 denaria (Cat. # 7.e.1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,000 denaria (Cat. # 7.b.1-6)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51,000 denaria (Cat. # 7.b.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 denaria (Cat. # 7.a.1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 denaria (Cat. # 4.b.6, 4.b.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 denaria (Cat. # 4.b.6, 4.b.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,500 denaria (Cat. # 7.e.1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Bearing Land (circa 4,600 denaria) (Cat. # 7.d.1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4: Attested donations for annual distributions.

Clearly, there is a great difference in the sums donated, as we have donations on a
very large scale and others which are comparatively small. The donations over 10,000
denaria, however, are meant to support festivals in which διανομαί were provided, while
those smaller than 10,000 denaria appear to have been intended only to support διανομαί.
The fragmentary amount, which was over 10,000, appears in an inscription from Phaselis,
and was intended to support διανομαί and spectacles (θεωρίαι).⁴⁴ Although very few of our
inscriptions provide information on the capital funds designated to support the
distributions, they must have been organized similarly to the foundation of Gaius Vibius
Salutaris in Ephesus or that of Gaius Julius Demosthenes in Oenoanda.

⁴³ Cat. # 7.b.7 ll. 21-24.
The long and detailed decree regarding the foundation of Salutaris of Ephesus provides for statues of Trajan, Plotina, the Senate and others; Salutaris also made arrangements for the maintenance of annual distributions. These distributions were to be provided from the interest on a sum of 20,000 denaria, which was to be set out at 9%, yielding an annual 1,800 denaria. This interest was used to provide cash-gifts to nine different groups. However, these gifts were not all διανομαί. Three διανομαί are mentioned of varying sizes, and six κλήροι, both of which Oliver translates as ‘distribution’. There is, however a distinction in the meaning of these two terms: the διανομαί are given to entire groups—the Βουλευταί, the priestess and ἰμυνάδοι of Artemis and a group whose name has been lost—while the κλήροι are given to portions of groups by lot. Thus, although the κλήροι do refer to distributions, they are distributions with limits set on them by the amount of money available, not by the number of members in a group—they are a lottery rather than a distribution. Of the total interest, therefore, only 493 denaria 9 assaria are to be spent on the ‘διανομαί’; some of this total, however, may have been saved, since the gifts for the Βουλευταί were to be given only to those who were present, but were available to all of the Βουλευταί and priests.

The foundation fund established by Gaius Julius Demosthenes consisted of annual donations by Demosthenes himself or his family and the interest which would accumulate

---

44 Cat. # 7.c.1 ll. 8-11: [καταργὸν καὶ τῇ ἡμερήσιᾳ πίστει εἰς διανομάς· καὶ τῇ θεωρίᾳ (δημαρίῳ) μὴ ἄλοιπον] ...

45 IAEph 27=Oliver (1941): 55-85, no. 3; cf. Cat. # 4.b.6 and 4.b.7.
on these donations, so that a total of 4,450 *denaria* would be available for each festival; however, the annual donations would continue only until Demosthenes himself or a member of his family donated interest-bearing land which would provide the same revenue. Demosthenes also details how this money is to be spent in each festival, even providing for a distribution of extra revenue among the citizens. However, we should note that the term ‘διανομή’ is not used in this inscription, so that it does not appear in our catalogue. Out of the 4,450 *denaria* available at each festival, though, 300 *denaria* are to be available for the distributions to the citizens.

The donation of interest-bearing land, the final entry in Table 2.4, was intended to support a penteteric distribution and games. The value of the land was sufficient to provide 1,150 *denaria* per year, so that over the interval, a sum of over 4,600 *denaria* would accumulate, depending on the rate at which the annual revenue of 1,150 *denaria* was let out.

---

46 Wörle (1988); SEG 38 (1988): 1462; Mitchell (1990). The Greek text of this inscription, along with a German translation, is provided by Wörle, pp. 4-17; Mitchell provides an English translation of the decree. Any shortfall between the expected value of the interest and the actual value would presumably have been the responsibility of the ἐπιμαλήτης to meet.

47 Wörle (1988): 6, line 27: καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ (δημόρια) τ’ καὶ ἕδω τι ἐκ τῶν θεμάτων προσγένηται μεριδεθάμενοι τοῖς ἔχοντα τῶν σειτομετρομένων πολείταις καὶ ἀπελευθέρωσι καὶ παροίκοισ (and the remaining 300 *denaria* and anything else remaining from the cash prizes is to be partitioned among those citizens who do not belong to the seiotometromenoi and free men and those who dwell in the city’s territory.). Note that διανομή is not used, though μεριδεθήσαμεν is.

48 Cat. # 7.d.l II. 24-30: δωρησάμενον καὶ κατὰ δια[θήκη]ς[κ]ν ἁγιᾷ ἐν τῇ Καρδαμυλῷ εἰς τύπῳ Χαράδοις καὶ Παυλωμής φόρωντα ἐπίτηρα ἀνθ. εἰς ἱππαρχίαν περικτηρίαν καὶ διαμ[α]θήθης ἀνδράσιν σειτομετρομένοις / ἀνὰ a. The annual revenue of the land donated was 1,150 *denaria*; the interest of the first year may have been let out as a loan in order to increase the revenue of the next year. Consequently, the revenue for the second year would be the 1,150 *denaria* of the land plus any revenue that may have been earned by the 1,150 *denaria* of the first year.
As is the case with one-time distributions, we have very little information on the value of each gift. Including the inscription recording Salutaris' foundation, five inscriptions tell us how much each individual is to receive. Although these inscriptions mention some of the same recipients as the inscriptions recording one-time distributions, there are too few to provide meaningful statistics. The rates, in general, are the same as those in Table 2.3. We are much better informed on how the distributions were to be conducted, that is, if the gifts were to be given, for example, πᾶσι τῶν πολίτῶν, or only to those who were present and on time. A discussion of this, however, will form the second part of Chapter Three.

IV. Occasions on which Διανομαί were Provided

The distributions, whether they took place only once or annually, were offered on specific occasions. In fact, the epigraphic evidence indicates that they were offered on those occasions which Pliny the Younger mentions to Trajan.49 Thus, we have attestations of διανομαί on such occasions as the assumption of a magistracy, the celebration of a festival, the birthday of the benefactor, or the dedication of a public monument. Although there is the Hellenistic distribution mentioned above on the occasion of a sacred marriage, there is no other celebration of a marriage, in the evidence surveyed here, with a διανομή. Table 2.5 summarizes these occasions.

49 Pliny, Ep. x.116-7; see above Chapter One, pp. 19-20 nn. 26-27.
Office or public service | 44 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Festival celebration</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthday or funeral</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public monument</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Customary' διανομαὶ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial visits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5.: Occasions on which distributions were offered.

A. Public Offices

Clearly, public offices and festivals were the most common events celebrated with the distribution of cash gifts. Although these two categories are closely associated, since festivals and games were funded and conducted by an agonothete—who can be considered a public official—, we have considered them separately as celebrations did not always accompany official duties.

The distributions which were offered during an office are, in general, easy to identify. Table 2.1 shows nine instances of the plural dative used with a participle of office or public service, such as ἀγονοθηρίσματα (Table 2.1, V), so that we have in these cases a benefactor serving as agonothete with distributions. However, in these cases, the duties of the offices did not include διανομαὶ: the distributions were provided in addition to the other responsibilities, making the holder of the office more worthy of praise. There are, however, very few indications of a precise time within the tenure of the magistracy on which the distributions were offered; nonetheless, given Pliny's testimony, it seems
reasonable to conclude that in at least some cases they were offered at the beginning of the term.\textsuperscript{51} The \textit{kouretes} list from Ephesus seems to provide an instance of \textit{dianoomai} being offered on the occasion of an office-assumption.\textsuperscript{52}

The use of the plural dative can be taken as an indication that distributions were offered during an office, but it is not the only connection which existed between \textit{dianoomai} and magistracies or liturgies. In many inscriptions, the distributions are listed between two offices, suggesting that they were given in connection with one of these. For example, the father of Marcus Aurelius Artemidorus Metrodorianus is honored as

\begin{verbatim}
   πρώτων γραμματέα του δήμου
   καὶ βουλαρχον ἐνδοξου
   [καὶ] γυμνασίαρχον πάντων τῶν γυμνασίων,
   δόντα διανομάς καὶ πάση τῇ πόλει,
   καὶ στρατηγὸν πρώτον, δόντα ἐν τῷ
   καιρῷ τῆς στρατηγίας ἐς παράτειμον
   ἐλαῖον (θηρária), καὶ εἰσφάραξιν μόνον, καὶ
   [τῶ]ις ἀγωνοθέτον, δόντα καὶ ἐν τῷ
   καιρῷ τῆς ἀγχηματίας ἐς τὴν ἀνα-
   κάθαρσιν τοῦ λιμένος θηρασίων
   μυριάδας δίο.\textsuperscript{53}
\end{verbatim}

The benefactor in this case served in a variety of municipal offices and it is reasonable to believe that the distributions of cash took place during his tenure as gymnasiarch. However, this is not certain since two other benefactions, the provision of

\textsuperscript{50} Cat. \# 3.a.1; see above Chapter One, pp. 37-38; note again that this is a distribution of meat, not of money. Appendix 3 contains a supplementary table to Table 2.5 (Table 2.5a) in which the catalogued inscriptions which record distributions on these occasions are listed.


\textsuperscript{52} Cat. \# 4.b.11 \textit{ll.} 2-3.

\textsuperscript{53} Cat. \# 4.b.15 \textit{ll.} 4-14.
oil and 20,000 denaria for the dredging of the harbor, are specifically placed during the στρατηγία and the ἀρχιερωσίνη respectively. Nonetheless, even if the διανομαὶ did not take place during the gymnasiarchy, it seems that they should be associated with this office rather than with the στρατηγία, the ἀρχιερωσίνη, or any of the other offices—that is, these distributions may have been promised or undertaken during the gymnasiarchy, but not necessarily completed until afterwards. Such an association, of course, assumes a chronological ordering of the offices.

However, the provision of distributions was not a set responsibility of magisterial offices: distributions of cash were often offered in addition to the obligations of the office, so that the provision of them was something to be emphasized. It is possible, of course, that they were obligatory in some cities or regions of Asia Minor, but, if they were, they would not then appear in the inscriptions of those cities: mention of διανομαὶ is intended to reflect the magnanimity of the benefactor, so that praise would be more meaningful when the distributions were provided in addition to the traditional duties of the office. We may therefore assume that most of the cities in which διανομαὶ were an expected part of a public office are not represented in this survey, except in the case of extraordinary διανομαὶ or those which were offered on other occasions.

Although distributions were not necessarily required, they may at times have been coerced by public opinion.\(^5\) Certainly, we will not be told that these handouts were

\(^5\) Cf. Dio Chrys., Or. 46, in which Dio is confronted by a hostile mob outside of his home attempting to force him to alleviate a grain shortage; similarly, Aristides (Dindorf xxvi ἱέρων Λόγος Α'); Behr 50 'The Sacred Tales', 94 ff.) went to great lengths to obtain immunity from the public offices which citizens tried to force on him.
offered against the benefactor’s will, but there are sometimes hints that this may have been the case. Some benefactors, but not all, are praised for their public spirit and the willingness with which they gave handouts. However, in those inscriptions which include adverbs referring to the magnanimity of the benefactor, it may be assumed that the benefactions were not part of any liturgical obligations. The βουλή of Thyatira in Lydia, for example, honors the son of Labianus who served as agonothete of the games of Apollo Tyrimnus gloriously and famously (ἐνδόξως καὶ ἐπιφανῶς) with διανομαῖς and ἐπιδόσεως for the βουλή.\footnote{Cat. # 5.a.1 ll. 4-8.} The διανομαί provided, however, were probably not among the obligations and liturgies incumbent upon him as agonothete. An agonothete, as the name implies, was responsible partly for the provision of games or contests of various types.\footnote{On the agonothesia, see below, Chapter Three pp. 92-93.} These distributions were provided in addition to the liturgical office, as is indicated by the simple reference to the distributions and the fact that the agonothesia was rendered ‘glorious and famous’ by their provision.\footnote{For example, cat. # 6.a.1 ll. 19-24: καὶ πάσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ θυσίαν καὶ ἐπιθέσεις παρατίθεντον ἐνεάυτῶν τῇ πόλεϊ καὶ μὲν ἄρα διὰ ἐπιθέσεις/μάτων μεμαρτύροντα. The unnamed benefactor in this case did provide handouts of money to both the citizens and the councilors, but these do not seem to have been included in either the liturgies or the ἐπιθέσεις, which were offered ‘blamelessly’. The adverb ἐνεάυτῶν here suggests that the liturgies and ἐπιθέσεις were performed because they were expected; they are praised because the benefactor seemingly had performed them in a reasonable amount of time.}

Other inscriptions neither mention nor imply such freedom of will, so that it is possible that at least some of these are hiding the fact that the benefactor had indeed been
compelled. This is, of course, not always the case, and should not be over emphasized, as it is an argument from silence.

It is also evident, as we have suggested above, that in some cases διανομαὶ were used as virtual campaign-promises—a candidate promised to provide distributions during the course of his official service. As is the case with distributions which may have been coerced by hostile public opinion, though, indications of this are never directly seen. A single inscription uses the term ὑποσχέσεις, an official promise, to record the intent to provide διανομή; this is, again, the Opramoas-inscription from Rhodiapolis:

πεποίησεν δὲ καὶ ὑποσχέσεις

This portion of the inscription does not explicitly tell us that Opramoas made the promise for the distributions as part of his campaign for any particular office, but we do know that he eventually became Lyciarch, the highest office available to him. However, the interesting fact about ὑποσχέσεις is not that it may have been used to secure his election. That these promises are mentioned in the case of Opramoas indicates that he did fulfill them, though when he did so is unclear; such promises would not be mentioned in an honorary inscription if they remained unfulfilled at the time of the inscribing of the stone.

58 Cat. # 7. b. 4 ll. C7-10: ‘and having also made offers and grants (ἐπιδόσεις) of money for διανομαὶ and festivals in some of the leading cities...’ Robert (1965): 207 understands ὑποσχέσεις as a ‘promesse officielle’. There are, however, other terms which seem to have a similar connotation, such as, for example, the verb ἐπαγγέλλω (SEG 32. 1243 ll. 41-43: ἐπετέλεσεν[ε] / δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀγαμέμνοις ὑπὸ τὰς Ἀσίας Κασσαρίους, καθὼς ἐπαγγεῖλατο, ταῖς... / ἦθοις καὶ εἰσαχάσεις). This verb, though, refers to the summoning of citizens or any group of recipients with a promise of distributions or a similar benefaction implied.
This notice also implies that other candidates promised distributions and other benefactions, but did not always follow through on their promises.

Διανομαί, however, were provided by officials so regularly that it seems that they did become expected, if not exactly required, in some cities. Vedius Antoninus, for example, undertook several building projects in Ephesus, instead of following the example of other wealthy Ephesians who provided donations for, among other things, διανομαί.59 The letter, which was written when the Ephesians failed to inform the Emperor of Vedius Antoninus' actions, does not tell us if Antoninus was an official at this time; however it is possible that he was, since the Vedii were a prominent family in Ephesus, occupying "eine lange Reihe der höchsten, wichtigsten, teuersten und prestigeträchtigsten Ämter, die die Stadt [von Ephesus] zu vergeben hatte."60 Since the magistrates, βουλὴ and citizens of the city were expected to inform the Emperor or his representative of Vedius Antoninus' φιλοτιμία, it is probable that it was performed during service as high-priest of the Imperial cult. This letter tells us that διανομαί were not always required of magistrates, but it does indicate that some sort of benefactions, φιλοτιμίαι, were expected by the citizens of individual cities and by Roman authorities. Such benefactions were often provided by priests of the Imperial cult, and we shall see

59 Cat. # 4.4.10 ii. 13-18: κἀκεῖνος καὶ συνεχώρησαν αὐτῷ [...]ς / καὶ ἔγγραφον ὅτι [αὐτῷ] τῶν ἀτολλίων τῶν παλαιστειομένων τρόπων, οὗ τῷ [παρά]χρηστα εἰδοκυμένῳ; καὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ θεάσι τῷ διανομοῖς καὶ τῶν ἀγώνων θέματι; διαπαν[όθεν]/τῆν φιλοτιμίαις, ἀλλὰ δὴ ὁ πρὸς τὸ μέλλον ἐλπίζει; σημειώσα(μεν τῆν) τῆν πόλεως προφήτησιν.

60 Schulte (1994): 95 and her Cat. 93, esp. IKEph 438, 727, 728, 3082.
below in Chapter Three that these officials were prominent individuals in local governments.

B. Festivals and Games

As we shall see, many διανομαὶ were funded by agonothetes, but there are distributions of money which were offered during the celebration of games which are not explicitly connected with the agonothesia. Opramoas, for example, provided a sum of money to the city of Phaselis and a gift of land to Tlos to support spectacles, games and coincidental διανομαὶ. He is clearly acting as an agonothete since he is supporting the games, but this may not have been an official liturgy—that is, he seems to have voluntarily made the donations and funded the games, perhaps as a ἰποσχέσις.

We have also included in this category διανομαὶ which were offered on the birthday of a local god or of the Emperor. It is almost certain that the priests of the respective gods and goddesses conducted distributions on these occasions, so that we may assume that the benefactor was serving as priest even though the office itself is not mentioned. However, we know that the priest or priestess paid for the distributions ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων in only five of these cases; in almost every other case, the omission of this phrase suggests that the temple-funds formed a portion of—if not the entire sum—the money which was distributed.

Feasts are occasionally mentioned in our inscriptions, accompanied by distributions of cash. Importantly, though, these are not feasts of private associations of
citizens, but rather associations connected with the Imperial cult. One inscription, for instance, tells us that the benefactor provided a feast for the city (τὴν πόλιν) twice and provided a διανομή, while others tell us that only those who were present to take part in the feasting received the handouts.  

C. Birthdays and Testamentary Distributions

Distributions offered on the occasion of the birthday of an Emperor or a member of the Imperial family were conducted by Imperial priests, so that, like distributions offered at games and other festivals, they are closely associated with those of the first category. The majority of the distributions offered on these occasions were events connected to the administration of the city or to the celebration of a regional festival. The birthdays which are celebrated by διανομαί are those of local gods and goddesses if they are not of an Imperial figure. There is one instance of the celebration of the birthday of the benefactor, but the donation to support this annual διανομή was given τῇ θηρίᾳ Κλαυδίᾳ, βουλή.  

There are, however, several inscriptions which describe διανομαί given in order to observe the anniversary of the death of the benefactor. These distributions could be used to increase public prestige, so that some benefactors attempted to attract additional people.

---

61 Cat. # 7.c.1 ll. 9-11 and 7.d.1 ll. 27-30 (testamentary); but he is also named as an agonothete in Myra, Patara and Rhodiapolis (Cat. # 7.b.4 ll. B12-14).

62 Cat. # 7.g.1 ll. 15-17: ἐπισάσσετα δὲ καὶ τῷ πόλιν β' καὶ δέχεται διανομήν τὰ πάντα ἀνά (διάνοια) τῶν θεῶν; Cat. # 4.b.12 ll. 11-12: ἐκατον τοῖς παρόντα εἰς τῇ ἀνάλογῳ τοῦ δείπνου ἐξεσθεν καὶ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Νεκμηδίου φυλετείᾳ λαβέν] ἀπτικήν μιαν.

63 Cat. # 6.b.1 l. 1.
to their funerary processions and celebrations by providing distributions to the traditional recipients, whom we shall identify in Chapter Three. Thus, we cannot assume that distributions provided on birthdays and funerals were necessarily private and unofficial events. For example, Ptolemaeus the grandson of Kolalemius left in his testament *aiōnious dōreás* to support, in part, *dianomai* for the city of Phaselis, with the implication that the recipients had to take part in the observance of the anniversary of his death.\(^{64}\) Although such an occasion is very close to a private occasion, Ptolemaeus was a priest of the Imperial cult, so that the observance of his death could easily be connected with that institution.

D. Public Monuments

There are several references to the donation of a public building or the restoration of such buildings in the *dianomai*-inscriptions, but it is not the case that the dedication of these was always accompanied by handouts. In addition to the donation for the dredging of the harbor of Ephesus mentioned above, Satyrus the son of Philinus was honored by the *boulē* and *dēmos* of Tenos after having served in every magisterial capacity, and having built a bathhouse with a fund to defray the heating costs; the *dianomai* which he provided, though, were given at the erection of a statue which itself commemorated these earlier benefactions.\(^{65}\) Similarly, a *hydrophorus* of Artemis in Didyma performed her duties, provided *dianomai* and dedicated bronze doors and stone measures for the temple

\(^{64}\) Cat. # 7.c.2 il. 19-22.
of Artemis. In general, though, such donations were not the occasion for διανομαί. The only dedications which are clearly accompanied by διανομαί are dedications of statues of the benefactor, of his family members, of the Imperial family, or of local gods.

However, statues only rarely provide the occasion for a distribution, if the epigraphic evidence does not mislead us. It is, of course, possible that each statue was accompanied by a distribution, but only six inscriptions explicitly clarify this. It was much more common for distributions to have been given before the decree of the βουλή and δήμος which allowed the benefactor to erect a statue, as the basic formula which we have outlined at the beginning of this chapter indicates: in many cases, the statues were a result of the distributions and other benefactions: the βουλή and δήμος honor the benefactor, who has given διανομαί, with a statue.

The decree of the βουλή and δήμος which allowed the benefactor to erect a statue usually followed the distributions, but in several cases the dedication of a statue did...

---

66 Above, p. 65; Cat. # 4.b.15 ll. 12-14 (Ephesus); Satyrus: Cat. # 3.c.1 ll. 1-4: ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δήμος Σάτυρος Φιλείου πληρώσαντα πάσαν ἀρχήν καὶ λειτουργίαν, καὶ ἀρχήν/λειτουργίαν πετράκης, καὶ ἀναθέτα τῇ πόλει / βαλανείῳ καὶ πεντακισεξήλιῳ, ἵνα ἐκ τοῦ / τόκου αὐτῶν θερμαινται τὸ βαλανείῳ.

67 Three inscriptions in our catalogue do include reference to buildings and διανομαί (Cat. 4.d.2, 7.a.1, and the repeated inscription of Tiberius Julius Justianus, 10.a.3-7). However, these references do not always mean that something is being built; it is possible that a pre-existing building has simply been restored or provided with a new feature. The example from Didyma honors a hydrophorus, who dedicated the doors of the temple of Artemis and stone measures, but these dedications are included among her services as hydrophorus (4.d.2 ll. 8-11). The anonymous benefactor of Tlos provided 25,000 denaria for διανομαί and for τὸ ἐν τοῖς ἱερῶι ἐθνικῶι Κασσάρειας—but not for the construction of the temple (7.a.1 ll. 1-6). Tiberius Julius Justianus enriched Ancyrα with διανομαί and decorated it with ἔργοι περικαλλουστάτων, but these ἔργοι did not necessarily provide the occasion for the διανομαί (10.a.3 ll. 9-10; cf. 10.a.4-7).
coincide with the handouts, in which cases we may conclude that the statues were voted due to a different benefaction, or earlier διανομαί. An inscription from Carian Nysa, for example, reads:

\[\text{ἐπὶ τῇ ἀνα-}
\text{στάσει τοῦ ἀνδριάντος δόντα διανο-
μήν τῇ φιλοσεβάστῳ βουλῇ}\]

This benefactor, whose name has been lost, was also responsible for a gift of oil in the gymnasia—so that he is a gymnasiarch—but the διανομή clearly took place before this second donation, and on the occasion of the erection of the statue.

**E. Διανομαί with Imperial Authority**

A single inscription in our catalogue records a διανομή on the occasion of the passage of Hadrian through a city. This is an inscription honoring Latinius Alexander of Ancyra, twice ἀρχιερεὺς. Hadrian is known for his frequent travels throughout the Empire, and his travels through Asia Minor have been discussed at length. He traveled through Asia Minor three times as Emperor: at the beginning of his reign in AD 117, in

---

68 For example, Cat. # 3.c.1 ll. 24-26, 4.d.2 ll. 11-12, 4.d.6 ll. 11-13, and 7.f.1 ll. 1-5.

69 Cat. # 6.h.1 ll. 1-3: at the dedication of a statue he gave διανομήν to the loyal βουλή; cf. also Cat. 7.e.1 ll. 12-19.


71 See, for example, Birley (1997); Magie (1950): 611-629 also discusses Hadrian’s travels in Asia Minor and the Greek East in general, as does Henderson (1923): 83-9, 289-93. Halfmann (1986) provides a discussion of the travels of the Emperors, from Augustus to Carinus.
123/4, and finally in 129. On his first voyage through Asia Minor, Hadrian visited the city of Ancyra, so that Latinius’ distribution has been dated to 117.\(^\text{72}\)

However, this is the only certain indication we have that διανομαί were offered to commemorate the passage of an Emperor through a city, so that we should not over-stress this: Ancyra was visited by Trajan in 113/4 while he was traveling with his legions to the East, and though there is an inscription commemorating one of his hosts in the city, there is no mention of διανομαί at the time.\(^\text{73}\) We have noted in Table 1.2 a significant increase in the attestations of διανομαί during the reigns of Hadrian, Antoninus Pius and Caracalla. The second quarter of the second century seems to have been a time of particularly generous benefactors, especially in Lycia, where several individuals are known to have provided on a lavish scale in addition to Opramoas of Rhodiapolis.\(^\text{74}\) Hadrian is said to have encouraged prosperity throughout the empire by the remission of taxes, and Antoninus’ reign is said to have been one in which the provinces flourished, so that this

\(^{72}\) Birley (1997): 83.

\(^{73}\) Levick (2000): 233, no. 220=Smallwood, Nerva-Hadrian 215. However, the lack of distributions in this case may be a result of Trajan’s policy rather than an indication that they were not offered on the occasion of Imperial visits after the reign of Hadrian.

\(^{74}\) For example, Licinius Longus: Magie (1950): 532-8, 1394; cf also TAM II (I) 250, II (II) 532, and II (III) 905; C. Iulius Demosthenes: Boarwright (2000): 28, 98; Wörle (1988), Mitchell (1990), who notes that Imperial permission was required for penteteric games; the anonymous benefactor of Xanthos: Balland (1981): no. 66, Cat. # 7.a.1. Furthermore, Veyne (1976): 144 notes that the Antonine age witnessed the apogee of euergetism.
period may well have been one in which the elite were indeed more willing to spend their resources. 75

Mary Boatwright notes that games attracted numerous visitors to the hosting city. 76 Hadrian encouraged games and festivals in many cities throughout the empire as well as in Asia Minor, including Ephesus, Thyatira, Tralles, Oenoanda and Ancyra, all of which appear in our catalogue. 77 Six of the nine distributions under Hadrian, and four of the eight under Antoninus Pius took place on the occasion of games or festivals, so that this may be the reason for the significant increases under these Emperors: both encouraged and permitted games, which were commonly accompanied by distributions of money.

As is the case with games, Imperial permission may have been required before diapomai could be given. We have seen Pliny soliciting such permission from Trajan, 78 and Gaius Julius Demosthenes receiving permission for his Demosthenia. If such permission was indeed required for all diapomai, it is perhaps surprising that there is not more evidence for petitions to the Emperor or Imperial officials in our inscriptions. Two verbs in Table 2.1 provide evidence to support this solicitation. Titus Flavius Aeneas, a

75 Hadrian: HA Had. 6.6: 'aurum coronarium Italiae remisit, in provinciis minuit, et quidem difficultatibus aerarii ambitiose ac diligentem expositis,' 21.7: 'Latium multis civitatibus dedi, tributa multis remisit;' Antoninus: HA Ant. 7.1-2: 'tanta sane diligentia subiectos sibi populos rexit ut omnia et omnes, quasi sua essent, curaret. Provinciae sub eo cunctae floruerunt'.

76 Boatwright (2000): 98; MAMA VIII 492b; cf. also Birley (1997): 157, who notes that games were celebrated in Heraclea Pontica in anticipation of or in response to a visit by Hadrian.

benefactor and high-priest of Stratonicea in the first century, served as Imperial high
priest and undertook an embassy to the Emperor. However, this embassy was not a
petition to the provincial governor, or to the Emperor while traveling through the region.
This was an embassy to Rome itself, a significant undertaking at any time, and this may
be an indication of why we have any indication that Flavius did acquire Imperial
permission: permission may have been obtainable from any Imperial official, but there is
certainly more worth praising in personally conducting an embassy to the Emperor than
visiting a regional governor or representative of the governor. The inscription does not
tell us everything that Flavius achieved on this embassy; however the right to make
diανομαί is emphasized:

πρεσβεύσαντος
πρὸς τοὺς Σεβαστοὺς ἱερὸν
καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων
καὶ τὰς διανομὰς τῇ πατρὶ
διὰ ἐπιτιθέντος

It is unlikely that Flavius received funds to support διανομαί, since we have seen that
funds donated to support διανομαί are donated εἰς διανομάς. Furthermore, this is a
technical use of ἐπιτίθησαν and of διανομή, where the noun refers to the act of distributing
rather than to what is actually distributed.

78 See above, Chapter One, pp. 19-20, nn. 26-27.

79 Cat. # 6.d.1 ll. 5-7; we have dated this inscription to the late first or second century; however,
the earlier date is based on the name of Titus Flavius, but the plural Σεβαστοὶ may indicate a date under the
Antonines. Two other inscriptions record that the benefactor also went on an embassy to Rome (Cat. # 1.a.1
ll. 5-6, 4.d.7 ll. 5-6), but they do not explicitly tell us that the right to provide διανομαί was granted during
this service. Nonetheless, it is not unreasonable to suggest that this did indeed form a part of the embassy.

80 See above, Chapter One, p. 18; cf. Parker & Obbink (2001): 253-263, n. 1B 11.
Similarly, a letter from the reign of Caracalla, whose reign also witnessed an increase to a lesser extent, to Atrius Clonius, the governor of Thrace, tells us that the customary διανομαί of Augusta Traiana/Beroe should be allowed to continue if the city was willing.⁸¹ We will also recall that Vedius Antoninus was excused from providing διανομαί since he had performed other benefactions in their place.⁸² Furthermore, Gaius Julius Demosthenes received permission from the governor of Asia for his penteteric games which included, as we have seen, cash distributions. Our catalogue contains nearly as many Imperial priests as agonothetes (Table 3.2, p. 86), but not every agonothete is listed as an Imperial priest. Nonetheless, there is a connection between the Imperial cult and games which is indicated by the celebration of gladiatorial games, or the provision of venationes. The agonothetes in our catalogue are all priests, if not of the Imperial cult, of a local god or goddess—they are all high-standing citizens. This indicates that agonothetes were Roman citizens⁸³ who enjoyed the friendship of the Roman authorities.

However, neither of these reasons can account for the increases alone. Significantly more distributions were in part a result of the increased prosperity under these two emperors, and a willingness on their part to permit and even encourage games and festivals.

---

⁸¹ Cat. # 1.c.1 ll. 27-28: τοις ἅγιοι τῶν διανομαί; cf. Millar (1977): 334; Barbieri (1952) no. 62; IGR I 717, from Philippolis; Dig. 26.10.7.2.

⁸² See above, pp. 68-69 and Cat. # 4.b.10 ll. 13-18.

⁸³ On the citizenship of public officials, see below, Chapter Three, pp. 96-99.
V. Chapter Conclusions

The distribution of cash-gifts in the Greek cities of Asia Minor is known primarily from epigraphic evidence as we have noted in the previous chapter and discussed here. As is to be expected from such evidence, the inscriptions which record these benefactions are very formulaic, and, although there is some variation within Asia Minor, many of the inscriptions are very similar in structure. However, this observation applies only to those inscriptions which can be said to be honorary, which, because they are honorary, usually do not provide a great deal of information on how the distribution itself was carried out. This is not, of course, universally the case, as several inscriptions do give us more details.

Public decrees, on the other hand, in which category we would include the inscription of Gaius Julius Demostenes, occasionally contain the instructions—sometimes very detailed instructions—of the benefactor. Imperial letters also refer to διανομαί, indicating that the Roman authorities were aware of the assembling of large groups of citizens to receive cash-gifts; this awareness suggests that the practice may have been permitted to certain individuals, whom we shall discuss in the subsequent chapter.

However, all of the inscriptions surveyed in this thesis do allow us to make some conclusions about the practice of handing out cash-gifts. They were provided on specific occasions and in public locations; these occasions seem to be constant throughout Asia Minor, though festivals were commonly celebrated with διανομαί; we may note, however, that testamentary διανομαί prevail in Aphrodisias. Although most of the distributions in Didyma did occur at the temple of Apollo, this may be a result of the prophets of Apollo and the hydrophori of Artemis being the most common benefactors.
Although we have discussed the distributions in our catalogue as annual occurrences or one-time gifts, we have very little information about how the sums donated by benefactors to provide and maintain the cash-gifts were to be administered. For such information, we are compelled to turn to other inscriptions, outside of our catalogue which record the distribution of money, but do not use the term διανομή. Some of these, like that of Gaius Julius Demosthenes, provide detailed information about the donation and administration of a capital sum whose accumulated interest is to fund the handouts, while others, like a second century honorary decree from Prusias ad Hypias, tell us only that money was handed out by the benefactor.\textsuperscript{84}

\textsuperscript{84} \textit{IKPrusias Hyp}, 18 ll. 8-11: ἐν τῇ ἐνδείᾳ / σεῖτον, οἷον, ἐλαιον, ἀργύριον διένεμεν τοῖς ἰ πολείταις προϊκα μόνος.
CHAPTER THREE: HOW TO MAKE A Διανομή

I. Introduction

The formula which characterizes the διανομή-inscriptions of Asia Minor varies, as we have noted in Chapter Two, from city to city; naturally, there is a similar variation in the benefactors and the recipients. Nonetheless, there are certain offices which were commonly held by the benefactors, and groups which are usually included in the listings of recipients. The euergetists are of high social standing, either at some point in a public career, or having enjoyed such a career; somewhat surprisingly, at least to our own sense of euergetism, the beneficiaries are often of a similar social standing.

There is insufficient space at the moment to provide a detailed analysis of all or even of some of the offices held by the benefactors, nor can we discuss each group of recipients at great length. Consequently, we shall briefly consider in the first portion of this chapter several of the most common offices. Following this, we shall provide a similar overview of the most frequent recipients of διανομαί, beginning with the βουλευταί and moving on to the more general πολίται and πατρίς. Finally, this chapter will conclude with an examination of the manner in which the διανομαί in our catalogue were conducted, and how this reflected on the τιμή of the benefactor.
II. The Benefactors

The inscriptions in our catalogue contain fifty-seven named benefactors; however, there are eighty-two benefactors whose sex can be determined and only five whose sex is unknown. There are, furthermore, six persons whose sex is probable, but not certain, as summarized in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Certain</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1.: Sex of the Benefactors.

There are approximately three times as many male benefactors as female benefactors. Riet van Bremen notes a similar distribution pattern in a land register from Larissa,² so that, although her evidence is of Hellenistic date, the ratio of males to females in our survey may be as she suggests the result of demographics: one in five families, van Bremen argues, may have had only a female heir,³ so that in general we should expect to find one woman for every four men among the benefactors. Thirteen women, including the uncertain cases, acted alone, or seem to have acted alone, so that when we consider female benefactors who were not associated with husbands or children, we have approximately the same ratio, which van Bremen notes throughout her study, of 4:1 (55:13). However, in these inscriptions, as in those which van Bremen has studied, we

¹ This table lists those benefactors whose inscriptions are repeated—Gaius Stertinius Orpex of Ephesus and Opramoas of Rhodiapolis, for example—only once.

² van Bremen (1996): 262-3; this register has been dated to c. 200 BC; cf. 250: the ratio of 4:1 is obtained from an analysis of Laum’s catalogue.
cannot know to what extent female benefactors actually worked independently of their husbands or fathers, or to what extent a tutor may have been involved. Four of our inscriptions mention a tutor, but it is unclear how far the authority of these tutors extended. These references appear at the end of the inscriptions so that they may indicate that the tutors were responsible only for the statues. Women do appear among the donors of διανοματικοί, but they are significantly less common than men; with this exception, we have avoided drawing conclusions beyond those of van Bremen from the proportions of male and female benefactors.

Overall, civic service was the most common occasion on which διανοματικοί were offered, whether this consisted simply of an honorary title or an office which involved active participation in municipal affairs; however, nearly every inscription indicates that the benefactor held at least one civic magistracy or liturgy during the course of his or her public career. There is a significant difference between magistracies and liturgies, which we shall attempt to clarify before discussing the offices and civic services themselves.

A. Liturgies and Magistracies

Liturgies were, like magistracies, honor-bearing offices in the classical period, most clearly illustrated in the case of Athens. The liturgy was an institution by which

---


4 Cat. #4.b.9 ll. 12-16, 4.b.15 ll. 24-25, 5.a.1 ll. 25-26, and 6.c.2 ll. 7-13.

5 See above, Chapter Two, pp. 64-69 and Table 2.5.

6 The information contained here has been paraphrased from the discussion of Finley (1983): 36-8, except where noted.
cities were able to meet some of their expenses by compelling their wealthier citizens to provide financial contributions. Unlike the magistracies, which were filled by election or by lot, liturgies could be imposed on wealthy citizens by magistrates. Thus, the trierarchy in Athens placed the expense of equipping and manning a trireme on the wealthiest class of citizens. The religious sphere also contained numerous liturgies, which were to a certain extent expected of wealthier citizens such as, for example the choregia.

It is, however, uncertain to what extent citizens could be compelled to take on these and other liturgies. There was, for example, a voluntary aspect to the choregia and by extension to later liturgies, so that the compulsion may have been more of a moral and social obligation than a legal duty.

A liturgist could receive a great deal of τιμή from his service, but it is significant that Finley’s main body of evidence for his discussion of liturgies is ‘political and forensic speeches’, in which liturgical service was used to characterize the speaker as a good citizen. Liturgists were not permitted, or simply did not, to publicize their actions

7 Jones (1940): 167.

8 Wilson (2000): 54 notes the case of Demosthenes in 349/8, who stepped forward when a choregos had not been nominated for his tribe (Dem. 21.13): ‘Επειδή γὰρ αὐτός καθεστηκότος χορηγὸς τῆς Πολιτικῆς φυλῆς, τρίτον ἔτος τυτί, παρώνις δὲ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐν ᾧ τῶν ἄρχοντων ἑπικληροῖς ὁ νόμος τῶν χοραί τῶν αὐλητῶν κελεύει, λόγων καὶ λαοδρίας γιγνομένης, καὶ καταχαροῦσα τοῦ μὲν ἄρχοντος τῶν ἐπιμελητῶν τῆς φυλῆς, τῶν δὲ ἐπιμελητῶν τῶν ἄρχοντος, παρελθὼν ὑποσχόμεν ἐνώ χορηγήσεων ἐβελλοντις. Demosthenes’ act is itself voluntary, but that a nomination was expected suggests an element of coercion.

9 Wilson (2000): 206 questions the nature of the obligation on the choregos to erect a monument after his victory, but this question must also be considered with regard to the service itself.

on commemorative monuments to the same extent that we find later magistrates, such as those who appear in our catalogue, boasting about their additional generosities.

The Hellenistic age witnessed an increase in the number of liturgies, and in the expenses of a single liturgy. At this time, the liturgies became more compulsory than honorific and in some cases even oppressive—they became a duty rather than an honor. Both Finley and Jones argue that liturgies became less compulsory in Greek cities under Roman rule, but the speeches of Dio Chrysostom and Aelius Aristides indicate that they remained as important and as morally obligatory as in the Classical and Hellenistic periods.

Liturgies did, therefore, remain a significant part of civic political life, sometimes willingly undertaken by benefactors, but other times reluctantly. However, the offices which were considered liturgies and those which were magistracies, that is, those which required the spending of the officer's own money and those which were provided with a sort of budget, will have varied between cities. As we have suggested above, cities in which ἰδαυουαὶ were compulsory will not report these in the list of a benefactor's generosities, and the same most likely holds true for liturgies which were entirely

---

11 Jones (1940): 186-7 provides an account of the negotiations which could take place between magistrates and potential liturgists. Dio, Or. 48.10 also notes peaceful means for coercing benefactions from wealthy citizens; cf. Levick (2000): 235-6 no. 234=P. Oxy 1415 11 17-31.

12 Jones (1940): 167, 'Legally therefore it would seem that compulsory spending ceased. On the other hand a moral obligation to spend rested not only on the magistracies which had formerly been liturgies but on all alike.' Both Dio and Aristides were chosen as liturgists by their fellow citizens, and both attempted to get themselves excused: Dio by arguing that he had already spent significant sums on the city of Prusa, and Aristides by arguing that his ill-health prevented him from taking up the responsibilities (Dio, Or. 43.2, 46.6; Aristides, Ἰερός Αὐτοῦ Δ 94ff.). Cf. Dio Chrys. Or. 7.1-63.
compulsory and no longer voluntary. However, when a liturgist went far beyond the normal performance established by his predecessors, this will be mentioned and praised during the Roman period on public monuments. Similarly, voluntary tenure in an office was something to be emphasized and praised.

Only fifteen inscriptions in our catalogue make no mention of an office, but of these, eleven almost certainly originally referred to one or more offices which have been lost through damage. The remaining inscriptions refer to twenty-seven different offices; Table 3.3 lists those which appear more than four times, together with the number of times that office appears in the inscriptions in our catalogue. For the purposes of this table, we have taken a mention of the distribution of oil as an indication of the gymnasiarchy. We should also note that we have counted each tenure in an office, so that Satyrus the son of Philenus of Tenos is the only attested architheorus, but he held the

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasiarch</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Stephanophorus</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest(ess)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Eirenarch</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial (Chief) Priest</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Prytanis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Priest</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grammateus</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agonothete</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ambassador</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Mag/Lit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Architheorus</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3.: Common Offices Attested in the Catalogue

13 See above, Chapter Two, p. 66.
15 The offices which do not appear in the table are: συγίκος (1), ἐδίκος (1), ταμία (1), ἵρων (1), ἰπόθελος (1), στρατηγός (2), ἁγιασμός (2), προστάτης (1), λυπάσμα (1), χρημα (1), προτεράμος (1), εἰδενής (1), εἰκωνοπότης (2), στούόμος (1), χολιαρχός (1), σεβαστοδύτης (1). We have counted the prophets of Apollo and the hydrophori of Artemis in Didyma among the priests and priestesses.
office four times. However, offices which appear in identical inscriptions have not been counted repeatedly.

i) The Gymnasiarch

The most commonly held office by our benefactors was the gymnasiarchy, one of the most expensive liturgies in many cities, so that it was necessarily held by members of the leading families throughout Asia. We find mention of the gymnasiarchy in sixteen of our cities, though this is based only on the gymnasiarchs who appear in our inscriptions. Since most large cities had several gymnasia, it was common for them to have more than one gymnasiarch, one for each age-group: thus, at Stratonicea, two brothers were gymnasiarchs τῶν νέων. However, this was not universally the case, as we also have a gymnasiarch πάντων τῶν γυμνασίων in Ephesus, clearly a much larger undertaking than the gymnasiarchy of a single gymnasium only.

Briefly, the responsibilities of gymnasiarchs included the maintenance and upkeep of the gymnasium itself, the provision of related appliances, the heating of baths, and, most importantly, the distribution of oil free of charge, or at a reduced price. The most common service is this distribution of oil, though some gymnasiarchs are also said to

---

16 Cat. # 3.c.1 ll. 1-3: τοις διόποτα πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ λειτουργίας, καὶ ἀρχῆς διεισδύοντα τετράκις. The significance of embassies has been noted above in connection with Titus Flavius Aeneas of Stratonicea (above, Chapter Two, pp. 76-77), and service as an ambassador to a religious shrine will have had similar significance and expense. Each of the four ambassadors listed in Table 3.3 were ambassadors to the Emperor, though only the inscription of Titus Flavius Aeneas tells us that the right to provide διανομέας was a result of the embassy (Cat. # 1.a.1 ll. 5-6, 4.d.1 ll. 2, 4.d.7 ll. 5-6 (cf. 4.d.8), and 6.d.1 ll. 5-6).


18 Cat. # 6.d.2 ll. 16.
have provided resources for the gymnasia and associated buildings, like Satyrus of Tenos, who provided a \( \text{βαλανείου} \) and a foundation to pay for its heating.\(^{20}\) A portion of the expenses entailed by this office may, in some cities, have been met out of the revenues of the city, but any difference between this and the total amount necessary, or the total amount rendered necessary by the gymnasiarch's ambition, was the responsibility of the gymnasiarch himself. Elsewhere, or in times of crisis, the entire expense may have fallen on the gymnasiarch.\(^{21}\)

The majority of our gymnasiarchs are men, but seven women do appear in the same office. Although this office was primarily a financial burden alone—that is, it did not require the same type of governmental service as, for example, that of \( \text{βουλευταί} \) and it no longer involved an active part in education and training as it had in the Hellenistic age—, all of these women shared the office with men.\(^{22}\) The gymnasiarchy was an official liturgy, but the provision of oil alone can in these cases be seen as a benefaction similar to \( \text{διανομαί} \). The mention of this service in our inscriptions is a claim to honor and prestige, but not every gymnasiarch will have provided \( \text{διανομαί} \) during (or after) this office or

\(^{19}\) Cat. # 4.b.15 I. 6.

\(^{20}\) Cat. # 3.c.1 II. 3-5: ἀνεβίντα τῇ πόλει \( \text{βαλανείου} \) καὶ δημάρχεια πεντακισχέλια, ἵνα ἐκ τοῦ \( \tauόκου \) αὐτῶν θερμαίνηται τὸ \( \text{βαλανείου} \); see above, Chapter Two p. 72. Such attention to the maintenance of the buildings associated with the gymnasium, though, was not as common as the provision of oil; although it was a part of the liturgy, some gymnasiarchs paid more attention to the maintenance of buildings than others (van Bremen (1996): 67).

\(^{21}\) Jones (1940): 221-5; Magie (1951): 62.

\(^{22}\) van Bremen (1996): 44-5, 66-73. Although van Bremen notes that only one half of the seventy-five women in her study who acted as gymnasiarchs are known to have done so alone, we cannot draw any
service; when διανομαί were provided during or in association with the gymnasiarchy, though, the benefactor was further glorified.

Gaius Stertinius Orpex and his daughter Marina have been classified as gymnasiarchs since they dedicated statues of Asclepius, Hygia, and Hypnus in one of the gymasia in Ephesus. They also made an endowment for two perpetual διανομαί; one of these, for the βουλευταί and priests, was to take place in the agora, and the second, for the γερουσία, in an unspecified location, but probably in the agora or the gymnasium. The statues in the gymnasium will have formed a part of their expenditure during the gymnasiarchy and the διανομαί in the agora will have drawn attention to their tenure, if, as seems to be the case, this office prompted the cash-gifts. However, the placement of their own statues in the agora also provides an opportunity of publicizing the role of Marina in the gymnasiarchy, since statues of women may have been excluded from the gymasia, even if they had served as gymnasiarchs.

ii) Priesthoods and High-Priesthoods

Both the gymnasiarchy and, in particular, the agonothesia were often held by priests of a local god or goddess or of the Imperial cult in the course of their public careers. Four of the agonothesiai in our catalogue included gladiators and venatores, a

significant conclusions from the fact that all of our female gymnasiarchs were thus associated since we have not focused on this office.

23 Cat. # 4.b.1 ll. 16-18 and 4.b.2 ll. 8-9; see above, Chapter Two, pp. 53-54, nn. 31-34.

24 van Bremen (1996): 196, who suggests this due to the fact that the gymansiaum 'had very strong male associations ... in its statuary.'
sure sign of the Imperial priesthood.\textsuperscript{25} The high-priest was responsible for maintaining at least an outward demonstration of the allegiance of his fellow-citizens to Rome and the Emperor, his family and predecessors.\textsuperscript{26} The use of Roman spectacles was one way of demonstrating such loyalty; so too were διανομέαι provided by Imperial priests as they then imply a tacit recognition of the priests' importance in the city. The value of διανομέαι in the Imperial cult can be seen through the provision of διανομέαι on the occasion of Hadrian's passage through Ancyra:\textsuperscript{27} διανομέαι could, but need not necessarily, be used to encourage citizens to take a more active part in the Imperial cult.

The Imperial high priest was also commonly the chief officer of a regional κοινόν—such as that of Asia, Galatia, or Lycia; however, the relationship between the archiereus of Asia and the Asiarch, or the archiereus of Lycia and the Lyciarch is unclear and much debated.\textsuperscript{28}

Priests and priestesses commonly appear in larger cities and in sanctuary cities as providers of διανομέαι, either during their priesthoods or after the completion of their official duties. This is not surprising, as it was the cults in these cities, as old and wealthy cults, which were most sought after.\textsuperscript{29} Thus, the prophets of Apollo and the hydrophori

\textsuperscript{25} Cat. \# 6.d.1 ll. 11-13, 6.e.4 l. 5, 6.f.3 ll.4-5 and 11.a.1 ll. 3-4; see below, p. 92.

\textsuperscript{26} Magie (1951): 544; Price (1984).

\textsuperscript{27} Cat. \# 10.a.2 ll. 8-12; above, Chapter Two, p. 74-75.

\textsuperscript{28} For example, Magie (1951): 448-9, 459, 1299-1301, 1388-9; Larson (1945): 85; Heberdey (1897): 59; Hertz (1992).

\textsuperscript{29} The temples of Artemis at Ephesus and of Zeus and Hecate in Stratonicea, for example, owned plots of lands which provided revenue for the temples. (Rostovtzeff (1957): p. 656, n. 6).
of Artemis are certainly responsible for one-third of the distributions provided in Didyma, while eight of the ten benefactors of Stratonicea, Panamara and Lagina served as priests of Zeus, Hera or Hecate. The prophets and hydrophori of Didyma were usually related—a father and his daughter—and several inscriptions use one of these offices as an indication of date, though another eponymous office is commonly included.\textsuperscript{30}

The duties and responsibilities of these and other priests will have been, in essence, similar to those of the Imperial priests, that is, with a large financial component in addition to any possible administrative duties; the amount of emphasis on Imperial propaganda is, perhaps, less in these cases than in those of priests of the Imperial cult. None of the prophets or hydrophori served as agonothetes, though the prophet Tiberius Claudius Marcianus Smaragdus was \textit{πανηγυρικός κυτάρχης}.\textsuperscript{31} The only mention of the \textit{Μεγάλα Διδύμεα}, though, appears in a third century inscription which has been supplemented.\textsuperscript{32}

The source of the funding of \textit{διανομαί} provided by priests is uncertain, since several of the priesthoods contained in our catalogue had large amounts of money

\textsuperscript{30} For example, Cat. # 4.d.4 ll. 10-12: \textit{προφητεύοντος Κλ(αμίου)- θεοδότου, I ταμευόντος Κλ(αμίου); 4.d.6 ll. 13-14: ὑθροφορεύοντις Ναόδος τής ῾Αγαθόποδος, ταμευόντως Αἴ[σχινον τοῦ Ο[..]ία δί(οςε) δὲ Διονυσίου [καὶ Τ][ι[γείου] Ὀ[ς[η]γίλου]. The prophet and hydrophorus were, simply, the priests of Apollo Pythius and Artemis Pythia, respectively (van Bremen (1996): 64).

\textsuperscript{31} Cat. # 4.d.7 ll. 2-4, and 4.d.8 ll. 2-4.

\textsuperscript{32} Cat. # 4.d.14 l. 1; the benefactor in this case, though there is no name or office surviving, was most likely a \textit{hydrophorus}, as the \textit{διανομαί} were given, among others, to the women and the maidens, who appear frequently as beneficiaries in the \textit{διανομή} inscriptions from Didyma (see below, pp. 103-106): \textit{δοὺς τοῖς παλικαρίας καὶ παισίν[καὶ γοειβάζω καὶ παρθένοις διανομάς.}
available through the possession of land. Thus, several of our benefactors may in fact have been distributing temple funds rather than their own money.\textsuperscript{33}

\textit{iii) The Agonothesia}

The agonothesia, like the gymnasiarchy, to which it is very similar, was a liturgy—often a very expensive liturgy. The agonothete was responsible for providing prizes for competitors—both athletic and musical—but it was also his task to ensure that there were competitors.\textsuperscript{34} The more important and famous contests took place on a penteteric cycle, like the sacred games of the Greek mainland, but only three such agonothesiai certainly appear in our catalogue.\textsuperscript{35} However, there is no reason to assume that all or even most of the remaining agonothetes were therefore responsible for only local, annual festivals.

As is the case with the provision of \textit{dionomai}, though, many of the benefactors who acted as agonothetes did so as part of another office, most often, as in the case of Heraclitus of Rhodiapolis, a priesthood.\textsuperscript{36} Many of these were Imperial priests, either

\textsuperscript{33} Only two of the inscriptions in our catalogue use the phrase \textit{ek tōn idion}, but in neither of these is the phrase directly connected with the \textit{dionomai}: Cat. \# 4.d.1 ll. 12-13, and 4.d.2 ll. 7-10. The inscriptions do not tell us that it is temple-funds which is being distributed, but we know this could happen from Hadrian’s letter to the inhabitants of Delphi (see above, Chapter Two, p. 51, no. 23).

\textsuperscript{34} Jones (1940): 234-5; \textit{IPriene} 111 167ff; \textit{SEG} 7 (1934): 825; Levick (2000): 131, no. 123=Ehrenberg and Jones (1976): 87, no. 102; Dio Chrys. \textit{Or.} 66.8: \textit{ai}ληγ\textit{tēs} dē kai mīnous kai kthariastās kai \tharimatosōn sannaktēn, ētī dē pūktas kai pāgkratiasatās kai palaistās kai dromēs kai tō toioûtōn ēthos.

\textsuperscript{35} Cat. \# 1.d.1 ll.5-7, 8.a.1 ll. 17-18 and 11.a.1 l. 6.

\textsuperscript{36} Cat. \# 7.b.7.
explicitly identified as such, or said to have provided gladiators and hunters. However, thirteen other agonothesiai, ten of which were held by two men, may have been local festivals held annually, rather than penteterically, simply because of the frequency with which the two men held them.

The phrase διὰ βιοῦ appears in association with one agonothesia, though it also appears in connection with several other offices and honors. This, like εἰς (αιωνίους) διανομαῖς indicates that the benefactor established a fund whose interest would support the agonothesia, or that the benefactor volunteered to meet the expenses whenever there were no other candidates. As with the gymnasiarchy, the agonothesia was marked out as more lavish by the provision of διανομαῖ.

iv) The Stephanephorate and Prytany

The stephanephorus was the eponymous official in many cities including Miletus, Magnesia on the Maeander, Nysa, Tralles, Aphrodisias and Stratonicea. The responsibilities of the stephanephorate were primarily financial, and were often met by a titular god or hero when there was no citizen able or willing to undertake the position.

---

37 Cat. # 6.d.1 ll. 11-12, 6.e.4 ll. 5-6, 11.a.1 ll. 1-4; κομητεία alone: Cat. # 6.f.3 ll.4-5.

38 [Marcus Aurelius], the father of Marcus Aurelius Artemidorus Metrodorianus was agonothete three times in Ephesus (Cat. # 4.b.15 ll. 11), while Opramoas was agonothete of Myrea and Patara, and five times agonothete of Rhodiapolis (Cat. # 7.b.4 ll. B13-14).

39 ἀγονοθητὴν διὰ βιοῦ: Cat. # 11.a.1 ll. 4-5 (cf. ll. 8-9); elsewhere: Cat. # 8.a.1 l. 16: ἱερὰ τοῦ Διὸς διὰ βιοῦ, ἱερὰς Διοκέσιον διὰ βιοῦ; Cat. # 10.a.3 ll. 4-5 (cf. 10.a.4-7): πορφύρα και στεφάνῳ διὰ βιοῦ.

Like the gymnasiarchy and διανομαί, bequests could be made to support an αἰωνίου stephanephorate after the death of a citizen. Consequently, this office could be held by women, but in their own right, and not simply as a nominal or complimentary title as some have suggested.

The prytany was a more common eponymous office than the stephanephorate throughout the Hellenistic period, and it retained this status under Roman rule in, among other places, Ephesus. It was an elective office, but the eponymous prytanis is distinct from the board of prytaneis, which was responsible for bringing decrees before the βουλή and δήμος. Members of the βουλή, the βουλευταί, were divided into committees, the prytaneis. This was not, like the gymnasiarchy, an office which required substantial donations, but there are three holders of this office who provided διανομαί, apparently during their tenure.

41 Magie (1951): 643.
44 Magie (1951): 135, 643; Cat. # 4.b.11 l. 1.
47 Cat. # 4.b.11, 6.g.1, and 8.a.1
v) *The Eirenarchy*

The *eirenarch* was a local official appointed by Roman governor from a list of ten citizens submitted by each city, but is not attested before the reign of Trajan.⁴⁸ He was a virtual police-officer, responsible to the magistrates to whom he conducted the brigands whom he arrested, assisted by mounted officials, *diogmitae*.⁴⁹ The office had been created in response to rising brigandage,⁵⁰ and is attested in cities throughout Asia Minor.⁵¹ None of the eirenarchs in our catalogue, however, provided *dianovai* during their tenure in this office.

vi) *The Grammateus*

The *grammateus* was, most simply, a secretary of the city. There were several *grammateis* in some cities; these magistrates are well known in Ephesus, which is the focus of Claudia Schulte's study.⁵² These secretaries most commonly served the *boulē*, *dēmos*, or *γερουσία*, but there were also secretaries of private organizations and associations, who were responsible for the public image of the association, among other duties.⁵³ These duties could include the supervision of statue arrangements or of public records, the representation of the provincial or local *koinon*, and the office was in later

---

⁴⁸ Lévy (1899): 287; Jones (1930): 212; Arist. *Or. 50.72* (*The Sacred Tales 4*).

⁴⁹ For example, *IGR IV 580*; see also Pfaff, *RE*, 9.2, 2032-2035, s.v. *ierenarcha*.


⁵¹ For example, *IGR III 203* reports an eirenarch of Ancyra; 450, of Termessus; IV 130, of Miletopolis; 461, of Pergamon; and 583, of Aizani.

⁵² Schulte (1994).
times occasionally held concurrently with the ἀρχιερώτητα.\textsuperscript{54} Consequently, the grammateus was a leading official in the assemblies of the people; in Ephesus, for example, he was responsible for conducting the distribution of money in Salutaris’ foundation.\textsuperscript{55} As the representative of the koinon, the βουλή or another group, this office will have entailed significant expense at times; consequently, it is not surprising that it is sometimes found listed as a liturgy, and other times as a magistracy.\textsuperscript{56}

B. Citizens as Benefactors

That the benefactors held these offices indicates that they were all citizens, both of their own cities and of Rome itself. Roman citizenship was granted to magistrates upon their election in cities and towns which possessed Minus Latium; following the reign of Hadrian, all βουλευταί became Roman citizens in towns which possessed Maius Latium.\textsuperscript{57} Grants of Maius Latium were common during Hadrian’s reign.\textsuperscript{58} This provides another factor which must be considered in conjunction with Table 1.2 and the increases under Hadrian, Antoninus Pius and Caracalla. Charts 1.1, 2.1 and 3.1 show more clearly than


\textsuperscript{54} Schulte (1994): 34-5; Magie (1951): 60, 524, 645.

\textsuperscript{55} Cat. # 4.b.6 II. 223-226: ἀφ’ δὲν διώσει τῷ γραμματέῳ τῆς βουλῆς δημάρχος τετρακοσία πλευρίκοντα, ὅπως ἐπιτελεῖ διανομὴν τοῖς βουλευταῖς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν εἰς τοὺς παρασπορὰς τῇ γενεσίᾳ τῆς μεγίστης θεᾶς Ὄμιος τῆς Μεγίστης Μαίας. Magic (1951): 645; cf. Acts 19.35-42, where the γραμματεὺς calms a crowd of Ephesians in the theater.

\textsuperscript{56} Magie (1951): 852 cites IPriene 113.8, 114.11 (liturgy); 112.22, 113.16 (magistracy), but we should note that these are all of Hellenistic date, and refer to the same individual, Aulus Aemilius Zosimus.

\textsuperscript{57} Henderson (1965): 180-181.

\textsuperscript{58} HA Had. 21.7: Latium multit civitatibus dedit.
Table 1.2 that our distributions are primarily a feature of the second century, though it should be observed that the inscriptions which have been broadly dated only have not been included here. Taking into account what we have just said about the benefactors, namely they were Roman citizens, we have another explanation for the increase in the second century: as grants of citizenship became more frequent, there were increasing numbers of Roman citizens who could provide \( \delta i a v o u a i \).\(^{59}\)

\[\text{Chart 3.1: Chronological Frequency of dated Distributions.}\] \(^{60}\)

\[^{59}\text{Given the degree of control over civic affairs which Roman officials could exercise in Greek cities (cf., for example, above, Chapter Two, pp. 69 and 78), it is probable that the magistrates and \( \beta eu\lambda eu\tau a i \) were known to these Roman authorities.}\]

\[^{60}\text{The data contained in this chart is that of Table 1.2. However, only those inscriptions which can be dated to the reign of an Emperor or to a narrow time span have been included; those which have been dated only as Hellenistic, or Imperial, or as belonging to a certain century have been omitted.}\]
The decline in popularity of the διανομή, not shown in this chart, is, as we have said, the result of a combination of the instability of the third century and a shift of focus, both in the public attitude towards the distributions, and in the attitude of the benefactors themselves: giving φιλανθρωπία was no longer as important as Christian giving.  

Although the distribution pattern of the διανομή-inscriptions can easily be assigned to an accident of preservation, it is notable that this pattern shows general similarities both to Mrozek’s curve and to the spread of Roman citizenship. Obviously, though, citizenship increased throughout the Imperial period, but there are periods when this spread was more marked than others are, particularly in the reign of Hadrian, as we have seen, by the distinction between Latium Maius and Latium Minus, and by the granting of Latium status to various cities.

Similarly, Sherwin-White notes the effectiveness of the Imperial cult in spreading ‘Roman’ culture and citizenship through the appearance of coloniae Commodiana, and we should note in this connection that a γερωσία Κομμοδίανη appears in Ephesus, clearly a similar indication, we will also recall the Claudian θεολρίη in Tralles. Citizenship by itself cannot, of course, explain the pattern of our inscriptions, but combined with the

---

61 See above, Chapter One, pp. 38-39.


63 See above, Chapter Two, p. 75, n. 74 and Chapter Three, pp. 96-97, nn. 56-58.

64 Sherwin-White (1973): 277; Cat. # 4.6.11 l. 4.

65 Cat. # 6.6.1.
other factors we have mentioned above, it does provide further insight into why there is such a marked increase.

III. The Recipients

Twenty-nine groups of recipients are attested in our catalogue, twelve of which appear only once. Table 3.3 lists those which appear two or more times. One very striking feature about this table is that several of the groups of recipients are also those to which many of the benefactors belong, namely the ΒΟΥΛΕΥΤΑΙ, the ΓΕΡΟΥΣΙΑΙ, the ΣΥΝΙΟΝΤΕΣ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The councilors/Senators (τῆς βουλῆς, βουλευταί)</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>The boys/youths (τῶν παιδευτάκις)</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The citizens (τῆς πόλεως, πολίταις)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>The Doctors (τῶν ἱατρῶν)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The women (τῶν γυναικῶν)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Those who are called (τῶν καλουμένων)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The maidens (τῶν παρθένων)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>The slaves (τῶν δούλων)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The elders (τῆς γερουσίας, γερούσιαστάς)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>The free men (τῶν ἐλευθέρων)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The electoral officials who come together (τῶν συνεδρίων ἀρχιερατῶν)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The tribes (τῶν φυλῶν)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The country (τῆς πατρίδος)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>The magistrates of the κοινόν (τῶν κοινῶν ἀρχηγῶν)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who customarily receive (τῶν λατρευτῶν τῶν λαμβάνοντων καὶ ἵππων)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The overseers of the market (τῶν ἀγορασταί)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who dwell nearby (τῶν παρεπιστῆριον)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3.: Common Recipients and Their Frequency.66

ἀρχιεραται and the κοινοὶ ἀρχιερεῖς. Consequently, we can conclude simply from the frequency of these groups that distributions were not primarily a result of a desire on the part of the benefactors to assist their fellow citizens or to help alleviate poverty.

66 Recipients not included in this table but attested in the catalogue are: ἀγορασται, ἱμαντα, Τυπονοῦσαι, ἀλλοι αἰῶν ἔποιηθη, πρεσβυτέρους, συνέδριον, νεοκυρίον, πρόσληψις, νεοπόι, στειτομετραμένοι.
Although the **bouleutai**, **gerousiastai**, and "**arhontes**

A. **Bouleutai, Gerousiastai, and "Arhontes"

Although the **bouleutai** are clearly the most common beneficiaries, they are listed as such in only sixteen of the thirty-six cities included in this survey, and do not appear as recipients at all in our evidence from Phrygia, Pontus, Galatia, or Pamphylia. Obviously, this does not mean that the **boule** did not exist in these cities and regions: we have already seen Pliny the Younger referring to the **boule** in Bithynia-Pontus, and the **boule** and **demos** honored Marcus Ulpian Flavianus in Aizani. Furthermore, the **boule** can be seen in several of these cities and regions under different names. In Oenanda, for example, a **dianomē** of ten **denaria** was given to the '**penteakouioi**', clearly a local senate with five hundred members.

Similarly, the **kouoi arhontes**, who appear twice in Opramoas' mausoleum, can also be seen as the magistrates of the **kouon** of the Lycian **ethnos**, members of a federal council and elective assembly. This federation had declined in its influence through the course of the Hellenistic and Imperial periods as Rome began to take a greater interest and role in the affairs of Asia Minor, so that it was no longer capable of foreign policy decisions—such as the declaration of war or the ratification of treaties—but could vote honors to citizens of its member cities in the time period with which we are concerned.

---

σέβαστοφόροι, and μαστειγφόροι. All of these appear only once, and have not been included in a larger category—**τῇ πόλει**, for example, includes: **πολίται** (7), **άνθροις** (1), **πόλει** (7), **δημοται** (1), and **δήμοι** (1).

67 Cat. # 8.a.1.

68 Cat. # 7.f.1 II. 24-25. This group has been included in the table under the **τῇ boule** category.
These actions, however, like the assembly and federation themselves, had to be ratified by Imperial authorities.⁶⁹

The γερουσία, in various cities, was also supported and monitored to a certain extent by Roman officials.⁷⁰ Although Magie stresses the age of the γερουσίασται as a means of providing an assembly of mature, rational citizens, Jones is right to note that the γερουσία was primarily an aristocratic association, whose membership was based more on birth, inherited wealth and connection to the Roman governors than on age. Thus, it was primarily a social collegium but it did have some political influence.⁷¹

B. Πολίται, Φιλαι and Πατρίδες

We can, therefore, say without a doubt that the recipients just considered were among the wealthy, if not the wealthiest, classes of citizens, like their benefactors. This implies very strongly that groups of recipients who are defined only vaguely, such as the πολίται or the φιλαι also included wealthy citizens. The πολίται, properly speaking, are the citizens of the cities and their surrounding areas, so that this group—and the φιλαι—necessarily included the βουλευται, though the opposite is not necessarily true.

The simultaneous mention of the πολίται and the βουλευται as recipients indicates that the two bodies were not exactly identical. The difference will have been that the πολίται were simply citizens, while the βουλευται were magistrates and members of the

---


⁷⁰ Magie (1951): 653; Dio, Or. 46.14 and 48.1-2 notes the authority of Roman officials over assemblies of citizens in Greek cities; cf. also above, Chapter Two, pp. 69 and 77.

local senate. The πολίται and the φυλαί are, therefore, broader groups, but they are still, importantly, citizens.

Distributions given τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς λαμβάνουσιν εἴς ἔθους and τοῖς καλουμένοις imply the citizenship of the recipients, but do not guarantee it. These two groups suggest that records may have been kept, from which it was determined which individuals received gifts, but the second group can also be taken to suggest that the gifts were allotted by a lottery, or a κλῆρος, to individuals whose names were chosen, or that they were given to those who had been summoned to the distribution. This may be a means of concealing the fact that some handouts were given to citizens of much lower standing, or even to non-citizens.

'Ἡ πατρίς also indicates this, though to a lesser extent than, for example, οἱ παρεπιδημησαντες. If this is indeed the purpose of such broad categories, though, we must ask why οἱ δούλοι and οἱ ἐλευθέροι appear five times: distributions which included slaves were probably less prestigious than distributions to full citizens, so that their appearance may be an oddity. That slaves appear among the recipients, though, emphasizes the generosity of the benefactor since the διανομή is that much more comprehensive. There can be no doubt that such recipients may have been concealed at times—these two categories include those recipients who are explicitly identified as such, but also those who appear as 'πάσαι τοῖς κ(αὶ) ὡλικίαι', people of all fortunes and ages, which may have included slaves. The appearance of slaves among the recipients, since it is so rare, strengthens the impression that διανομαί were not intended primarily to help alleviate
poverty; at the same time, their appearance does suggest that some benefactors were willing to assist the poor.

C. Γυναῖκες, Παρθένοι and Παιδενταί

It is perhaps surprising that women are the second most common group of recipients. In fact, they appear to be only slightly less common among recipients than they are among benefactors. This, however, cannot be attributed to the demographics noted above and by van Bremen. The evidence provides no indication that female benefactors preferred female or young recipients. As is the case with slaves, the provision of διανομαί to these groups served to draw the public gaze towards the benefactor, and cannot be seen as a type of reciprocal gift between equals. The women, however, should not be compared too closely with slaves, in connection with whom they never appear.

Women are the sole beneficiaries of only two distributions, provided by a priest and priestess of Hera in Panamara, and by a benefactress of Heracleia Salbace. Elsewhere, they appear as recipients in connection with another group. Thus, in Syros, διανομαί were given to women and boys, though at different rates. However, this inscription presents difficulties of interpretation, as we have noted above, since it is unclear what exactly is being distributed. The wife of a euergetist in Heracleia Salbace

72 See above, p. 82-83, nn. 2-4.
73 Cat. # 6.e.2 II. 7, and 6.g.1 II. 13-16.
74 Cat. # 3.b.1 II. 14-19; see above, Chapter One, pp. 24-26: καὶ ἔδωκεν [ἐκκάστῳ] ἑαυτῷ σφριδὸς δημάρχην πέντε, ἔλευθερους δ' ἐπανήγερε καὶ θηλείαις ἑκατονταῖς ἀτρατικοῖς ἐπιμελητέοις καὶ ἔδωκεν ταῖς μ[ην γυναιξί] διανομαίς ἀνα.
provided distributions in her own name for the wives of the Βουλευταί and the πολίται, which suggests that a similar διανομή in Τενός may also have been destined for the wives of citizens.\textsuperscript{75} They are almost always listed as the wives of the Βουλευταί or of the πολίται: they were women of some influence and importance as wives, but also, we must assume, in their own right.

Didyma provides the most attestations of women as recipients; outside of Didyma, though, women are no more common as beneficiaries than the παιδευταί, and the παρθένοι are non-existent. Even in the ten cases of female recipients in Didyma, though, there is no indication that female benefactors preferred female recipients: we find both prophets and hydrophori providing διανομαί to the γυναικές and the παρθένοι as well as to the Βουλευταί and other groups. However, there are two indications that these groups were much more restrictive than they at first seem.

A prophet, celebrating the 'Ανοιχτόι festival gave διανομαί ταῖς ἑκ Ναοῦ γυναιξίν καὶ ταῖς παρθένοις.'\textsuperscript{76} This phrase appears only twice in our catalogue, in Didyma and nowhere else. These two appearances suggest that ἑκ Ναοῦ may be an unmentioned restriction in the other Didyma-inscriptions. Otherwise, the mention of a restriction would take away from the magnanimity of the distribution, rather than emphasizing the

\textsuperscript{75} Heracleia Salbace: Cat. # 6.g.1, where Ammia the daughter of Charmidus held the same offices as her husband, the prytany and the stephanephorate, which suggests that these may have been honorific titles only. Τενός: Cat. #3.c.1 II. 15-16: ἀνδρὰς καὶ γυναῖκι Τηνώις.
τιμή of the benefactor. As a restriction specific to Didyma, though, there would be no reason to include this reference, as the citizens to whom the inscriptions were directed would automatically have understood ‘ταῖς γυναιξί’ as ‘ταῖς ἐκ Ναοῦ γυναιξί.’ We have dated the two inscriptions in which this phrase appears to the late first century AD and the reign of Hadrian respectively, so that it is possible that these two texts were inscribed at a time when the use of the phrase was beginning to be omitted. ‘Ταῖς ἐκ Ναοῦ γυναιξί’ may also refer in this case to women who were being initiated into the cult at Didyma.77

Secondly, the παρθένοι appear only in Didyma, while the παιδευταί appear in Didyma and elsewhere; the παιδευταί do appear as the beneficiaries of other donations in Didyma but only once as the recipients of a διανομή.78 This rarity suggests that their inclusion was unusual and a sign of significant generosity. However, the παρθένοι always receive διανομαί when they appear in our inscriptions and not a gift of another type: they do not receive a different gift when διανομαί are given to another group. It is possible that these, like the γυναικῖς, were restricted to girls with some connection to the temple and the service of Artemis and Apollo. What this service was is uncertain, but there are several possibilities. The hydrophori were, in general, the daughters of the prophets of Apollo—the παρθένοι may have been a group of former hydrophori, or a group from which

76 Cat. # 4.d.3 ll. 3-5; cf. Cat. # 4.d.10 ll. 21-22, in which a hydrophorus provides διανομαί to the same groups.

77 Titus Flavius Aeneas, who undertook an embassy to the Emperors (Cat. 6.d.1 ll. 13-17), also supported all of the women who were taking part in the Heraea at Panamara: ἵππαισταντος / τοῦ Δίας τοῦ Παναμαρου ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι, καθαυτῷ ἡμᾶς τὰς γυναῖκες κυρίωματι ἐποιεσθαμένα πάσας.
hydrophori were selected; or, they may have been, like *ai *ék *Naoû γυναικές, initiates into the cult. It is possible that there was no such limitation to the term παρθένος, but since the γυναικές and the παιδευταί appear in Didyma and elsewhere, it certainly seems that the παρθένοι as recipients of διανομαί have some connection with the temple of Apollo and the service of Artemis.

IV. The Distribution of διανομαί

As we have seen, there are only a few inscriptions which say how much was distributed in total and to each recipient. 79 Many of our benefactors were munificent on a very large scale, claiming to have provided διανομαί for the entire population. We should not, however, assume that this is not a rhetorical usage of the phrase to make the benefactor appear more generous than he or she in fact was: it may be that only those individuals who arrived in the specified location at the specified time received anything.

There are indications that groups, such as the βουλή or the πόλις, did not, in fact, all receive handouts—that is, some members of the βουλή will have received gifts, but others will not have. 80 Several of our inscriptions record that διανομαί were given to the citizens or to each citizen. 81 However, we should not understand this to mean that every citizen in the city or town received a gift. As we have seen, the total amount of money

---

78 In Cat. # 4.d.3 ll. 5-7, they are the recipients of τὰ δεῖμα during the Ἀνομοί festival. In Cat. # 4.d.7 ll. 10-11, 4.d.8 ll. 10-11, and 4.d.9 ll. 1-2, copies of the inscription honoring Tiberius Cladius Marcianus Smaragdus, they are the recipients of a διανομή.

79 See above, Chapter Two, pp. 57-63.

80 Cat. 6.f.1 ll. 17-18.
dedicated for the purposes of distributions could vary greatly, and we have suggested that
the larger the sum the more likely it was to be mentioned. Several of the cities contained
in this survey are some of the largest cities in Asia Minor—Ephesus and Miletus, for
example—so that a distribution πᾶση τῇ πόλει would necessarily have been supported by a
very large donation. However, since sums are only very rarely mentioned for these
‘universal distributions’, we should be hesitant to accept the statement at face value;
rather, these phrases should be taken to indicate that the distributions were given to some
or most of the citizens.82

These distributions could be extremely extensive, even in relatively small cities,
so that in all but the most lavish of διανομαί restrictions must have been imposed to avoid
unnecessary expenses: recipients must be prevented from lining up to receive again, from
sending someone in their place to receive their handout, and, most importantly, measures
must be taken to prevent the money from running out before all of the recipients who
were intended to had in fact received a gift, however small.

A. Oi παρόντες

Several benefactors placed specific limits and restrictions on who was entitled to
receive their gift, one of the simplest of which was to refuse to give a handout to anyone

---

81 For example, cat. # 3.c.1 l. 12, in which a distribution is provided for every free citizen of
Tepos: παντὶ θείους Τενωρ.

82 Cat. # 6.f.1 ll. 17-18, for example, reads ‘τοῖς πλήστοις τῶν πολιτῶν’; this is a rare statement in
our inscriptions, and it appears to be equally rare in the Latin inscriptions of the Roman West. We read
relatively frequently of sportulae and epulae to the municiipes, as, for example, in CIL XI.6060: cutus
dedicatione decurionibus sportulas et / municipibus epulas / divisit; a distribution to each of the municiipes
is more common in the Latin inscriptions than in the Greek, but it is not as common as a distribution to the
municiipes: for example, CIL X.1416: legavit municipib(us) singulis HS IIII n(umnum).
who was not personally present. Διανομαί, according to our evidence, seem to have been intended to be carried away rather than spent on something provided by the benefactor, but only by those who were the intended recipients—a stand-in could not be sent to receive the cash gift.

This limitation, although it is not always explicitly spelled out, is the most common restriction, appearing certainly in twenty cases, and probably applying in every other case. Even the oft-praised Opramoas seems to have employed this limitation in making his arrangements for διανομαί for the Lycian κοινόν:

επίδοιΣ τῷ ἔθει ἀρχηγίου δημόσια
πεντάκις μύρια καὶ πεντάκις χείλια ὡστε
tὼν κατ’ ἑτοῖς τόκου αὐτῶν χαρεῖν εἰς δια-
νομήν τοῖς συνιστών εἰς τὰ κοινὰ τοῦ ἔ-
θους ἀρχαιόταται καὶ βου-
λευτάις καὶ κοινοῖς ἀρχηγοῖ καὶ τοῖς λοι-
ποῖς τοῖς ἑξ ἔθους λαμβάνουσιν.⁸³

The recipients of this διανομή are clearly not all of the magistrates and officials of the κοινόν, but only those who personally gather (τοῖς συνιστών) on the occasion of the federal assemblies.

Of course, magistrates were not, as we have seen, the only beneficiaries; lower classes of citizens were also included in the lists of recipients, as these too added to the fame and glory of the benefactor, if only by their numbers. We have suggested above that these can be glossed over in an inclusive term such as τῇ πάλει. Furthermore, several inscriptions do not mention specific recipients, so that it is implicit that it is only those who are present—whatever their social standing—who received a portion of the handouts.
B. Oι καλουμένοι

Such a requirement was the most common and the easiest means of limiting the recipients without appearing to do so blatantly, but it requires a second condition in order to function properly. A benefactor who provided cash handouts to everyone who was present could be exploited with very little effort. In the crowds, a recipient could take his or her gift and circle back for a second or even a third. Citizens with numerous dependents could bring them all and collect large sums from numerous small gifts. Therefore, it is not surprising that at least one inscriptions indicates that lists (οἱ δήλτοι) of tribes were used.

These δήλτοι are mentioned explicitly only in one of our inscriptions, but they are implied in several others.84 Similarly, some of the distributions in Istrus and Ephesus were give ‘τοῖς καλουμένοις’, but these could also have been the winners of a lottery or κλήρος. These οἱ καλουμένοι may also have been citizens who had been invited to the distribution.85

A third means of controlling the recipients also implies the use of formal or informal records. In the passage of the Opramoas-dossier quoted above, we read that the

83 Cat. # 7.b.1 II. H6-12; cf. Cat. # 7.b.2-6.

84 Cat. # 6.f.3 II. 7-8: έκαστον δήμου ἐκ τῶν ἐκ δῆλτων καλεσάτως. Cf. above, Chapter One, p. 16 n. 16, where we have seen Marcus Roccius Felix providing distributions to recipients from a public list.

85 Istrus: Cat. # 2.a.2 II. 26-32: βασιλεύταις πᾶσιν καὶ γερουσιασταῖς καὶ Ταύρουσταῖς καὶ ιατροῖς καὶ παιδικταῖς αἰ τοίς ἱδία ἐκ ἐκ δῆλον καὶ δυό καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐκ τῶν διανομιμένων ἐκ τῶν δυὸ καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐκ τῶν διανομιμένων. Ephesus: Cat. # 4.b.8 II. 10-12: διανομῆν τοῖς / πολεμίταις ἐκ τῶν καλουμένων εἰς τὰς / θείας ἐκάστης δηνάριον δίδοναι.
cash gifts were also to be given ‘τοῖς λαμπάοις τοῖς εἴς ἔθους λαμβάνονσιν’; similarly, several other distributions are described as an ἔθους. There was clearly an established custom by which certain groups of citizens were always, or usually, included among the recipients. As is the case with ‘ταῖς ἐκ Ναοῦ γυναιξί’, though, we do not know, nor can we expect to discover, who exactly these recipients were. Lists may have been kept on less durable material, but they were unnecessary to include in an honorary inscription, since the recipients were known to themselves, the benefactors and their fellow citizens ἐξ ἔθους.

C. Οἱ παρόντες ἀνὴ δραχμῶς ἴσομοίρας

One benefactor, Gaius Stertinius Orpex, however, does seem to have made διανομαί available to all of the βουλευταί and priests of Ephesus. This distribution was funded from a donation of five thousand denaria and was to be paid to the βουλευταί and the priests who were present in the agora. It is probable that this is a capital fund, so that approximately three hundred denaria would be available for each distribution, assuming an interest rate of 6%. We do not know, though, how many βουλευταί and priests would normally participate in this διανομή, but given the size of Ephesus, there were undoubtedly more than three hundred recipients. This makes the idea of the entire five thousand denaria being distributed attractive, but a second διανομή in this inscription is

---

86. For example, Cat. # 1.c.1 l. 28, and 4.b.9 ll. 11-12.

87. Cat. # 4.b.1 and 4.b.2 ll. 9-12. The basis of attributing both of these inscriptions to Gaius Stertinius Orpex, named in the first portion of 4.b.2, which has not been included in the catalogue, is the dedication of the statues of Asclepius, Hygia and Hypnos in the gymnasium, which appears in both inscriptions. Furthermore, these two inscriptions are the only two in the catalogue, aside from those in the Opramoas-documents which use the verb λαμβάνω. As we have noted above (Chapter Two, pp. 53-54, nn. 31-34) it is possible that these two inscriptions record different distributions since there are small
clearly intended to be an annual occurrence, and a second inscription lists the διανομή to the βουλευταὶ and the priests as annual. The second distribution in this inscription is for the γεροντία and has a specified rate: two denaria per person.

The distribution with which we are at the moment concerned, though, was to be split evenly among all of the potential recipients. Rather than at a specific rate, the recipients were to take a διανομή, ‘ἀνὰ δραχμὰς ἱσομοῖρας’, so that the amount each individual received was dependent on the number of βουλευταὶ and priests who took part.

If, as we have suggested, this was intended to be a yearly occurrence, the size of the individual gifts could be quite small. However, it is important to note that even in this case, Orpex specifies that only those individuals who are present should receive anything, but the handouts of money are available to all of the βουλευταὶ and priests.

D. Οἱ κλῆροι

This raises the question of why a condition, which seems to make the benefaction less praiseworthy, would be included in an honorary inscription. We have noted above that, although the distributions almost always appear to be meant to be taken away, there is an uncertainty in our understanding of certain distributions. It is possible that the distributions of money were intended to be spent on something provided by the benefactor, such as meat, wine or oil, but this is nowhere explicitly stated in our catalogue.88 Gaius Stertinius Orpex did make arrangements ὤπως ἐκ τῆς προσόδου αὐτῶν

---

88 The strongest suggestion that this was the intent of a διανομή rests, as we have noted above, on the translation of καί in an inscription from Syros (Cat. # 3.b.1; cf. above, Chapter One, pp. 24-26; Chapter
We should note that this is not termed a διανομή, though; if we must assign a name to this distribution, it seems to be a κλῆρος more than anything else, as the three δεναρία are allotted to selected individuals. If the διανομαί, like the κλῆροι, took place on the occasion of a banquet or feast, it is plausible that the number of βουλευταί and priests would have been much smaller than the total number in the city of Ephesus, so that more was given to each recipient than the inscription seems to say. Each βουλευτής and γερουσιαστής would have received a small handout, while others, selected by lot, received an additional gift.

The distinction between διανομαί and κλῆροι has been noted briefly above in connection with Oliver’s translation of the Salutaris decree from Ephesus. Simply, a κλῆρος is a handout on the basis of a lottery, whereas a διανομή is a more general gift of money. However, aside from the foundations of Salutaris and Orpex, lotteries appear only very rarely in the διανομή-inscriptions. In fact, there are only two other instances of such an event in our catalogue.

---

89 Cat. # 4.6.2 II. 13-15.

90 IKEph 27 = Oliver (1941): 55-85, n. 3; Chapter Two, p. 61.

91 A κλῆρος by itself, however, does not indicate that money was necessarily distributed. This use of the term appears in Ephesus (for example, IKEph. 35 1. 21 and 36a II. 16-18), but elsewhere in Asia Minor it is not certain that a distribution of money is described as a κλῆρος (for example, TAM II 677 1. 16).
Tiberius Claudius Ctesias established a posthumous foundation which was to provide διανομαί for the βουλή, the δήμος, the φυλαί and the προκλήροι. These last recipients must be similar to the πόλεις in other inscriptions, but limited to those who have been selected, presumably by a lottery of some sort, but possibly, and perhaps more likely, by the active choice of the benefactor.

An inscription from Aphrodisias, on the other hand, records a distribution, in connection with two others, in which κλήροι, prizes chosen in a lottery, are awarded to the βουλευταί and the γερουσιασταί. As is the case in the other two inscriptions, this one does not tell us how the recipients are actually to be chosen. However, the potential recipients may themselves have been restricted. This inscription records several distributions: the κλήρων διανομᾶς, the 'διανομὰς τοῖς τε τῆς πόλεως κατοικοῦσιν πολείταις τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας', and 'ἐτέρας δὲ διανομὰς τῇ βουλή πάση καὶ τῇ γερουσίᾳ'. The lottery is not to be open to the entire βουλή and γερουσία, but only to the λαμπροτάτῃ βουλή and the ἱερωτάτῃ γερουσία. The presence of the two superlative adjectives may be used as an indicator of the date of the inscription, but they may also imply a stratification in the βουλή and the γερουσία since they do not appear in the report of the third final

---

92 Cat. # 6.c.3 ll. 6-7.

93 There is also the case of Antacus the son of Modestus in Syros, whose διανομή was provided γερουσιασταίς and τοῖς ὁς ἐπὶ βουλήθη (Cat. # 3.b.1 l. 21), in which it is quite clear that the recipients were chosen by the benefactor personally.

94 Cat. # 6.c.5 ll. 33-34: ἀνατεινότα πρὸς αἰωνίων ἔν' κλήρῳ διανομᾶς.
distributions. Though we do not know what form the lottery took, it is possible in this case that it was open only to the high-standing members of the βουλή and the γερουσία.

Although κληρονομοί appear only rarely in our διανομή inscriptions, they are attested as often in the inscriptions of Aphrodisias as are διανομαι. These distributions are described in the same manner as the αἰωνίους διανομὰς of Aphrodisias: they are supported by the donation of a capital sum whose interest is to be distributed on certain occasions; they describe lotteries rather than more general distributions, though. Only two of six inscriptions in which κληρονομοί appears do not use the phrase ‘εἰς αἰωνίους κληρονομοὺς’ as what appears to be a parallel to ‘εἰς αἰωνίους διανομὰς’.

One of these, a marble base broken so that only the second half of the inscription remains, is in honor of a citizen who fulfilled every magistracy and liturgy, and who undertook an embassy to the Emperor; it is not clear which Emperor is meant, but the βουλή is described as ἱερωτάτη, so that we may tentatively suggest that the inscription dates to after the reign of Septimius Severus; as we have noted above, the presence of this superlative adjective may indicate a stratification within the βουλή. The benefactor dedicated sums of money for the βουλή, the γερουσία and the νεοποιοι χρυσοφόροι, in the

---

95 The superlative λαμπροστάτη is most often applied to the city or to a proconsul in the inscriptions from Ephesus (for example, ὑπερκρατεινός: ΙΚΕρθ 243, 627, 714, 799, 2054, 2055; ἀντίπατος: ΙΚΕρθ 619a, 621, 639, 666c, 698, 3030, 3088); it is only rarely used of the βουλή, so that we have suggested here that it may refer to a group within the βουλή.

96 MAMA VIII 413c.13, 482, 520 bis, 523-525.

97 See above, Chapter Two, pp. 50-51, nn. 22-23.

98 MAMA VIII 525.
same terms as the διανομή from Aphrodisias mentioned above:99 ἀνατεθεικότα τῇ ἱερωτάτῃ βουλῇ ... Ἐ β' εἰς αἰανίους κλήρους νομάς'.

The second inscription uses κλήρος neither in the accusative plural nor in the genitive plural.100 This is a Hadrianic document which was found in the city wall, and details loans made by Attalus the son of Adrastus. Κλήροι of two hundred and forty measures of seed are to form a part of the security for a loan lent by Attalus to Diodorus the son of Musaeus of Heracleia Salbace. These measures were therefore allotted to Diodorus by a procedure which was more certain than a lottery, since he could use them as collateral. It is clear, though, that in this case the κλήροι are not prizes of money.

V. Διανομαὶ as Φιλοτημαί

The distribution of cash-gifts would obviously attract numerous potential recipients, not all of whom, as we have seen, would have been given a gift. As we have seen, there were limitations placed on the recipients, in order to prevent unnecessary expense and potential shortages, but also to make a social statement. A benefactor is only rarely praised for having provided διανομαὶ to poorer individuals like slaves and freedmen. Such gifts do bring glory to the benefactor, but only through their numbers. Providing gifts to citizens and members of the local aristocracy, on the other hand, brings

99 See above, p. 112.

100 MAMA VIII 413c=Laun (1964): 103-106, no. 102c: ἐπὶ οἰκείῳ Τυδίῳ Τυδεώς τοῖς 'Απελλάου ἄλλου διπλαού δανείου δεδεσμένον ὑπ’ ἑμοῦ Διοδώρῳ Μουσαιοῦ τῷ αὐτῷ ἀρχαιῶν ὡς γίνεται τόκου μέχρι μυρᾶς 'Απελλάου τριακάδος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος Χ δισκελία τετρακόσια πεντήκοντα ἐπὶ ἤπαθήκαις / κλήρως τοιοῦ στόρου κύριου διακαθὼς τεσσαράκοντα τοῖς ὁδίνι ἐν Ἀπελλάῳ λεγομένοις 'Αλλιασιοῖς.
a significant amount of τιμή to the benefactor simply by their provision, which is only enhanced by their numbers. Thus, a benefactor may include lower classes in his or her distribution, but certainly not at the expense of citizens closer to his or her own social standing.

Since the evidence for διανομαί comes from inscriptions honoring the benefactors, it seems that providing such distributions was more honorable than receiving them. Thus, benefactors of ἐξώθεν διανομαί are praised, but not by individuals: as we have seen in Chapter Two, the subjects of the verb of honoring are the βουλή, the δῆμος, and/or the γερουσία—that is, public entities rather than individuals. Individuals do not appear in our inscriptions, except as the authors of decrees of honoring: a benefactor is not honored by one of the recipients of his διανομή, but rather by the city itself, once a motion has been proposed by an individual.

Despite this, it is a fact that aristocrats and βουλευταί did receive διανομαί. The reciprocal gifts to the benefactors are the decrees which allow the erection of a statue or a similar memorial; this allows the aristocrats who had received gifts to remain somewhat anonymous. A particularly magnanimous benefactor may have been the recipient of a proposal that the expenses of a statue be covered by public funds, which happens in only two cases.101

Only very rarely do we find in the evidence an indication that the benefactors summoned people to their distributions, but they must have done so in every case. Every

---

101 Cat. # 5.a.1 ll. 21-22, 7.e.1 ll. 16-17.
in our catalogue was obviously carefully arranged beforehand, which requires a
public announcement that the distribution would take place, for example, on a certain day
at a certain place. Nicomedes included in his foundation a proviso that all future $\text{διανομαὶ}$
should take place ‘ἐν τοῖς περὶ τὸν ναὸν τὸς Σωτῆρας – οἶκοι’, but otherwise we know
where $\text{διανομαὶ}$ took place because we are told that they had taken place rather than that
they would take place in those locations.

Many inscriptions, particularly those which record annual or penteteric $\text{διανομαὶ}$,
implty when and where the distributions are to take place, but there is only one $\text{διανομή}$-
inscription, to my knowledge, which records the announcement of $\text{διανομαὶ}$, though it is a
supplement. This records the benefactions of a priest and gymnasiarch in Panamara who
took place because we are told that they

$\text{ἐπαγγέλλω}$, in addition to the sense of a promise which we have noted above, also
suggests the summoning of the recipients to the $\text{διανομή}$; this use of the verb or the corresponding noun,
however, does not appear in our catalogue as a summons to a distribution of cash (for example, Cat. #
4.d.10 ll. 12-14 and 6.a.1 ll. 3-4).

A benefactor of Kyme, however, provided a feast in the

\[\text{Cat. # 4.b.12 l. 19.}\]

\[\text{Cat. # 6.e.1 ll. 10-11.}\]
tenemos of the temple of Dionysus for Roman citizens, residents of the city and foreigners 'έκ προγράφας' and a second meal in the Prytaneion for the same recipients 'ἀπὸ καρίγματος'.\textsuperscript{105} the recipients of each meal were summoned, in one case by a written notice, and in the second case by a public announcement. We have also suggested that the 'τοῖς καλουμένοις' of Table 3.3 were those who were summoned to a distribution.\textsuperscript{106}

VI. Chapter Conclusions

All of the διανομαί in our catalogue were provided by citizens of various cities in Asia Minor—some benefactors may have been citizens in more than one city in a region, but only Opramoas is known to have enjoyed such multiple citizenship. However, that more such citizens do not appear in our catalogue is due to the fact that we have not focused on the individual benefactors themselves. In addition to being citizens of their own cities and regions, though, our benefactors were also Roman citizens, so that they were those individuals whom the Roman authorities favored and supported—they were the local aristocrats.

This high standing did not prevent the same individuals from appearing as recipients of other διανομαί. In fact, it is this equality in social rank which caused many citizens to be both benefactors and recipients. Our evidence, approximately one hundred inscriptions from a period of over three hundred years, does not provide direct support for this duality, but, as we have shown in this chapter, the benefactors were βουλευταί, who

\textsuperscript{105} SEG 32 1243 II. 17-18 and 37-38.
also appear as the most common group of recipients. However, there is no indication that even when διανομαί were provided to ‘πάνη πόλη καὶ ἡλικία’ they were given consistently with an interest in alleviating poverty. They were usually given as a matter of course in an individual’s—or a family’s—political career and pursuit of τιμή.

As we have seen in the previous chapter, there is a formula which characterizes many of these inscriptions despite its variations. There seems equally to have been a characteristic manner in which διανομαί were actually distributed. Of course, it is also possible, and probable, that this too varied from city to city: each citizen would have known how διανομαί were distributed in his own city—whether by a calling of tribes or by a general queue-up—so that there was no need to inscribe this. Nonetheless, several inscriptions do tell us how the handouts were to be distributed, whether by an allotment, a name calling or a customary procedure.

CONCLUSION: Διανομαί and Romanization

I. Epigraphic Evidence of Διανομαί

This thesis has examined the practice of handing out διανομαί in the Greek cities of Asia Minor, and we have seen that a διανομή in the epigraphic evidence of Roman Asia Minor always refers to a distribution of money. Although there are other terms which are used to describe distributions and foundations in general, the study of διανομή itself has indicated that these distributions of money were offered by Roman citizens on occasions related to their offices or liturgies.

Διανομαί are similar to the distributions of money in the Latin West, but there are significant differences which have appeared from the summary of sportulae in Chapter One and the discussion of διανομαί throughout this thesis. First, a sportula could consist of a gift of food or of money, whereas a διανομή is always a gift of money in the Imperial period. The only instance of a distribution of meat called a 'διανομή' is a Hellenistic distribution from Cos which we have discussed in Chapter One; this distribution was offered on the occasion of a sacred wedding. Such private occasions are not commemorated by διανομαί, since distributions on these occasions would be too similar to the distributions provided by Emperors discussed in detail by van Berchem. This forms the major distinction between διανομαί and gifts of money in Rome: διανομαί were offered on official occasions connected with public offices.

There is also a theoretical question about the nature of διανομαί: were they intended to be unrestricted gifts, to be carried away by the recipients, or were they
intended to be spent by the recipients on a meal provided by and in honor of the benefactor, either partially or entirely? This problem appears most clearly in a distribution on the island of Syros, and is dependent entirely upon the translation of *kai* as a connecting conjunction or an explanatory conjunction. However, there is evidence that when the handout was intended to be spent on a meal, it could be termed a *stupës*, that is, a *sportula*, rather than a *diagovoun*. Obviously, such terminology could vary over three centuries and from city to city, but there is no clear evidence that *diagovoun* was used to describe a type of rebate in a feast in the period with which we have been concerned; instead the evidence indicates that a *diagovoun* was an unrestricted gift of money.

Gifts of money seem to have become more common in the second century. This increase of attested *diagovuai* may, as we have said in Chapter One, simply be due to the epigraphic habit: it may have become more appropriate to honor this type of benefaction with an inscription at this time. As we have seen throughout this thesis, though, this is only a partial explanation of a problem which is better explained through a combination of causes: the epigraphic habit, increased interest of the Emperors in the provinces shown by increased interference in local affairs by governors, the different attitudes of various Emperors, and the increasing Roman citizenship during this time period.

There do not, however, seem to have been any significant changes in the practice itself: *diagovuai* were, according to the epigraphic evidence, generally given to the same groups of citizens by the same groups of benefactors throughout the period covered by

---

1 Cat. # 3.b.1 ll. 14, 17; cf. above, Chapter One, pp. 24–26; Chapter Three, p. 103, n. 74.
this thesis. Similarly, the occasions on which and the locations in which they were provided did not vary significantly.

The main sources for this practice are the honorary inscriptions commissioned by the cities whose citizens were the recipients of such generosity, so that we are usually only told that a benefactor provided a διανομή. This does limit the information available to us concerning the specifics of giving διανομαί, but since honorary inscriptions in general are formulaic, varying in their particulars rather than in the manner in which they present their information, it is possible to restore διανομαί in certain benefactors’ careers, keeping in mind the verbs most commonly used for this and the discussion of omissions which we have provided in Chapter One. Several honorary inscriptions, though, provide more information about διανομαί, so that we know the most common recipients as well as the benefactors, resulting in clear correspondences with the Latin practice of cash gifts. However, inscriptions which provide extensive detail about individual distributions are much more difficult to supplement since there is nothing with which any supplemented details may be compared.

Relatively few inscriptions tell us how these handouts were actually conducted, but there is enough evidence to make some conclusions. Obviously, a one-time distribution of money which was offered to commemorate the assumption of an office or the completion of a liturgy could be accomplished much more cheaply than a recurrent distribution provided on a birthday or funeral. Since the necessary funding for διανομαί could be quite high, many of our benefactors made substantial donations of money or
land to support perpetual distributions; these donations were either under their own
supervision or under that of a relative or an appointed ἐπιμελήτης.

Annual or penteteric festivals, though they do not appear in the διανομή-
inscriptions frequently enough to provide an opportunity for a complete study here,
entailed substantially greater expense, as the founder or agonothete had not only to
establish a fund to provide sufficient revenue for prizes and other incidental expenses, but
also to attract competitors and spectators. Depending on the status and location of the
festival, though, a portion of this expense will have been met from public or temple
funds, or from the endowment of an earlier agonothete; any shortfall between the amount
of money available from such sources and the total amount required will have been paid
by the current agonothete himself.

We have considered the distributions in two broad categories: those which were
intended to be repeated, and those which were intended to be offered only once. There is
no indication that either type of διανομαί was preferred by any group of benefactors.
Since several of our cities are represented only by one or two inscriptions, we cannot say
for certain that repeated distributions were favored or disfavored by benefactors in many
of our cities. However, when one-time and repeated distributions do appear in the same
city, one type does seem to dominate. This is particularly clear in the cases of
Aphrodisias and Ephesus, where, when the figures are combined, nineteen repeated
distributions are recorded as opposed to five one-time distributions; Didyma, on the other
hand, provides evidence indicating the dominance of one-time distributions. The reasons
for this, in Aphrodisias and Didyma at least, are clear: the αἰώνιοι διανομαί of Aphrodisias
were annual distributions which were funded from the bequeathal of a sum of money in the benefactor's testament, while in Didyma διανομαι were most often provided by the prophets of Apollo or the hydrophori of Artemis as a benefaction in connection with their term of service.

The sites of the διανομαι are in these cases clear: those offered in connection with a priesthood took place in or near the temple, while statues and gymnasium, especially for gymnasiarchs, also provided convenient locations for the handouts. The theater or the agora are also attested sites, but these two appear so rarely—the agora twice and the theater once—that we cannot say for certain that these were the locations most commonly used by magistrates or liturgists who gave διανομαι.

The διανομαι which we have studied in this thesis did not take place at the homes of the benefactors, which Juvenal implies was the common practice with sportulae in Rome, though there are suggestions that they took place on the occasion of a feast. If this is taken to be an indication that these διανομαι were in fact given in the home of the benefactor, it implies that the handouts offered on these occasions were given to a relatively select group of recipients; we have seen Pliny the Younger questioning Trajan about the distribution of gifts on private occasions like these, but these distributions were not provided for collegia or έταιρία, but as a part of the workings of the Imperial cult.

Distributions provided to a variety of recipients were one way in which a wealthy aristocrat could enrich his city in addition to the customary benefits which citizens derived from magistracies and liturgies, such as the provision of free, or low cost, oil by gymnasiarchs. Originally, διανομαι may have served in part a purpose similar to that
which we have attributed to Hellenistic kings in their euergetic behavior to cities in Greece and on the western coast of Asia Minor: to win public support. Like liturgies, though, διανομαί must have become more and more expensive as magistrates and liturgists provided them on novel occasions, establishing a tradition of cash handouts.

II. Romanization

The providers and recipients of διανομαί have been considered in summary in Chapter Three, with the conclusion that they often came from the same social classes. We have also seen that they were high-ranking citizens in their cities, whom Roman authorities could easily observe. Private groups of citizens, εταιρίαι, were supervised so stringently that a fire-brigade was not permitted in Nicomedia, but the assembly of citizens to receive διανομαί will have been conducted with the knowledge of Roman authorities.

The βουλή and δῆμος could be, as Dio says, strongly influenced by local, provincial and Imperial Roman authorities, so that not only the measures discussed by these bodies but also the bodies themselves will have been known to Roman authorities, whether formally or through private complaints, as we have seen in the case of Vedius Antoninus. As we have said above, many of the benefactors contained in our catalogue are Roman citizens who enjoyed the favour and support of local Imperial authorities, and who formed the βουλή of many cities in Asia Minor during the Imperial period. Thus,

---

2 See above, Chapter, p. 68-69, nn. 59-60.
both the benefactors and the recipients would have been, in most cases, known to or recognized by the Roman authorities.

We must also note that several of our benefactors were expressly permitted by the Emperor to provide distributions. Such notice is only implied in two of our inscriptions, but there is no reason to assume that it was lacking in every other case. We can suggest, however, that permission for διανομή obtained from the Emperor himself, either in person or in letters was a more difficult undertaking so that it would be more likely to appear in our inscriptions than permission obtained from other Roman authorities, such as, for example, provincial governors.

There is a final element of Romanization which we have only briefly touched upon. Several of the inscriptions in our catalogue report that distributions were provided to different groups at different rates. This is a feature which has also appeared in the inscriptions which we have considered from the Latin west, and this, more than the distribution of money itself, is particularly Roman. We have no evidence of a distribution of money, or of food, being provided at different rates in the Hellenistic period. The Hellenistic inscription from Cos, which describes the distribution of meat at a sacred wedding, tells us that a distribution was to be made, but there is no indication that citizens of a higher standing received any more than citizens of a lower standing. We cannot know, though, to what extent this distinction was noted by Greek citizens themselves as an element of Romanization. Some citizens may have recognized different

---

3 Cat. # 1.c.1 ll. 28, 6.d.1 ll. 8-9; cf. 4.b.10 ll. 13-17.
rates as a Roman practice, but we simply do not have the evidence necessary to make a
generalization for all of the citizens of Asia Minor.

In conclusion, then, διανομαὶ were distributions of cash in the Greek cities of Asia
Minor during the Imperial period provided by that class of citizens which Rome tended to
favor both in the East and elsewhere—the aristocracy. The activity was permitted by
Roman authorities to selected individuals who, not surprisingly, appear frequently as
priests of the Imperial cult. The distributions served in part to give these aristocrats a
means of emphasizing their high-standing in the community to one another, but also of
conciliating those of lower social standing than themselves to the rule of Rome, when the
gifts were given to broader groups of citizens.

\footnote{Cat. # 3.α.1.}
Appendix I: Catalogue of Inscriptions

I. Moesia and Thrace

a. Dionysiopolis


5

b. Pentapolis


5

---

Epigraphic Conventions Used:

(δημαρία) : expansion of a symbol or abbreviation.

[δημαρία] : restoration of letters no longer visible.

δημαρία : restoration of letters partially visible.

δημαρία : ligatures.

<δημαρία> : letters incorrectly inscribed and corrected by the editor.

{δημαρία} : extraneous letters.

[......] : six letters missing.

[-- --] : significant portion of the line missing.

\(\nu\) : empty space.

TOT : letters not understood by editors.

1 Epigraphic Conventions Used:

2 IGBulg I 16 reads \(\nu\).

3 Robert (RPh 33 [1959]: 206) reads \(\kappa\tau\iota(\sigma)\tau\alpha(\upsilon\ \tau\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\alpha\varphi\iota\varsigma\ \tau\alpha\varphi\iota\varsigma\ )\).

---

20

5

Robert (RPh 33 [1959]: 206) reads γιµανι(ς)άρχης δ', ούτα καί

Augusta Traiana


---

25

30
d. Odessus

1) Honorary inscription; Mid Imperial; PHI7 Moesia and Thrace [IG Bulg I(2), II, III(1-2) & IV] 63(2) =IGBulg I 2 63. Lines 1-19.

ἀγαθῇ τίθητι.
Κλαυδίου
'Ακίλαν

τὸν ἀπὸ προγόνων ἀρώ-
κοτον γενόμενον ἀγωνο-
θέτην τῶν μεγάλων πεντα-
ετηρικών ἀγώνων καὶ ἀρξαντα
ἀγώνες καὶ συνδικησοῦτα πιστῶς
καὶ ταμίαν τῆς πόλεως γενόμε-
νον καὶ δύνα εκάστῳ βουλευτῇ

τε καὶ φιλοτείμων καὶ προσγρά-
φω καὶ τοῖς παρεπιδημήσασιν

στρατιώτας διάνοιμος Ἀττι-
κάς δέκα ὑπὲρ τε τῆς ἀναπτύ-
σεως δόντα εἰς τὰς τῆς βουλῆς

χρείας Ἀττικάς, καὶ εἰσωρθήσαντα

τοὺς κρατίστους βουλῆς καὶ ἀποπληρώσαν-
tα φύλαξ τε καὶ στέμασιν στέμμασιν τὰ ἐς ἐθνὸ

βουλή δήμου ἐτείμησεν.

2. Black Sea and Scythia Minor

a. Istrus

1) Honorary decree; No date; PHI7 Black Sea and Scythia Minor [Inscr. Scythia Minoris II,1] 17=IScythiae Minoris II 1 17. Lines 1-19.

[-------------------------]
[------------------------]ΔΙΟΡΘΙΑ[------------------------]
[έδοξε] εἰ τῶν δήμων ἔπιμη[νινούς τοὺς δείνα]
[Ἀλσχίσα]νος, Δισκάρις Π[- ------- εἰπεν ἐπει]-
[δὴ Ηγιασάριονας - --------]νος ἀνατέθη[ηκε χρυ]-
[τοῖς] τοιακασόνος ὑ[πὸ σωσ] [------------------------]
[------------------------]κρατηρὶ πόλει [- -----------------]
[------------------------] τοῖς παντοπ[- -----------------]
[------------------------] τῇ[μ] τοῦ τοῦ [- -----------------]
[------------------------] ο[γδόνοις Π[- -----------------]
[------------------------] νέμειν τ[ῶι δήμωι - --------- καθ']
[------------------------] ἐτοὺς ένας [------------------------]
[------------------------] τὸ χρυσό[- ----------------- δια]-
[------------------------] νομὴν [------------------------]
[------------------------] ἱέρω[επι- -----------------]
[------------------------] νέμειν [- ----------------- δρα].

3. Aegean Islands

a. Cos

1) Religious document with passing mention; 300 BC; PHI7 Cos and Calymna [HGK] 10 C1=SIG 3 1106; Laum (1964): 52 n. 45. Lines 87-96.

b. Syros

1) Honorary inscription; AD 183; PHI7 Aegean Islands General [XII, 5 Cyclades] 663=IG XII (5) 663. Lines 1-33.
κρ[ά]τορος Καίσαρος Μ. Αιρηλίο[υ]
[Κ]ορμίδου Ἀντωνίνον Ἑβ[αστοῦ] [Εὐσκ]-
[θ]οῦς τύχης καὶ νίκης ιερᾶς τε [συγ]-
[κ]λήτου καὶ δήμου ᾿Ρωμαίων [καὶ δή]-
[μ]ου Συρίων ᾿Αντιός Μοδέστου [στε]-
[φ]αινηφάρος ἐπώνυμος ἀρχών [ἐκαλ]-
[λ]εύχεται Ἑστία Προτανείας καὶ τοις [ἄλλ]-
[λ]οις θεοῖς πάσι, καὶ παρέσχεν τῇ μὲν [συν]-
[όδ]ημ(?) τῆς γερουσίας τῇ τετράδι τὰ ἐξ ἐθνος]
[αὐτ][οίς πάντα, τῇ δὲ γενεαῖς ημέρα[ν τοῦ]
[κυ]ρίου Αὐτοκράτορος παρέσχεν τοῖς [μὲν] 5
[γε]ρουσιοσταῖς δεῖπνον καὶ ἐδουκεν [ἐ]-
[καστ]ῳ σφυρίδος δηνάρια πέντε, ἐλεύ[θ]ερο-
[ραι]ς δὲ γυναιξίν πάσαις καὶ θυλείας[ς] 10
[παιοιν] ὀικον καὶ ἐδουκεν ταῖς μ[ὲν γε]-
[ναιξί] διανομῆς ἀνὰ ἀσφάρια δικτώ],
[
ταῖς δὲ] παιοιν ἀνὰ ἀσφάρια τέσσαρα[ν] τῇ] 15
[δὲ ἐξήγη] ημέρα παρέσχεν τοῖς μὲν ἔρη-
[ρουσιασταῖς καὶ ἄλλοις οἷς ἐξουθίδης[ς] 20
[δείπνοι]ν καὶ ἐδουκεν ἐκάστῳ διανομῆς[ς]
[ἀνὰ δήναριον ἐν τοῖς [δὲ] λοιποῖς πολει-
[παρέσχεν] ὀικον καὶ ἐδουκεν διανομῆς[ς]
[τοῖς μὲν πολείταις ἀνὰ δηνάριον ἑν, [ἐλευ]-
[θ]εροὶς δὲ] παιον ἀνὰ ἀσφάρια ὡκτώ [ἐκά]-
[λευσέν δὲ κ]αὶ τοὺς παρεπιθηματας [ἐκ] 30
[τῶν Κυκλάδων νόσων οἷς τὰ αὐτά παρ[ἐ]-
[σχεν ἁ] καὶ τοῖς πολείταις, [σο]ν ἀρχεὶν
[.5]θοὶ Καλλίστου τοῦ Θεογόνου[το].
[ἐπί] τούτων ἦν ῥεγεια εὐκαρπία εὐετηρία.

c. Tenos


η βουλῆ καὶ ὁ δήμος Σάτυρον Φιλεύνου πλη-
ρώσαντα πάσαν ἁρτή καὶ λειτουργίαν, καὶ ἀρχι-
θεωρήσαντα τετράκις, καὶ ἀναθέτετα τῇ πόλει
βαλανεύου καὶ δηνάρια πεντακασχείλα, ἵνα ἐκ τοῦ
tόκου αὐτῶν θερμαίνεται τὸ βαλανεύον, καὶ τοῖς ἐν ῾Η-
ρίστῳ θεοὶ δηνάρια πεντακασχείλα, ἴνα ἐκ τοῦ τό-
κου αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ τῆς Βουδωσίας ἀετῷ κατ’ ἔτος
διδοῦται τοῖς εὐχωριθησθημένοις ἐν τῇ ιερᾷ ἐ-
λευθέροις Τηνίοις κατ’ άνδρα διηνάσαιοι, [καὶ] ἄλλα τοῖς
αὐτοῖς θεῖος δημαρία μύρια, ἵνα ἐκ τοῦ τόκου αὐ-
τῶν κατ’ έτος ἐν τῷ ιερῷ τῇ Καταστεφανώσει
καὶ τῇ ὀκτωκαιδεκατῇ παντὶ ἐλευθέρῳ Τηνίῳ
ἡ κατ’ ἀναλογίαν τοῦ συνελευσμοῖνον πλήθους
μερίζεται διανομῇ, καὶ ἄλλα δημαρία ἐξαισχείλι-
α, ἵνα ἐκ τοῦ τόκου αὐτῶν κατ’ έτος ἀνδράσι καὶ γυ-
ναῖζι Τηνίους ἐν τῇ ὀρισμένῃ τῶν ἐπιταφίων αὐ-
τοῦ ἡμέρᾳ μερίζεται καθ’ ἐκαστὸν ἡ κατ’ ἀναλογίαν
tοῦ συνελευσμοῖνον πλήθους διανομῇ, καὶ ἄλ-
λα τῇ πάλιν δημαρία μύρια ὀκτακυσχείλια πεντακό-
σια, ἵνα ἐκ τοῦ τόκου αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ ἀνδρών καὶ γυ-
νακών καὶ παίδων ἐλευθέρων Τηνίων κατ’ έτος
didual τὸ ἐπικέφαλον καὶ ἐν ἄλλαις δὲ πολλαῖς
καὶ ποικίλαις ὑπηρεσίαις τε καὶ ἐπιδόσειν εὐ-
ρεγονήσαντα τὴν πατρίδα εὐχαρίστως ἐτέιμη-
sει, χαρίσμασίς τῇ πάλιν τῶν ἀνδρών τα Μαλ-
θάκης τῆς Φίλεινος.

2) Honorary inscription; AD 212; PHI 7 Aegean Islands general [XII 5 Cyclades]
951=IG XII (5) 951. Lines 1-20.

η βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δήμος
Λύρος Σάτυρος Θεοφίλου τῶν
φιλόπατριν καὶ δίς στεφα-
νήρων, ἀρβαντὰ πάσαν
ἀγγέλων, καθ’
καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ πρώτου ἀν-
δράσιος ἀναστάσει δη-
λωταὶ, ἔτι μὴν ἐπιμελεῖσά-
μενον τῶν τοῦ Διονύσου οἴ-
κων καὶ ἀναβέντα χρήματα τ[οῖς]
δόοις, ἐτέιμησεν καὶ δευτέ-
ρω ἀνδράσι, δόντα καὶ πάλιν
πάσιν τοῖς κατοικοῦν διανο-
μή, καὶ ἔλεον ὑέντα, ὡστε μαρ-
τυροῦμενον ἐπί τοὺς καλλί-
στοις καὶ εὐνοοῦσας πε-
ρὶ τῶν πατρίδα ὑπάρχοντα ἀ-
ναγορεύοντας ἄι ἐν ταῖς ἐπι-
φανεστάταις τῶν θεῶν η-
μέραις.
4. Ionia

a. Teos


[—] καὶ ἑπιφανῶς καὶ
[θεία]τιάν συνταγμα τῷ ἱερῷ
[τῷ]τῆς βουλῆς εἰς αἰω-
νίαν μνήμην τῇ ἱε-

299 n. 26;
BCH 46 (1922): 334-5 n. 21;


b. Ephesus


[—] τῇ ε.
[—] —— ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος
[—] —— σὺν τοῖς ἀνδραίσιν
[kαί] παντὶ [τῷ — — — — — — οὐ κόσμῳ καὶ
[τῷ] καταστρώματι οἱ αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐπο[η]—
[σα]ν καὶ ἐν τῷ σταδίῳ ἐν δεξιᾷ β σ[ε]—
[λί]δες σὺν τῷ κατακρίνοντι το[ῦρ]
[τῷ] λευκολίθῳ καὶ τῇ ἕξεδρᾳ τῇ πρὸ τοῦ
ἐργοῦ αὐτῶν· καθίερωσαν δὲ καὶ τῇ βουλ[ῇ]
ἀργύριον, ὅπως ἐκ τῆς προσώπου καὶ τῆς ἱερατείας
τῶν πρὸ τῶν τειμῶν αὐτῶν ἐν [τῇ] ἁγ[ῷ] φ[ῳ]


b) —— διανομῆν· ὡμόιος καὶ τῇ γερουσίᾳ[τῷ]
ὅπως λαμβάνωσιν ἐν τῷ σταδίῳ πρὸ τῶν
τειμῶν αὐτῶν διανομῆν καὶ ἐ[τὶ τοῦ]
[μ]νήματος αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἐτέρου χρήσεως κλῆς—
[σου] καθίερωσαν αὐτοῦ· ἀνέβηκαν [θέ]—
[kαὶ] ἐν τῷ χρυσωσίῳ Ἀσκληπίου Ἰ[γῷ]—
[εἰς] τὸν σὺν παντὶ τῷ ἰδίῳ [κόσμῳ].


οὗτος μετὰ Μαρείης [τῇ]ς θυγατρὸς [—]
[—] ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ ἀνέβηκαν Ἀσκληπίου σὺν 'Τιγειᾳ καὶ 'Τινῳ
σὺν παντὶ αὐτῶν κόσμῳ, καθίερωσαν δὲ καὶ τῇ 'Βεσσαίᾳ βουλῇ καὶ
ἰερείᾳ (δημάρχια) πεντακιοχείλεα, ἵνα πρὸς ταῖς τειμαῖς αὐτῶν ταῖς ἐν τῇ
tετραγώνῳ ἀγορῇ [...]

.............λαμβάνοντο διανομῆν· οἱ παρόντες ἀνὰ δραχμὰς ἱσομοίας, καὶ τῇ
γερουσίᾳ (δημάρχια) διασχίζεντο πεντακίστῳ, ἵνα λαμβάνοντο διανομῆν κατ’
4.b: Ephesus

[...] οἱ παρόντες ἀνὰ δραχμὰς ἱσομοίρας, καὶ τῇ γεροστίᾳ (δημαρχ.) διασχίζανα πεντακόσια, ἵνα λαμβάνοσι διανομὴν κατ᾽ ἐνιαυτὸν ἐκαστὸν ἀνὰ δημαρχία β', ὁμοίως καθιέρωσαν τῇ αὐτῇ γεροστίᾳ ἄλλα (δημαρχία) χειλία πεντακόσια, ὅπως ἐκ τῆς προσόντων αὐτῶν κατ᾽ ἐνιαυτὸν ἐκαστὸν οἱ κληροψινέες ἀνθρώποι λαμβάνουσιν ἐπὶ τοῖς τόποις εἰς εὐνοιαν ἐκαστὸς (δημαρχία) τρία καὶ ἐκ τῶν λυπτῶν (δημαρχία) τρίάκοστα

[... ὁμοίως ἐκάστῳ [-] καὶ λείτους τρεῖς, φί[-]]
Καλένθαις Μαιοίς
[-] ἐκ κυκλικών? δήμων. κεφ[(ει) Λοι] [-]
[-] ὁμοίως [-] εἰς τὸ γεροντείον (δημαρχία) πεντακόσια


[...] εἶπον δὲ τὴν ἐπίθετα[ληταί], τὸ μὲν ὑπεναυπτίματον ταύτῃ διατάξει;?
[ψήφισμα] ὑπάρχετι ἀκ[ίου], καὶ ἀποτεισάτω [ο το]̣ [πράξασ] εἰς προσκώμα[ν]μα θεάς?]
[Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ τῶν Σεβαστῶν δημάρχον μύρια καὶ ἐκ πλαταίας ταύτῃ δια[γ]μα[ν] τοῖς προσβλ[υτέροις]

dημάρχος μύρια, καὶ πραξάσα[θε]αν οἱ μετ᾽ ἐκείνο[ν τ]ῶν ἐνιαυτῶν ἄρχοντες καὶ ὁ παρα[φύλαξ]

4) Honorary decree; late first century; PHI7 Ionia [Ephesos] 550=IKePh. 1151. Lines 10-15.

[...] Μουσάτος Λογείνος Τ[[-]
[-]οτ[... Πρ] [ἐμπιεσάμενου τοῦ ἐφφηβάρχου [-]
[-]ος καὶ ἐπόδοσ[ε]ίς τῶν ἐφφήσων καὶ τῶν ἐξ ἐθεοῦς ἐτ[-][-]
[...] πρὸς θεοῦ ἡμέρας, δόντως δὲ καὶ διανομὰς βουλη[κα] [κα] [γεροστίᾳ καὶ τοῖς συνέδροις π]ασὶ τῷ ἑδίῳ ἐνιαυτῷ [ι] ἐρωτήματι

5) Honorary inscription; early Imperial; PHI7 Ionia [Ephesos] 1629=IKePh. 997. Lines 1-17.

[...] πι[[-]
[...] ἠ[[-]
[...] τος
[...] [δι] ανωμή
Section 4.b: Ephesus

[--- --- --- πα]σαχούν-
[τρόπον ἐν τῷ μνήμι τῇ πόλει]
[τα]ς δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερα-
[τεί]ιας διαπάνας πάσας
[καὶ] τὰ εἰς τὴν πόλιν δι-
[δὲ]𝑜μενα δηναρία πεντακισ-
[χῦ]λια ἐδωκαν ἐκ τῶν
[HeaderText]
[Ἡ δίων τῇ πόλει Φλανιά
Μαίορος θυγάτηρ Μελ-
τίνη ἡ μύητρα αὐτῆς καὶ
Μαίορ ὁ πάππος καὶ
Μαίορ νε(ό)τερος ὁ θεός αὐτῆς.

6) Public decree; AD 104; PHI7 Ionia [Ephesos] 212=IKEph. 27; SEG 15 (1965): 698; Oliver (1941): 60-1 n. 3. Lines 221-243.

τῶν δὲ καθεσμομένων ὑπὸ Σαλοντα-
[ρίου δην(αρίων) β] μ(υρίων) τ[ε]λείστε τόκου Σαλοντάριος ἱραμαίαν καθ’ ἐκαστοῦ εὐν-
[ἀυτοῦ] τὰ γειν[όμενα δηνάρια χίλια δικαστικα, ἀφ’ ἃν διότι τῷ γραμμα-
[τεί τῆς β]ουλῆς δηνάρια τετρακόσια πενήντηκοντα, ὅπως ἐπιτελεί διαινομήν
[τοῖς] Βουλευταῖς ἐν τῷ ιερῷ ἐν τ[ῶι πρ]οιναίῳ τῆς γενεσίως τῆς μεγίστης

[Text continues...]

[...] τέμισος, ἢ τίτις ἐστὶν μηνὸς θαρση[λί]ῶνος ἐκτῇ ἱσταμένου, γεινομενής τῆς

diain-
[μιᾶς ὡς] τῇ]; σεμπτης, διδαμένον[ν ἐ]κάστῳ τῶν παρόντων δηναρίου ἐνός,
[μὴ ἔχουσα] τοις ἐξωσιάν τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς διανομῆς ἀπάντη δοῦναι, ἐπεί ἀποτελέ-
[τού τῆς β]ουλῆς ὑπὲρ ἐκαστοῦ ὑμάματος τοῦ μὴ παραγενομένου καὶ λαβόντος
[προστειμον δὴν(αρία) −] ἐὰν δὲ μείξαυν γει[νηται ο κόλλυμος, ὡστε]

[Text continues...]

[...] εἰς πλεύονας κυρεύην, ἐξεστ[ο δὲ Καὶ [−]
[−]α ἀνα κυ[...]. ἀμαίων[ς δώ]-
[σει τῷ τοῦ συνεδρίου τῆς] γερουσίας[[…]ας] χραμματεῖ κ[ατ’ ἐν]-
[αὐτὸν ἐκαστοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ προγεγραμμένον τόκου δη(νάρια)] τ(πή)β]
[ἀστάρια β, ὡς ἐπετελή κλήσεων τῆ] γενεσίω τῆς θεό[ῦ]
[ὑμέρας τοῖς τοῦ συνεδρίου μετέχουσιν] εἰς ἄνδρας τῇ [ἀνά δη(νάριον) α’ ἕαν]
[δὲ μείξαν ως ἐκ γεννημένον κόλλυμος,] ὡστε εἰς πλεύο[νας]
[κυρεύην, κληρώσει καὶ πλεύονας, έκ]άστου τῶν λαχ[igrated]
[τῶν ἀνά δηναρίον ἐν λαμβάνοντος, διδοῦσθω ως καὶ]
[τοῖς − τοῖς νεοκαρισίου παρὰ] Σα[λονταρίῳ τῷ καθερῳ]
[κότι εἰς διανομῆν δη(νάρια) − καὶ τοῖς ἱσταμένοι τοῖς]
[ἀναγραμματείοις δη(νάρια) − εἰς κλήσεων ἀνὰ δηναρίον] α’ ὡς καὶ
[τὰ εἰς τὴν θυσίαν ἀγορασάσουσιν, τοῦ κλήρου γεινομενον]
7) Public decree; AD 104; PHI7 Ionia [Ephesos] 602=IKEph. 27g; Oliver (1941): 68 n. 3; (continuation of 4.b.6.). Lines 532-539.

ομοίως διώκει άπό τού προγεγραμμένου [τόκου] και τοίς θεσμοίς εἰς διανομήν δη(νάρια) ζ., ὦστε λαμβάνειν αὐτοῦς ἐν τῷ ιερῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς γενεσίως τῆς θεοῦ ἀνὰ ἀσφάλεια θυμίων διώκει 


Οὐενουλήγος Ἀπαννιαδὸς ἀνθύπατος[ς]
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          .O.P...O.F.Α...
κατὰ τὸ ψήφισμα τῆς βουλῆς,
δούσαν δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐξ ἐθνῶν
διανομάς· ἀναστήσαν-
τος τὴς τειχῶν τ. Ἀλλιού
Σεβαστοῦ ἀπελ(ευθέρου) Πρεσίσχου
ταξιασσοῦ τοῦ τροφεύος
αὐτῆς

10) Imperial letter; AD 145-6; PHI7 Ionia [Ephesos] 198=IKEph. 1491; SIG 3 850.
Lines 1-19.
[ὑ[ιός] θεοῦ Τραία][ν][οῦ Παρθικο[ῦ ὁ ὢν][ος,
['Ἀντωνεῖνος Σεβαστοῦ[ῖ], ἀρχιερεὺς μ[έ]γιστος, ἡ]μασ-
[τίκι]'[ῆς ἑγουμένως] τὸ ἡ', [Ἀ]ὐτοκράτωρ τὸ ὅθ', ὄψιν[ος τὸ[δ ὀ[πα][]-
[πρὸς ὑμᾶς] ὅ[νδιδαί 'Αντωνεῖνος ἠμαθον οὐ[χ] οὔτε[ς ἔκ]
tῶν ἑτερῶν[ν ἤρωμάτων ὡς ἐκ τῶν [ἐκ]εἰνόν βουλῆμε-
nος γὰρ παρ' ἑμοῦ τυχεῖν βοηθείας [εἰς τὸν] κόσμου τῶν
ἐργῶν ὦν ὑμὴν ἐπηνειλατό ἐδῆ[λ]ωσεν ὡσα [κ]αὶ ἡ[λίκα οἱ-
cοδομημάτα προστίθησιν τῇ πόλει[ε] ἀλλ'] ὑμε[ις ἀκ[κ][-
thῶς ἀποδέχεσθε αὐτόν· καὶ καὶ καὶ καὶ [νεκ]αρφήσαν αὐτῷ [...]<
ά ἡτήσατ]α] καὶ ἀπαδεύξαμεν ὅτι [ο]ῦ τῶν πολλῶν τῶν
πολεμονεμένων τρόπου, οἱ τοῦ [παρ]αχοῦμ[α ἑυδοκίμα] εἰ[ν] ἥ
[ά θε[α]ς καὶ διαινομάς καὶ τὰ] τῶν ἁγίων θέρατα] δαπαν[ῶ] [συ]?
[τῶν] δι[λητῶ] ἤραν, ἀλλὰ δι' οὗ πρὸς τὸ [μέ]λλον έλπίζει[ν] σεμο-
[τέραν πονή] σεν τῷ πόλει προήηθα[ν τα]. τὰ γράμματα [ἐ]πε[μ][
[Κλα(νίδιος] ὕππηλιανὸς ἀ] κράτιστος ἀθῆ[πα] [πατος. εὐπαρκείτῃ

11) Kouretes list with passing mention of a διαινομή; reign of Commodus; PHI7
ἐπὶ πρωτόνως Μ[ή[ροκου] Αὐρ[η]λίου] Μενεμάχου
τοῦ καὶ ἀνανεωσμένου τὸ ἱερὸν συν-
έδριον τῶν κωφτῶν δόντως διαινομάς
όςας καὶ τῇ γερουσίᾳ. [[Κομμῳδίας]]
ἐπὶ ἀρχιστάτων Φίλωνος ὁ τοῦ Ἑρμολάου
φιλοσ[ε]β(αστοῦ) καὶ Ἐσπερία, Ἄ' Ἀπολλωνίου
ὅσοι καθόρισαν πρωτόνως τοῖς κεκουρωτεκόσων·
Πά(λιος) Οὐνήθ(ιος) Ἀ' Ἀντωνίνου σταυ[κ] (η[τικός] (δη[ραίασ] ἀ[η[ηθία]) Φίλωνος Ἀντωνίνου
καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς Τ(ίττῳ) Φίλ(ος) Δαμιανῷ καὶ
Τ(ίττῳ) Φίλ(ος) Δαμιανῷ Ἀ' Ἀντωνίνῳ
κουρήσῃ αὐτῆς.

[--] Νεικομήδους, τοῦ καθο[λικού ἐκδικοῦ τοῦ συνεδρίου ἡμῶν, τῆς αὐτοῦ ἐπιμελεία<ς> [έξαιρεν τὸν παρασχόμενος παράδειγμα, πόρων]


[γιστ]ῶν κυρίω ἡμῶν καὶ θεῶν εὖ[φανεστάτῳ αὐτοκράτορι Καίσαρι]
M(άρκω) Αὐρ(ιλίῳ) Κομμώδῳ 'Αντωνείνῳ [Σεβαστῷ Εὐσεβεῖ Βύτισχεῖ]

τὰς κατ’ ἐτοὺ θυ]-

[οί']ας ὑπὲρ τῆς αἰώνιος διαμωνῆς [αὐτοῦ, ὦστε, εἰ]ὼν μὴ ἐλατὸν ἀναλίσκειν εἰς τὴν εὐχαιρίαν ἀτ[ικῶν – ἐκ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Νεικομήδους]

δηλουμένων πόρων, ἐκαστὸν τῶν παρόντα εἰς τὸ ἀνάλομα τοῦ δείπνου ἔξωθεν καὶ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Νεικομήδους φιλοτεμίας λαβεῖν

ἀττικὴς μιᾶς διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺν τ[οῖς συνεδροῖς] κυρώσαι καὶ νομοθετῆσαι εἰσεῖ [διὰ τοὺς ἐπί[ψηφισμοὺς] τοὺς ἀγαθὴν τῆς γερουσίαν εἰ]-

ς τὸ δ[ύνατον] φιλάνθρωποι τῇ[ν ἐπὶ τῇ προγεγραμμένῃ εὐσεβείᾳ]

νομοθετοῦν ὡς α[ἵων] ομοίως δὲ τοὺς συνεδροὺς εἰσα[εί]

φιλάνθρωποι καὶ ἐπίτευκτοι τα[περί τὰ δείπνα προσφιλοτειμομένου τοῦ ἐκδίκου ἐς τῇ[ν δαπάνην τῶν δὲ –]

προο[εῖν, ὡς] ἐν μὲν τοῖς δε[ίπνοις λαμπροδουχείς] ἐν δὲ ταῖς κατακλίσεωιν κατε[– τοῖς συνεδροῖς μετα]-

λαμβάνειν [τῆς] εὐχαρίας. εἰ πατ[ῆς δὲ μὴ παρε]εῖν ἔτεροι [πᾶροι, ἐπὶ ταῖς ομοίας εὐχαρίας καὶ θυσίας ἐπίτευκτοι, το[-)]

ἀπὸ τοῦ τῶν προο[οίων κολλώθου προσθήκῃ]ν ποιεῖσθαι[α] τοῖς προσπάρχο[υσι] πόροις [ἐς τῆς δαπάνης τῆς θυσίας τοῖς δὲ πολεῖ]-

ταῖς διανομᾶς γ[ενέσθαι πάσας κατὰ τόδε τῷ]ν ἴησομα ἐν τοῖς περὶ τοῦ ναὸν τῆς Σωτηρίας – οἴκοις


ΑΙΣ[----------].ΙΟΙΣ διανομᾶς ὡς μηδενὶ
A[----------].ΙΟΙΣ διανομᾶς ὡς μηδενὶ
O[----------].ΙΟΙΣ διανομᾶς ὡς μηδενὶ
Ω[----------].ΙΟΙΣ διανομᾶς ὡς μηδενὶ
ΑΟΝ[----------].ΙΟΙΣ διανομᾶς ὡς μηδενὶ
ΕΙΩΣ[----------].ΙΟΙΣ διανομᾶς ὡς μηδενὶ
Μ.ΣΤΑ[----------].ΙΟΙΣ διανομᾶς ὡς μηδενὶ
Ν..ΓΟ[----------].ΙΟΙΣ διανομᾶς ὡς μηδενὶ
ΞΝΙΣΩ ΣΙ[----------].ΙΟΙΣ διανομᾶς ὡς μηδενὶ
ΣΟΔΩ[----------].ΙΟΙΣ διανομᾶς ὡς μηδενὶ
N.M[-------------]  
OΤΚΛΩΝ.ΟΝΜ....[-------------]  
Μ.ΑΜΑΝΟΙΣΕΠΤΟΚ.ΒΩΝ.ΚΟΠΩΝ  
Ο.ΣΙΑΣ ἀποθέσατε πρὸς ΟΤΑΣ.ΤΤ.ΟΙΣ  
[ἐ]δοξεῖ τῇ γερουσίᾳ ὡποῖς πάσαις αἷς [---]  
θέσιν ἦ ἐξ ὁποῖας .Η.ΟΙ....ΙΔΙ.Ο.Ρ [---]  

14) Public decree; Imperial; PHI7 Ionia [Ephesos] 2726=IKEph. 2111. Lines 1-5.  
[---][---]  
ἐσται τοῖς βουλευ-
tαῖς διανομὴ ἐπὶ  
tοῦ ἀνδρίαντος αὐ-
tοῖς τοῖς παρούσιν  

[---][---][---][---]  
[καὶ] γυμνασίας ἑαυτῶν τῶν γυμνασίων,  
[δ]όντα διανομὰς καὶ πάση τῇ πάλει,  
[κ]αὶ στρατηγὸν πρώτον, δόντα ἐν τῷ  
kαραῷ τῆς στρατηγίας ἐς παράτειμον  
[ἐ]φελάιον (δημαρχία) ἐ, καὶ εἰρήμαχον μόνον, καὶ  
[τ]ριὰς ἀγωνισθῆνη, δόντα καὶ ἐν τῷ  
kαραῷ τῆς ἀρχηγοστίας εἰς τὴν ἀνα-
kαθαρισιν τοῦ λιμένος δημαρχίας  
μυριάδας δύο, καὶ ἐπιστάντα ἴργος  
tῆς πατρίδος τοῖς πρωτεύοντι καὶ  
sυντελέοντα καὶ παραδόντα,  
πατέρα Μ(άρκου) Αιρ(ηλίου) Ἀρτεμιδώρου Μητροδω-
ριανοῦ ἱππικοῦ φιλοσεβ(άστου) πρωτάνεως  
καὶ γυμνασίας ἑαυτῶν τῶν γυμνασίων  
καὶ ἀγωνισθῆναι καὶ εἰσαγωγῆς τῶν  
mεγάλων ἐπιεικείων, ἐν τε τῷ καραῷ  
tῆς πολιτείας στρατηγὸς τῷ ἀνδρὶ  
tῶν πρωτανείας στρατηγὸς τῷ ἀνδρὶ  
τῶν πρωτανείας κάθοδον ἑως τῆς ἐβδομησεως τῆς πολιτείας  
προφασμένων τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ ἀνδρὶ-
άντος Αιρ(ηλίου) Εὐφήμου καὶ Αιρ(ηλίου) Εὐγενίου  
[γραμματέων - τοῦ ἑ]σωτάρ[τ][ο]υ μισ[θοτηρίου.]
c. Magnesia ad Maeander

1) Honorary inscription; Imperial; PHI7 Caria [Magnesia] 269=IMagn. 179. Lines 23-35.

d. Didyma

1) Honorary inscription; Augustan; PHI7 Ionia [Didyma] 334=IDid 264; *Hellenica* 11-12: 454 n. 2 and 464 n. 4. Lines 1-17.

προφήτης Ἰάσων [*Ἰά*]σωνος πανηγυρικός τρις [τρ]ιών πανηγύριον, — — οὐν—

μοι, προστάτης γεροντίας, προβεβιάσας πρὸς τὸν Σεβαστὸν [ν, πατρὸς] γυμνασιάσας γεροντίας [σίας], πατήρ Ἰουλίου Καπίτωνος γυμνασιάς [αίσχου] — —


στυ]—

λοβάτας Ε...[— — — — καὶ κεφαλ]άς ἐκοσι δύο [— στυλ]—


tος ἐπὶ το...ΙΟΝ [α]‘τοι π[αι]ακληθήνεντες ὑπὸ [το]‘δ’ ε[δ]μ[α]ν [ν — ]

καὶ τὸ ἐργον ὅ….....καὶ ἀνέστησαν ἐκ τῶν ἱδ[ιῶν — ]
tες τὰ ἐθν...ΟΦ...τες παραλιπόντες τῶν ὑ[ποσ]χέσεων οὐδένε, στυ]—

λοβάτας καὶ Ε.Τ...[— — — — — — — διανο]—

μᾶς τῇ τε βολῆ καὶ τ[ο]‘εις πολείτας πᾶσι — — ταῖς γυ]—

ναζί ἀνανεωτόμεν[ο]ς τὰς πάτρια ἐθνη τεμνηθέν]

τες διὰ ταῦτα π[....]

2) Honorary inscription; early Imperial; PHI7 Ionia [Didyma] 442=IDid 381. Lines 1-15.

[— — — — — — — — — — προγόνων ἅφε]—

χάς καὶ λειτουργίας τε[τελεκτῶν,]

πληρώσασα δὲ καὶ τὴν ὑδροφορίαν ἀξί[ι]—

ως τοῦ γένους φιλοτείμους καὶ τᾶ μὲν

μυστηρία ἐκτυπωσά τελέσασα, δούσα

[ὅ]‘καὶ διανομᾶς τῇ βολῆ καὶ ταῖς παρ-

[θεν]οις καὶ ταῖς γυναιξίν, ἀναβείσα δὲ

ἐκ τοῦ ἱδίων καὶ τὰς χαλκᾶς χθάρας τού]

[ναοῦ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ τά λίθινα]

σταθμ[........]ν ὑπερβοῦσι καὶ ὁδὸ ἐπὶ

τε τοῦτοι Ἰπασίν τεμνηθέντα

ὑπὸ τῆς βολῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου

eικόνων ἀναβείσι καὶ ἀνδριάν-

των ὑποχρηστευόμενός ἦν Θεοδότου

Κλαυδίο <υ> Θεοδότου
3) Honorary inscription; late 1st century; PHI7 Ionia [Didyma] 419=IDid 297; RPh 23 (1899): 317 n. 33. Lines 1-13.

[- - - - - - - έστιάσας δέ]
[toûs] πολείτας ἐπὶ ήμέρας ἵν'
[doûs δὲ] καὶ διανομάς ταῖς ἐκ Να-
[οῦ γ]υναικίν καὶ ταῖς παρθέ-
[vous], ποιήσαις δὲ καὶ τοῖς παρ-
[σ] τα δείπνα ἐν τοῖς Ἄνοι-
[γ]οις ὑπὸ σμήνων ἐπὶ ἡμέ-
[ρα] δ', δοὺς δὲ τῇ ἱερᾷ βουλῇ
[δια]νομάς καὶ τῇ γενεσίῳ
[toû] θεοῦ ἡμέρα τῇ ἁγοραί[φ.α.]
[.....] λ[.α. ἄνυλοι-
[a ... κατὰ πάσας ἐορ[τᾶς]
[-----] λ. Ὅ ὁ ὁ ὁ

4) Honorary inscription; AD 103/4; IDid 360. Lines 1-12.

[ὑδροφόρος Ἀρτέμιδος]
[Πυθίς ...] ΙΩΣ Βακχίου,
προγόνων λειτουργῶν
τῆς πάλεως, ποιήσαις τὰ
μυστήρια πάντα εὐσεβῶς
τοῖς θεοῖς, δοῦσα δὲ τῇ
βουλῇ διὰ(ν)ομᾶς(ς) καὶ γυναῖξι καὶ
παρθένοις ἀνεβηκε δὲ
τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι ὑδροφόροσα τὸ
παραπέτασαν: προφητεύ-
οντος Κλ[αυδιοῦ], Θεοδότου,
ταιμιεύοντος Κλ[αυδιοῦ], Ἡρακλείτου

5) Honorary inscription; AD 124; PHI7 Ionia [Didyma] 377b1 1=IDid 279b. Lines 1-14.

[.η]μ[ν, στεφά]γηφόρω[ν, .... · κατὰ
μ]έν τ[η]ν προφητείαν δοὺς ταῖς
[γ]υναῖξι καὶ ταῖς παρθένοις δι-
ανομές καὶ τοῖς πασίν καὶ τῇ βου-
λή πολλάκις καὶ τοῖς ἀνδράσι τοῖς
κόσμως, δοὺς τῶν πολείτων ἐ-
κάστῳ δημόσιᾳ [δ]ό[κε] καὶ τρεῖς ἔστη-
tας οἴου καὶ δ[είς] ἔλαιον πάσαι[ς]
6) Honorary inscription; AD 129-138; PHI7 Ionia [Didyma] 382=IDid. 254. Lines 1-14.

7) Honorary inscription; reign of Hadrian; PHI7 Ionia [Didyma] 373=IDid. 270. Lines 1-11.

8) Honorary inscription; reign of Hadrian; PHI7 Ionia [Didyma] 372=IDid. 269; RPh 23 (1899): 318 n. 34; Hellenica 11-12: 480. Lines 1-14.
9) Honorary inscription; reign of Hadrian; *IDid*. 271. Lines 1-7

[..... doius] ομαίων πα[σίν εν τοῖς 'Αρωνημοῖς δια]-

νομινον, θείς ἔλαιον ταῖς ἔθι[μοις ἴμεραις, εὑ]-

σεβῆς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς, φιλ[άνθρωπος δὲ] πρὸς τοῦ ἁγιοῦς ὑπ' ὑ[δρα]φοφορίας

Λαυλίας Ἀναχρησῆς ν. ταμιευόντων Πο. Αἴ]-

λίου Φλαουμιανοῦ Ἑπιγόνου [Καπετωλεί]-

νοῦ καὶ Πο. Αἰλίου Φλαουμα[νοῦ]

10) Honorary inscription; AD 125-50; PHI7 Ionia [Didyma] 478=*IDid* 312; *Hellenica* 11-12: 463-4. Lines 1-25.


νία. Ἀπολλωνιδοῦ, εὔγε[νής] μιτρός Β. [. . . . . . . . .]δος

[τῆς ... ... ...] ὑδροφόρου τῆ[ς] ἑι Δίκη [Ἀρτέμιδος, ἄ]-

[κλέους] τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίδου καὶ κατ' ἐστίονων

[. . . . . . . . .] Μητροδότου τοῦ Νικίου, τεωμεθέρα ὑπὸ τῆς

[Βουλῆς κ]αὶ τοῦ δήμου ψηφισματί τῷ ὑπογεγραμμένῳ

[ἐπὶ] μητροπόλει τῆς Ἰω[νίας, τῆ] ἱερὴ καὶ ψιλοσεβάστῳ

[. . . . . . . . .] Μηλή]σιῶν Βουλῆ καὶ τοῦ δήμου ἱερὴν ἐπιστατῶν

[ἐπὶ] η ὑδροφόρος τῆς Πυθείς Ὀρτέμιδος Ἀπολλωνία

[Ἀπολλωνίδου, προγόνων ὑπάρχουσα ἐγενεῖν καὶ λε[ι]]-

[το]ύρχον τοῦ δήμου καὶ ἐν ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐν [χορη]γίαις καὶ

πρεσβείαις ἀναστραφέντων, πολημαμένων δὲ καὶ

ἐπαναγέλλεις ἐπὶ τοῦτος ψηφίσματι [α]ς ἐπικαρπου[τ]ς ὑ-

ρηθέντων, καὶ πατρὸς δὶ[. . . .] [λε]ι] τούχα[ύντω]ς Ἀπολ-

λωνίδου, ἀνδρὸς καλ[ῶ] [. . . . . . . .]α [. . . . . . . .] μ πρὸς?
11) Honorary inscription; Reign of Commodus; PHI7 Ionia [Didyma] 494=IDid. 333. Lines 1-10.

άγαθη τύχη
tὴν ὑδροφόρου τῆς Πυθῆς Ἀρτέμιδος Στατιλί(ιαν) Ἰουλίαν ἡ βουλή κ(ai)
ὁ δήμος ὑδροφόρησαν φιλο-
tείμων κ(ai) τὰ μυστήρια ἐκτελέ-
sαν πρὸς μέτα τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσε-
βῶς, πρὸς [δὲ τοὺς πολεῖς ταῖς φιλο-
tείμοις, δόσαν [δὲ ταῖς παρθέναις]
tὰς διανομὰς κ(ai) [.π...[...]] τῷ πο-
λει κ(ai) τοῖς τοῦ ἐρείπου κατοι[κο]ῦσιν πᾶσιν,

12) Honorary inscription; second century; PHI7 Ionia [Didyma] 454=IDid. 353. Lines 1-19.

Ἀρτέμιδος Πυθῆς Φλαβία Νομιαγή Βουγένεια
Θεοδότη, πατρίδος Λαιανδρία-
δῶν, πατρίδος Τίτου Φλαβίου
Σωτήρου, μητρὸς δὲ Αλμιλί-
ας Νομιαγῆς Ἀρτέμιδος
ἀδελφοὶ Π(οπλίου) Σαμωρίου Νω-
μιανοῦ, γυναῖκα καὶ πάππων
καὶ προγόνων λειτουργῶν
tῆς πόλεως, δύσα διανομὰς
tῇ τῇ βουλῇ καὶ ταῖς παρθέ-
ναις καὶ ταῖς γυναικίς, ποιή-
sαν δὲ καὶ τὰς νομισμά-
νας πᾶσας θυσίας τε καὶ
σπονδὰς εἰσφέρας καὶ δαιμ-
λός ἑπι στεφανηφόροι
Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Διονυσίου,
ιποχορητεύοντος Φλαβίου Ζωσίμου

13) Honorary inscription; second century; PHI7 Ionia [Didyma] 161=IDid 111. Lines 1-8.
[--- 'Απόλα]-
lων Διδ[μεί]
kαι τη ιερά βουλή[η]
(δημάρχος) α, αφ' ἀν τοῦ τόκου
αὐτῶν λήφθηνται
διανομήν, καθ' α
ἐν τῷ δι' ἀρχείου ἐγ-
γράφῳ δεδήλωται.

14) Honorary inscription; AD 230; PHI7 Ionia [Didyma] 490=IDid. 375. Lines 1-12.
Beginning lost
tῶν Μ[εγάλων Διδυμείων; δοῦ]-
σα τοῖς πολλ[εῖοις καὶ πασίν;?]
καὶ γυναιξίν καὶ παρθένοις
διανομάς καὶ τῇ ιερωτάτῃ βου-
λή δοῦσα διανομάς ἐν ταῖς πα-
νηγίρεσιν καὶ ποιήσασα τῇ βου-
λή τὰς σποου[δὰς] πάσας καὶ τοῖς
περὶ τὸ μαν[τεῖον] ἐκτενῶς καὶ
φιλοστείμονες καὶ [iou τῇ]
ὑστερηθεὶσα]
κατὰ τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐλαίῳ-
θεσίας ποιήσασα δ[αφλώς]

e. Miletus
[αὐ-]
tοῦ τῆς βουλῆς
εἰς ἐπώνυμον αὐτοῦ
ημέραν ἄστ' ἀν ἀπὸ τῶν
τόκων διανομῆς δἰ-
δοσθαί τῇ βουλῆς
μηχανός ἐπὶ (?) ἀδ' κα-
tὰ τὸ ψήφισμα καὶ
[τ]ὴν σύνταξιν τῆς Χά-
[ρί]τος τῆς κειμένην
[ἐν] τοῖς ἀρχείοις
5. Lydia

a. Thyatira

1) Honorary inscription; AD 177-180; PHI7 Asia Minor [Lydia: TAM V.1-2] 983; TAM V (2) 983; CIG II (3) 3493. Lines 1-26.

[ἀγαθὴς τύχη.
[ἡ] βουλή

[λύ] στράτου ἀγωναθησαν-
[τὰ] τοῦ πρὸ πόλεως Τυρίμου ἐν-
[δό] ξας καὶ ἐπιθανὼς ἐν τε δια-
[νο] μαὶς καὶ ἐπιδόσειν ταῖς πρὸς
[τῇ] μ βουλήν ἀναστραφέντα φιλο-
[τ] είμως καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶς, καὶ
[τῇ] ἀ δημοτελεῖς θυσίας καὶ ὄλο-
[τ] ος ἀφθόνως καὶ ἀνυπερβλη-
[τ] ίς ἐπιτελέσαντα εν τῇ πα-

χρόιει, κοσμήσαντα τὴν πατρί-
δα ἐν τῷ διμελικῷ καὶ γημ[ι-
κ]ῶν ἀγώνι θέμασιν ἀσυνκρίτος

οἴκοθεν καὶ τειμόμασιν πρὸς πάν-
τας τοῖς ἀγωνιστάς κατ' ἀξίαν τοῦ
θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς Λαῖβιμιανοῦ, ἀνδρ[ί]
ἐν πάσαις ἀρχαίς καὶ λειτουργίαις

καὶ ὑποτευκώντος τῇ

πατρίδι φιλοτείμως ἡ βουλή ἐκ τῶν

[Ἰ] δίων μαρτυροῦσα ἀνέστησεν
[ἐ] ξι παιδὸς ἡλικίας καὶ ἐν ἄλλως
[Ἀ] χαῖς καὶ λειτουργίαις αὐτοῦ ἡμῆν ἐ-
[ἐ] υποτευκώντος τῇ πατρίδι ἐπιμελη-

θέντος Ἀντωνίου Βάσσου.

b. Sardis

1) Honorary inscription; early second century AD; PHI7 Asia Minor [Sardis 7,1] 43, p 1-I 4; Sardis vol. 7, 1. 43; SEG 44 (1994): 971 a, b.

[ὃ] δήμος ἐτείμησεν

Τιβέριον Κλαύδιον Σιλάνιον ἥρωα, στεφα-

νηφόρου φιλόπατρον, καταλιπόντα κατὰ

διαβάσκεν εἰς διανομὴν ἔτη πάντων τῇ μὲν πό-

[λει − − −].
c. Apollonis


[---] τὴν πραγματεύοντα ὑπὲρ τῆς
ἀναλαμβάνοντα
προ-τού καὶ τῶν τέκνων καὶ τῶν
ἐγκαθιστῶν καὶ τῶν πρατανει-
ἀν τίμημα ἐπιχορηγήσαντα εἰς
ἐξομολογείται καὶ πάσας ἀρχάς καὶ
λίτουργίας τῇ παρθηκόω ἑκτελέσαντα,
[κ]αταλαμβάνοντα τῇ κρατίστῃ θουλόθ [Ἀ-
π]ολλανείων ἔστιν διανομὴν καὶ τῇ
πόλει ἀλειμμα τῇ γενεβλήον αὐτ[ο]ῦ
ἡμέραι καὶ ἔτος.

6. Caria

a. Sebastopolis


--- [γυμνά]---

σιγορρήσαντα ε[......]

ἐπανεγειραμένων αὐ-
τῆς τῇ ἀρχής ἔτους, ὄν-
τα ἀπαρασκευάστων,
[κ]αὶ αὐθεντοῦ δέντα
τὸ ἔλαιον ἀδιάλει-
πτως ὃ ἔτει ἐπιπραό-
κετο ἡ κοτύλη τοῦ [ἐ]-

λαίου α’, καὶ παραπολ[ῆ]-

σαντα πυρῶν κύπρους

[θηραρίων] β’, τοῦ κύπρου πω-

λομένων (θηραρίων) δ’, καὶ δό-

ντα διανομῆς πολέιτη

μὲν (θηραρίων) α’, θουλθυτῆ δὲ

(θηραρίων) αγ’, κοσμήσαντα τὰ γυ-

μαίασια ἐφόδιος, μὴ φε[ι]-

σάμεν[ο]ν ἀναλωμάτων, καὶ[πά]-

tουργίαν καὶ ἐπιδ[ῆ]-

σεις ποιησάμενον[ν ἀ]-

μένπτως τῇ πόλει[ι κα]-

θῶς αὐτῶν καὶ διὰ ψηφι[σ]ο-

μάτων μεμαρτύρηται
b. Tralles


[- τῇ κρα]〈τ〉άτη Κλαυδία βουλὴ [-
- Σωμαρχος ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ ἀνέθηκεν [-
-], ei ὥστε ἀπὸ τῆς προσόδου [-
-] ὥς ἐπὶ τῶν αἰῶνα καθ᾽ ἐκα[στον -
-] διανομῆς ἀστικαί ἐννυ[α -]


[- τῇ κρα]〈τ〉άτη Κλαυδία βουλὴ [-
- Σωμαρχος ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ ἀνέθηκεν [-
-], ei ὥστε ἀπὸ τῆς προσόδου [-
-] ὥς ἐπὶ τῶν αἰῶνα καθ᾽ ἐκα[στον -
-] διανομῆς ἀστικαί ἐννυ[α -]

b. Tralles


[- τῇ κρα]〈τ〉άτη Κλαυδία βουλὴ [-
- Σωμαρχος ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ ἀνέθηκεν [-
-], ei ὥστε ἀπὸ τῆς προσόδου [-
-] ὥς ἐπὶ τῶν αἰῶνα καθ᾽ ἐκα[στον -
-] διανομῆς ἀστικαί ἐννυ[α -]

2) Honorary inscription; mid Imperial; PHI7 Caria [Aphrodisias] 253. Lines 1-23.

[katά] τὰ ἡ[ψηφισμ]ένα ὑ-
πὸ τῆς Βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου Μάρκου
Αὔριλίον Ἄτταλον Ἄρτε-
μιδώρου πεντάκ[15] τοῦ Μενίππου Ἄτ-
τάλου, ἄνδρα τῶν εὐ-
γενέστων, ἀπὸ προγόνων ἀρχικῶν
καὶ λειτουργῶν, τε-
λευτήσαντα νέον
τὴν ἡλικίαν τὴν
δὲ ἀναστασιν τοῦ
ἀνδριάντος ἑπο-
ήσατο Αὐριλία Ἄμμα ἡ
μέηπος αὐτοῦ, ἀνα-
θεία τῇ κρατιστ[η]
βουλή εἰς αἰώνιον
διανομᾶς ἀρχικι-
ον, καθὼς διὰ τῶς ἀ-
νάβεσιν ἔσθη-
λοῦται.

2) Honorary inscription; mid Imperial; PHI7 Caria [Aphrodisias] 337=MAMA VIII 511. Lines 1-13.

[-]ξιαν, ἀ-
[nαθέ]μα τῇ ἱερω-
[τάπη] βουλὴ εἰς αἰ-
ωνίον διανομῆς

[ἐν τῇ θέσει καὶ ὁ δήμως καὶ οἱ γεροντεῖς ἔτειμησαν
τῇ ἀναστάσειν ἁρμαίοις Υἱὸν Κλαύτου Κτησίαν
καὶ -] ἰδίᾳ τὴν γυναικά αὐτός καὶ
[- τοὺς] ὑπὸ αὐτῶν διὰ τὴν τοῦ βί.
[σὺν ἅρτῃ καὶ σεμν]όντητα ἀναθέντας εἰς δια-
[νομὰς αἰωνίους καὶ υἱοφανῶς τῇ τοῦ ἱερών
[καὶ τῷ δήμῳ καὶ ταῖς φυλαίς καὶ προκλήροις]
[τοῦ κατ᾿ ἐν τοῖς τόκων ἃ]πο (δημαρίων) μωρίων χειλίων.


[ἐν τῇ θεσμῷ κεκήρυξεν Ζήνων ὁ προγεγραμμένος, ἀνατ[θεικός –
'Ἀπολλωνίου] τοῦ Σάμου, ὁ τοῦ ἄδελφος αὐτῶν υἱὸς –
- τοῖς χρυσοφόροις νεοτησίᾳ εἰς αἰωνίους διανομὰς ἁρμοίρου – καθὼς ἐν
τῇ ἀνάθεσίσι διορθοῖται. ἐς κηριθηθεῖται ἐν τῇ σοφ[φ –
-]τοῦ ἐπερο ὁ συν[φ]ίλος ἐξουσιών ἔπειραι μετακινθηθῇ τῆς σοφοῦ; ὡς ἐν-
θαλατία τινά ἐν τῇ σοφῷ, ὡς ἀνυξίᾳ αὐτήν. ἔπει ἄπ[θετείς εἰς τοῦ τοῦ]
κύριον Ἁὐ-
- ἀκράταρος; φίλον ἁρμοίρου γι, ἓν τὸ τρίτον ἔστω τοῦ ἐκδίκησαιτος εἰς
dὲ [τὰς εἰσώστας ἐ]γκηθεθηθοῦνται οὐς ἡν Χρήσιμος διατάξηται. Τῆς
epιγραφῆς τιμῆς
[ἀντίγραφον] ἀπ<ε>τ<θ>θῇ εἰς τὸ χρυσομάκιον ἐπι στεφ[ανοφόρου –
-]


καὶ τὰς λευκόλυθους παραστάτας[δ]ας
καὶ τὸ κατ᾿ αὐτῶν εἰλιμα μετὰ τῆς γλυφής αὐτῶν καὶ
τῶν κείμενα μετὰ τῶν βωμοκυκλοφορίων καὶ κεφαλῶν
κατ᾿ ἐντεκενάκοτα, καὶ τῇ λαμπροτάτῃ δε βουλῇ καὶ τῇ ἰε-
ροτάτῃ γεροντεία ἀνατεθεικότα χρήσματα εἰς αἰωνίων
κλήρ(ω)ν διανομάς, καὶ ἄλλας δὲ πολλὰς πολλάκις διανομάς δεδοκότα τοῖς τῆς τήν πόλιν κατοικοῦσιν
πολείταις τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας, καὶ ἐτέρ(ἀ)ς δὲ διανομάς δεδοκότας πολλάκις τῇ βουλῇ πάση καὶ τῇ γε-
ρουσίᾳ, ἄλλα καὶ ἐπίσηςεις πολλάκις ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ πε-
ποιμένων κατὰ τῶν τῆς πάλεως γνώμον πολείταις
te καὶ ξ(έ)νωις, καὶ ἐλκ(ει)δ(ί)άκτο(u)ς πολλάκις τεθεικότα
ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς τοῦ Τε(ν)αέλου ποταμοῦ εἰσαγωγῆς,
καὶ πρεσβείας δὲ πολλάκις εὐτυχῶς ἐκτετελεκτα,
[k]αι παρ’ ἱλον τῶν βίων αὐτοῦ εὐεργέτην καὶ φιλόπατριν,
[ἐν ἰ]δίοις ἔργοις ἀνέστησεν· προσωματεθεικότα δὲ
[πρ]όσφατον κ[αι] ἄλλα εἰς τὸ ἔργον ἐπὶ τὸ εἶναι
[ὅ]πως μνημόνευς 11α .

d. Stratonicea

1) Honorary inscription; late first century; PHI7 Caria [Stratonikeia] 77=IKStrat.
1025; BCH 61 (1937): 259 n. 67 & 260 n. 70 & 262 n. 71-2; Robert (1971):
171-2 n. 164. Lines 1-29.
Τίτου Φλαβίου, Δέοντος νι-
ού, Κυρέινα, Λινείου, φιλορω-
μαίου καὶ φιλοσεβαστοῦ
καὶ φιλοπατρίδος, ὑπὸ τῆς
πόλεως, πρεσβευσάντος
πρὸς τοὺς Σεβαστοὺς ἢ Ῥώ-
μην καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων
καὶ τὰς διανομὰς τῇ πατρ[ι]-
di ἐπιτυχόντος, ἀρχιερα-
tεύσαντος μεγαλοπρε-
pώς, ἐν ἦ ἀρχιερωσύνῃ k[αι]
μνημοσύνας καὶ κυνήγια σ[υ]-
νετέλεσεν, ἑρατευσάντος
τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Παιαμάρου ε[ν]
Ἡραλίου, κακοὶ μὲν τὰς γυναι-
κές κηρύγματι ὑποδεξα-
μένου πάσας, ἐν δὲ τῇ γυ-
μνασίᾳ πάντας τοὺς πο-
λείτας μὴ ἡμέρα δετνε[ι-
σ]αντος, γυμνασιαρχόσα[ν]-
tὸς τῇ ἐλκυστῷ ἑλαίῳ, ἐν γυ-
μνασιαρχίᾳ καὶ ἀγώνια ἐκ τῶν
[ἰ]δίων ἐποίησεν, πολλὰς πρεσ-
βείας καὶ ἐκδίκιας τῇ πατρί-
di παρασχομένου, ζήσα̯ν-
tὸς τῇ ἐπιφάνειᾳ καὶ κοσμ[ι]-
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ως ἄνεστησεν Τίτος Φλά(βιος), [Δέ]-
ointo uio's, Kureina, Ἀριστό-
[λαος].


ἐτίμησαν δὲ
[kai tou's uio's aútou] Ὁράσωνα Ἰεροκλέους Δέ-
[onta Ἰε(ροκμήτην) ἀρχιερεία τῶν ΢εβαστών, γυμνασίαρ-
[χον τῶν νέων, ieré]a τοῦ Παναμάρου, καὶ Λέον-
[τα Ἰεροκλέους Θράσυωνα Ἰε(ροκμήτην) ἀρχιερεία τῶν ΢εβα-
[στῶν, γυμνασίαρχοι τῶν νέων, ieréa Δίος Χρυσαορίου]]
— τοὺς καθ’ ἥλικιαν υἱοὺς φιλοσόφου[ς,]
ἀργυρίων δόντας] μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς εἰς α[—
—ν ἀναπλήρωσην μόιρας ἀναπόστατα
—] βο(υ)λῆς καὶ τῆς γερουσίας[—
— εἰς δι]ανομὴν [—]

c. Panamara


καὶ πάλιν ιερατεύει μετὰ τῆς ἄξιολογιστάτης

Λεοντί-
[δος ἐν τοῖς Ἡραῖοις, τ]α τείμ(ια), τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ἐυσεβῶς καὶ τὰ πρὸς
τοὺς αἰνθρώπους φιλοσεμιστάτα ἐκτελέον ὡς καὶ γυμνασιστικῶν
[τελείων μεταλτερίσσα] εἰς τὰ [Παναμάροια, τιθέντα τὸ ἔλαιον ἐλκυστῶν
ἐν λουτρήσων, καὶ τοῖς Ἡραῖοις ὕσπερ τὸ πρῶτον καὶ νῦν πάν τὸ πλῆ-
[θος καλεῖν τῶν ἐλευθέρων καὶ] τῶν δούλων ἐπὶ τε τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ ἐπὶ
διακομή ἄργυριοι ὃ τε δήμος ἡμῶν βουλόμενος τὰς ἁξίας
[χάριτας ἀποδοῦσιν Μενῶν]δροὶ καὶ τῇ Λεοντίδι τετείμηκεν αὐτούς καὶ δι[ά]
τούς τοῦ ψυχίσματος, ἐπιβεβήκεν τοῦ το πλῆθος
[εἰς τιμὴν καὶ σέβασμον] τοῦ θεοῦ προγράφεθαι πάσιν τοῖς ἐπειδιδομένοι[ις]
ἐγκραφαῖς τοῦ το θεοῦ ὄνομα καὶ τὸν ιερὴ


ἰερεῖς ἔς ἱερέων ἐν Ἡραῖοις Δημήτριος [Μυρο]-
νίδου, ἱερία Στακτῆ Μενεκλέως ἱερατεύον[τες]
ἔς ἐπανελθεῖς εὐσεβῶς καὶ ἑυδόξους, ἑστιᾶσ[αν]-

 Honor -

4) Honorary inscription; second half of the third century; PHI7 Caria [Panamara] 238=IKStrat 303; BCH 28 (1904): 252-3 n. 70. Lines 1-13.
5) Honorary inscription; Imperial; PHI7 Caria [Panamara] 130=IKStrat 197. Lines 1-16.

\[\text{[ἐν Ἠραίοις τὰ} - ἐξ ἐπανγελίας Τιβ[έριος] Φλά[οιος]. Μενάνδρου ὦς, Κυ[ρεῖνα], [Θ]εοφάνης, ιερατεύσας καὶ πάντα ποιήσας εἰσέβαζος καὶ ἄξιος τῶν προγόνων κ[αὶ] τῶν γενέ̆̄s.}

[οὐν, Τιβ[έριοι] Φλ[άοιος] Μενάνδρου τοῦ τρίς ιερατεύσαντος ἐν Ἠραίοις ἔξ ἐπανγελίας, καὶ Φλ[άοιας] Λεω̆ν-]

\[τίδος τῆς ιερατεύσασας τετράκις ἐν Ἠραίοις καὶ ἀπάξ ἐν Κομώρε[ῖοι], ιερατεύσαντων [δὲ καὶ αὐτῶν τῆς μεγίστης καὶ ἐπιστή̆̄ματος θεᾶς Ἐκάτης, μεθ' ὦν ἐτέλεσαν \[γ]υμνασιαρχίαν παρ' ὀλον τῶν ἐνιαὐτοὺ̆̄ν, κατασκευάζαντες κατὰ τὰ μέγιστα τρα- \[πέζας τοῦ θεοῦ - - - - - - -]ς φιλοτείμας ΕΛΗΘΛΟΣΤΗΣ [τὴ̆̄ς πατρ[ίδι, πεπο[]- \[ῃκώς δὲ καὶ δημοθυμίας καὶ δεῖπνα πάσης] τύ[χε] δὲ ἤλεκτρικά] καὶ πάντα ποιήσας \[εἰσέβαζος μὲν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς, φιλοτεί̆̄μας [δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους] δι' ὀλον τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ[ός].]


f. Laguna

1) Honorary inscription; AD 166-9; PHI7 Caria [Lagina] 66=IKStrat 672. Lines 5-21.

τα ἀκρόαματα ἐμισθωσάμε-θα, καὶ τοὺς δεσμένους ἔτει[μή]-σαμεν, καὶ μετὰ πρωτανίαν ἐν [δυσ]-
φορῷ καιρῷ παράτειμα καὶ σείτο
καὶ ἐλαίου παρασημένου(α)μεν μεγά-
λα, καὶ μετὰ Ἰακχιστῶν ὠν[Δα]-
μύλα καὶ Δημητρίου ἐν μὲ[πει]

μύσταις καὶ τοῖς πλιστῶις τῶν π[ολι]-
tῶν τὰς διανομὰς ἔδωκαμεν

ἐν τῇ ἱερωσύνη ταύτης γυμνα·

[σιαρχάσαντες -]

2) Honorary inscription; Imperial; PHI7 Caria [Lagina] 79=IKStrat. 685; BCH 44

[ἰερεῖς ἐπι[μν]ε[γι]μ[ον][α]

"Επαίνετος δις τοῦ Γαλέστου[ν Πάμης]φιλὸς Κο[λιοργεύς], δρομὸς Αλιο-
[nίς] ἱερω[νί]ς, πλειστοῦν ἐπὶ θα[ρή]τοις ἱερεῖς γυμνῆς αὐτοῦ Φλα(οβοῦ),

[− θυμάτωρν.] Ἄρτεμνος Ἰε[ωκομήτης], ἐτέλεσαν τὴν [ἱερωσύνην] εὐσεβῶς
μὲν πρὸς

τὴν θεὸν, φιλοτήμοις δὲ πρὸς τ[οὺς πολ]εῖτας καὶ ἔνους, ἐστιάζουντες

τῇ μὲν Σεβαστῇ τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει πάντας, ἐστιάζουντες δὲ καὶ ταῖς

[ἐφοστὰς] ἔξος τοὺς ἐν τῷ περιπόλῳ καὶ [τοὺς πε]ριοικοῦντας πάντας,

γυμνα·

σιαρχάσαντες δὲ καὶ ταῖς ἐορ[τήσιμοις ἡ]μέραις καὶ τῇ κλειδαγωγ[η]

ἐν τῇ πόλει, θέντες τὸ ἐλαιον ἄν[έθην πάση τ]ύχῃ καὶ ἡλικίᾳ, καὶ τοὺς

[καλαρᾶς]−

θέντας καὶ θεατρικοὺς ἐτιμησα[ν, καὶ ἔδωκαν] τῇ τελευταίᾳ τριακάδι

dιανομήν τοῖς ἐν τῷ περιπόλῳ, ἐξ[αρίσταντο δ]ὲ καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ τοῖς 

θύσιοιν

3) Honorary inscription; Imperial; PHI7 Caria [Lagina] 97=IKStrat. 701; Robert

ἰερεῖς καὶ τῆς ἐπιφανεστάτης θεᾶς Ὑ[κάν]της ὑποσχόμε-

νοι προσόφατον, Τιθέ[ριος] ΚΛ(αύδιος), ΚΛ(αύδιος) Ἀριστέων 

ὑος, Κ[υ]λείνα,

"Ἀριστέ·

ας Μένανδρος καὶ Ἀιλ(ία), Ἀιλ(ίοο) Εἰρηναίοι θυγάτηρ, Γλύκινα,

μεθο ὀν ἐτέλεσαν ἀρχηγερσώσην ἐπὶ φιλοδοξίας καὶ κυ-

νήσιος, ἰεράσαντα καὶ τῆς θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν τε πάλιν ἱστι-

ασαν πάσαν καὶ ἔδωκαν διανοήσις ἐκάστῳ τῶν πολιτῶν

ἀνὰ δημοκρατία δύο ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ, ἐκαστοῦ δήμον ἐκ τῶν

δέλτων καλέσαντες, ἐγκυκλιάς[2]χρησάντας δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει

τῇ τῆς κλειδος παρμηθήμερας δύο πρῶτοι καὶ ἐν τῷ περι-

πόλιμῃ τῶν εἰθομενῶς ἡμέρας, ἔδωκαν δὲ καὶ τά τῆς

Σεβαστῆς δημοκρατία χεῖλι ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ τῆς ἱερωσύ-

νης ἐναυτῷ εἰς ἐπισκευὴν καὶ κατασκευὴν βαλανεῖ·
ου, οὗ ὁ πάππος τοῦ Ἀριστέου Φιλά(οιος) Αἰνέας ἀνέθηκεν τῇ πόλει. [τοῦτο] τοῦ Ἀριστέου ἀνέντος τῇ πατρίδι τῷ [αὐτῷ ἐν] οὐρανῷ τοῦ βαλανείου μέρος.

4) Honorary inscription; Imperial; PHI7 Caria [Lagina] 98=IKStrat. 702. Lines 1-6.

[=]ου[τ]οι[-] [κλειδιοφόρος —, — θυγάτηρ, —]. ἡ δὲ βιον ἰ[πεια τῆς ἐν]
[Κωράζοις Ἀρτέμιδος; συνεφιλοτιμηθῆ δὲ καὶ ἡ μήτης αὐτῆς Οὐλ(πία)
 λεοντί[ς, ἡτίς]
[καὶ αὐτῇ ἐκλειδιοφόρησεν ἐν τοῖς ἐμπροσθεν χρόνοις ἀξίως τῆς ἰδίας]
[μητρός —]
[= κα]ὶ εὐθυναρχίαιν ὑπ[ο]δε[ξαμεν]

5. Heracleia Salbace

1) Honorary inscription; Imperial; PHI7 Caria [Herakleia Salbake] 18=MAMA VI 119; Robert, (1954): n. 66. Lines 1-20.

[ὁ δήμος ἑτέρησεν]
᾽Ἀμμίαν Χα[ρ]μίδο[ν, πρυντάν]ν καὶ στεφανηφόρον, μιαν τῶν εὑρεσιότάτων ἀπὸ προγόνων βουλευτῶν, ἀγνὴν καὶ σώφρονα καὶ κεκοσμομενὴν πάση ἁεστῆ ἡθεσὶ καὶ φιλανδοίᾳ,
γυναῖκα Γαίου Ἀβουρνίου Ἐὐπτυχίαν πρωτάνεως καὶ στεφανηφόρον, δόσαν καὶ αὐτὴν διανομάς ταῖς τῶν βουλευτῶν καὶ πολειτῶν
γυναῖξιν πάσαις, διὰ τὴν παλτὸς τοῦ γένους αὐτῆς πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα εὐνοίαν τε καὶ τειχῆ.

6. Nysa


ἐπὶ τῷ ἔλαιον καυρῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναστάσει τοῦ ἀνδριάντος δόντα διανοο-
μὴν τῇ θείᾳ φιλοσεβάστῳ βουλή καὶ θέν- 
τα πάλιν ἔλαιον τῇ πόλει ἐν τοῖς γυμνα-
σίοις τῇ ηκ. τοῦ 'Ἀρτεμισίους μηνὸς ἐν ἥ καὶ ὁ ἀνδριάς ἀνεστάθη κατὰ τὰ δό-
ξαντα καὶ ψηφισθέντα τῇ τε βουλή 
καὶ τῷ δήμῳ.

7. Lycia

a. Xanthus

1) Honorary inscription; after AD 132; PHI 7 Asia Minor [Balland, Fouilles de 

Δωρεάς ἔδωκεν:
Λυκίων τῷ κοινῷ εἰς μὲν

dιανομάς μ. (υρίαδας) κε,
εἰς δὲ τὸ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἑθνικὸν
Καυσάειων μ. (υρίαδας) γ

Ξανθίως δὲ γε [ρουσία] και μ. (υρίαδας) α,

ὑπὲρ Ἕλενης μ. (υρίαδας) γ. εἰς γυναικείον
βαλανείον μ. (υρίαδας) α. εἰς τὰ ἐν τῷ
ἱερῷ ἔργα μ. (υρίαδας) β. (ήμησι), εἰς τὸ γυμνάσιον
καὶ τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ βαλανείον μ. (υρίαδας) δ. (ήμησι)
eἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν μ. (υρίαδας) γ. ὂ(λον) μ. (υρίαδας) κ. 

Παταρέυσιν εἰς μὲν στοάν τὴν

ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ γεγονούσα διπλήν πρός

τῶν λιμέν μ. (υρίαδας) δ. εἰς δὲ στομέτριον
μ. (υρίαδας) α. εἰς δὲ πανήγυριν μ. (υρίαδας) β. β’, ὡ(λον) μ. (υρίαδας) ζ β’.

Μυρεύσιν εἰς τὸ περιστύλου τοῦ

γυμνασίου καὶ τὴν σκοτύλωσιν

αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς κέινας μ. (υρίαδας) ε. ξ

Τλωεύσιν εἰς μὲν βαλανείον μ. (υρίαδας) γ

εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀγορὰν μ. (υρίαδας) ε. ὡ(λον) μ. (υρίαδας) η

πάσιν δὲ τοῖς ἐν Λυκία κατὰ πόλιν

βουλευταὶς ἀνά ἐκεῖμεν.

Ξανθίως δὲ πάσι καὶ σῖτου ἐκάστῳ ἀνά μο(δίους) ἑ

τὰ δὲ τέκνα πάντα τῶν πολείτων παιδεύ-

εϊ τε καὶ πρέπει ἐτέσιν μὲν ἐς αὐτὸς ἀνα-

δεξάμενος τῆς φροντίδας, μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ

κτήσεις καὶ ἀργύρια ἀναλείψει τῇ πόλει σὺν

ἐνιαυτῷ προενήκησι, ὡστε ἐκ τῆς προσόδου

εἰς ἀιῶνα τῆς χάριν αὐτοῦ φυλάσσωνθαι:

κάθων δὲ καὶ συνεδρικῶν τοῖς βιώσασιν,

ἐκόλουθον δὲ καὶ τὰς πενθάνας παράδειγμα.

7 Kourouniotes reads θκ.
τρέφει δὲ καὶ τοὺς πενομένους.  
τὰς στοὰς τὰς τὰς ἀπλάς καὶ τὰς διπλὰς τοῦ ἱεροῦ  
τῆς Λητοῦς ἐμπροσθείσας καὶ τὸ Καίσαρει-  
ον ἀποκαταστήσας ἕκ τῶν ἰδίων καὶ κα-  
θηρῶν τὰ ἔργα ἐδικεῖν  
τῷ μὲν βουλήτῃ καὶ γερουσίαι [κ]αὶ τοῖς  
στιμητρομένοις ἀν[ανδράσιν] ἄν[ανδρόν] [κ]αὶ  
tοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς πολείται[ς κ]αὶ  
μετοίκοις ἄνα (θραχμάς) 1.  
tόκους δὲ ἀνήκεν καὶ ἄρχαία  
ἐχαρίσατο εἰς μ(υριάδας) μ.  

b. Rhodiapolis  
1) Honorary decree; AD 124-153; IGR III 739, V 102-114=TAM II 905 V G14-H12; Kokkinia V G14-V H12.  
[aὐτὸς τε ὁ ’Οραμάδας] μετὰ πάσης φιλοτείμας τοῖς  
προγονοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀ[μιλλάται καὶ ἀνα-  
περ]βλήτων ἐπιδείκται φιλοτείμας ἐν  
tαῖς πατρίσιν καὶ ταῖς θεολογοτάταις  
tῶν ἅλων πόλεων, οὗ διαλείπει δὲ πολ-  
lά καὶ πακίλα εἰς τὸ ἐθνὸς φιλοτείμο-  
μενος, ἀρχιφυλακής τε μεγαλοψύχως  
καὶ ἐπιδοὺς τῷ ἐθνεὶ ἀργυρίων δημάρχια  
πεντάκις μύρια καὶ πεντάκις χειλία ὡστε  
tὸς κατ’ ἔτος τόκον αὐτῶν χωρεῖν εἰς δια-  
νομοῦ τοῖς συνιόσιν εἰς τὰ κοινὰ τοῦ ἐ-  
θνοὺς ἀρχαιότασι ἀρχιστάταις καὶ βου-  
λευταίς καὶ κοινοῖς ἀρχούσι καὶ τοῖς λοι-  
pοῖς τοῖς εἰς ἔθνους λαμβάνοντιν  

2) Honorary decree; AD 124-153; IGR III 739, VI 24-34=TAM II 905, VI B9-C4;  
Kokkinia VI B9-C4 (continuation of 7.b.1).  
[ἀρχιφυλακὴς Ἀντίων χρηματοπρέπῶς  
καὶ κεχαρισμοῦν τῷ ἐθεὶ (θραχμά) πεντάκ[ις]  
μύρια καὶ πεντάκις χειλία, ὡστε τὸν τόκον]  
χωρεῖν εἰς διανομῆν τοῖς ἀρχιστάταις [κ]αὶ  
tοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς εἰς ἔθνος λαμβάνον[τίν],  
tετειμημένον δὲ καὶ πρότερον ὑπὸ [τοῦ]  
κοινοῦ καὶ ταῖς τεταρτάσις τειμαίς, ἐπ[η-  
nομένον δὲ ψηφίσμασιν καὶ τειμαίς καὶ το-  
λευταίς εἰς ταῖς πρωτευούσις πόλεσιν],  
με[μαρτυρημένον δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ ἡγεμόνων  
καὶ ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπων τῷ Σεβάστω]}
3) Honorary decree; AD 124-153; IGR III 739, VI 70-85=TAM II 905 VI E12-F15; Kokkinia VI E12-VI F12 (continuation of 7.b.2).

Honorary decree; AD 124-153; IGR III 739, VI 70-85 = TAM II 905 VI E12-F15; Kokkinia VI E12-VI F12 (continuation of 7.b.2).

4) Honorary decree; AD 124-153; IGR III 739, IX 2-45; TAM II 905, IX A2-C10; Kokkinia IX A2-IX C10 (continuation of 7.b.3).

5) Honorary decree; AD 146; IGR III 739, IX 80-111=ΤΑΜ II 905 XI F1-H4; Kokkinia IX F2-IX H4 (continuation of 7.6.1).

6) Honorary decree; AD 124-153; Kokkinia XIV C10- XIV D1 (continuation of 7.b.5).

μενον τῇ πατρίδι εἰς διανομᾶς καὶ
ἀγώνας Ἀσκληπιὼν καὶ ἄφθοριον
(δημαρίων) μύρα καὶ πεντάκες χάλια: ὥν ἔτει-
μοσεν ἡ πατρίς καὶ προεδρία.

25
c. Phaselis

1) Honorary inscription; AD 146; TAM II (3) 1203; CIG III (1) 4324; SEG 31
[- - - -έτ]ε[ι][μή]σεν
Ὀπραμόραν Ἀπολλωνίου
δῖς τοῦ Καλλιάδου ᾿Ρόδι[α]-
pολείτην καὶ Μυρέα κα[.] 
Φασηλείτην, πολε[][ε][ύ]-
μενον καὶ ἐν παι[ς] κατὰ
Λυκίαν πάλαι π[άσας,
χαρισ]άμενοι καὶ τῇ ἤμε-
tέρᾳ π[ά]λιο εἰς διαν(ομᾶς
καὶ) θεωρίας (δημαρίων) μ[ύρα.....
- -][α πεντακ[όσια]

10
2) Honorary inscription; late Imperial; PHI7 Asia Minor [Lykia: TAM II.1-3] 
1200=TAM II (3) 1200; CIG III (2) 4332; IGR III 764; Laum (1964): 124 n.
140. Lines 1-26.
Φασηλείτων ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δήμος
[Π]πολεμαῖον δῖς τοῦ Καλλιά̃μοι
[Φ]ασηλείτην, ἀνδρα καλὖ[ν]
[καὶ] ἀγαθ[δ]ῇ γενόμενον καὶ [τοῦ]
[πρ]ώτον τάγματος τῆς πόλ[ε]ος,
eικοσαπρωτεύοντα κ[[- - - - - ]
μέχρι τοῦ τῆς ζωῆς χρόνου,[ς, ἑρα]-
teισάται τῆς προκαθηγέτης[ι]-
dος τῆς πόλεως βελῶν Ἀθηνᾶς
Πολιάδος καὶ τῶν βελῶν Σεβασ-
tῶν, πρωτανεύοντα φιλοτεί-
μος, ὑποφυλάσσοντα τοῦ Λυκίων
ἐθνούς, ὡς καθ' ἐκάστην ἄρχῃ
τετειμηνοῦν αὐτῶν ὑπὸ τῆς
πόλεως πολλὰ καὶ μεγα-
λα παρεσκημένον τῇ πατρίδι
ἐν τῷ τῆς ζωῆς αὐτῶν χρόνῳ,
καὶ μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν δὲ
αιωνίως δωρεάς καταλελο-
pάτα τῇ πατρίδι εἰς τὸ ἀναδήματ[α]
καὶ θεωρίας καὶ διανομᾶς ἀρετῆς

10
15
20
d. Tlos

1) Honorary inscription; AD 136; PHI7 Asia Minor [TAM II, 1-3] 578=TAM II (2) 578; IGR III 679; Laum (1964): 124 n. 139. Lines 1-30.

Τλωέων τῆς μητροπολ[εως]
tοῦ Λυκίων ἔθνους ἡ βου-
λῆ καὶ ὁ δήμος καὶ ἡ γερουσ[ία]
Οπραμιάν Ἀπολλωνίου[ν]
dιὸς τοῦ Καλλιάδου Τλ[ωέα]
καὶ Ὀρθιαπολείτηρ, πο[λει]-
tei̇omėnon δὲ καὶ ἐν τα[ίς]
kata[tά] Λυκίων πάλευτι [πά]-
σαις, τοῦ ἀρχισε[ρεά] τ[ῶν]
Σεβαστῶν καὶ γραμμα[τέα]
Λυκίων τοῦ κοινοῦ, [δι̇ εν πα]-
ρεσκε[ν] καὶ τῇ ἡμετέρ[α] πό-
λει, χαρισάμενον καὶ [ἀργυ]-
ρίου δημαρίου μυριάδα[ς ἔς]
eis τὴν τοῦ θεάτρου κα[τα]-
σκευὴν καὶ ἐξεδράς τ[ῆς]
ἐν τῷ βαλανείῳ, ἀνδρὰ μεγα[ν]-
λόφου καὶ φιλότειμον [καὶ]
φιλάγαθον καὶ πάσῃ ἀρ[ετῇ]
κεκοσμημένον, ἐπὶ τῇ <κ>[αί]
eis τὴν ἡμετέραν πόλ[ιν]
ὕπερβαλλούση μεγα[λο]-
φορύση;
διωρισάμενον καὶ κατὰ δια[θή]-
κὴν ἄγρον ἐν τῇ Κορυδαλλι-
κῇ ἐν τόπῳ Χαράδρας καὶ Παιδα-
γυνή ἐφορτά ἐπίστα αὐτὸν ἐν
πανήγυρι πενταετηρικὴν καὶ διαν[ο]-
μὴν ἀνδράσιν σειτομετρουμένοις

ἀνὰ α.
e. Kadyanda

1) Honorary inscription; late Imperial; PHI7 Asia Minor [*TAM* II, 1-3] 671=*TAM* II (3) 671. Lines 1-19.

[παλλὰ καὶ μεγάλα πεφιλοτεί]-
μημένων ἐν τῇ [πατρίδι ἰδίᾳ καὶ]
κατὰ κοινῶν τῷ Α[ικίων ἔθνει]
καὶ ἑπιδόσειν [π]ολλαῖς καὶ
οὐ μόνον εἰκοσαπρο[ωτεύσαντα],
ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν δευτέρου καὶ [πρῶτον?] 
tετελεκότα παραπράσεις [σείτου]
καὶ ἐλαίου, παρ’ ἐκαστα ποιο[ντα?] 
καὶ θέσεις ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ, [καὶ]
ἐν τῷ ἄλλῳ δὲ βίῳ ἔαυτόν πα[ρασ]-
χώντα πάση τῇ πάλει χρήσιμον[ν] ἐν
πατρός τάξει, ὡς διὰ ταῦτα πάν-
tα ὑπερβ[α]λεῖν αὐτῶν πᾶσας[ῃ τῇ]
ἀρετῆ καὶ τετειμήθαι ἐπὶ θείς
ταῖς εὐεργεσίαις ἀνδριάν-
tι εἰκονικὸ, ἤν καὶ κατέστησεν[ν]
ἡ πόλις ἐξ ἑδίων χρημάτων,
διδομένων τῇ πόλει ἱλαρ[ιον]
(δημάρχων) μύριοι τ, (δημάρχω) ἃ εἰς τή διανομήκας καὶ πανθυμον.

f. Oenoanda


[*T]*ρημησεόν τῶν πρώτων
Οὐαιμόνιος ἡ θουλὴ καὶ [δὲ]
δόμος καὶ ἡ γεροσοβία ἐτε[ί]λ-
μηρεῖν εἰκόνι χαλκῆ την
ἀξιολογότατην Μαρκι-
αν Αὐρηλίαν Πολύκλειαν
Μαλητσος Μαυσωλού Μάλητος,
γυναίκα τοῦ ἀξιολογοτάτου
Μάρκου Ἀὐρηλίου ᾽Αρτεμιόνας
β’ ᾽Απολλωσία, μεγαλοφού-
ση διαπέρσονα, διαμηναμέ-
νην καὶ συστημαμένην μετά τοῦ
ἀνδρὸς εἰς τοῦ πάντα χρόνου
καὶ αἰῶνα ἐξ οἰκείας φιλο-
τειμίας ἀγώνας θημελικῶν
καὶ τῆς ἀνέκαθεν συνηγέ-
νδος ὑπαρχόντης Τεμησοσέων
τῆς Πανφυλίας, καὶ τῆς Καισα-
g. Balbura


καὶ ΛΔΑ[- - - - -]ΙΙΛΚΛ[- - - -] αριστος καὶ ? [- - - -] παντί [ - - ]
ΛΝΕΘΙΚΕ μαρτυροθέτει δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ ἡ γεμάτων πλεονάκης ἐπὶ ταῖς
εἰς τὴν παρὰ(α) εὐποιαῖς
[προ]τυχαίωσαντα ἐν δυσθέτῳ καὶ
ῥῶ διστημώς καὶ μαρτυροθέτετα,
[τεχ]ασάμενον τῶν θεῶν Σεβα[στῶν]
με[τὰ] καὶ γυναικὸς Ἀμμίας τῆς κα[τ]
Τερ[τίας Ἐρμαιόν ἐπιφανῶς καὶ
[e]ὔστεθως ως [με]μαρτυρηθοῖ καὶ τετει-
μηθοῖ τα[ν]̃ [τει-]
μαίς, ἀνα[σ]τάσαντα καὶ εἰκόνα ὑπο-
χάλκου τοῦ κυρίου Καίσαρος
Ἀγαθείνου, ἐστιάσαντα δὲ καὶ
τὴν ἄλλη β' καὶ δόγμα διανομὴν
πάσι ἀνὰ [θηραίας τριά ἡμεν,
μαρτυρηθεῖτα δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς κρα-
τιτῆς Οἰκουμένην πόλεως διὰ
τε ψυφίσματος καὶ ἐπιστολῶν

h. Bubon


[B]ουβονε[τὼν ἡ] βο[υλή καὶ ὁ ὅη]-
μο[ς ..]έτει[μη]σεν 10[.........]
vestigia incerta
Μο[λ]εσσας Β[ου]βουέα ν[.....]
κα[ν], ἀνδρα σε[μν]όν καὶ ἀγαθ[ὸν καὶ με]-
γαλόφρονα, ἢθει καὶ δόξη διε[νέκαντα]
Ἰ[.....]ποντά τῇ πατρίδι εἰς [.....]
ΔΕίων γέν[ο]υς υπάρξαν[.....]
ἀπὸ προγόνων πᾶσας ἀρχ[ᾶς]
φιλοτέιμως τελεσάντων, συνγε-
νὴ λυκιαρχ[ῶ]ν καὶ ἔθνων [ἀρ]-
χ[ό]ντων, διαθέμενον δὲ[έ]
καὶ κα]ταλιπόντα εἰς ἡμίσουσ
[μ]έ[ρ]ος κληρονόμον τὴν
πόλιν, ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς προσόδου
ἐργοὺς κοσμηθήσαν, καὶ ἔξω-
θέλει εἰς τε διανομάς καὶ ἐλε-
πεωσίων καὶ ἄγωνας, ἀναστα-
θήναι δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ οὕς διετά-
ξατο γενέσθαι ἀνδριάντας,
τειμάσθαι δὲ αὐτῶν καθ’ ἐτος
καὶ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν εἰσγραφὴν τει-
μαίς.

8. Phrygia
a. Aizani
1) Honorary inscription; before AD 156/7; SEG 25 (1985): 1365=MDAI 35
Μ. Οὔλ. 'Ἀποστολικὴν Φλαβια-
νῶν εώς ὁ Οὔλ. 'Ἀποστολήν Φλα-
βιανοῦ Ἀρχιερέως Ἀσίας ναῶν
τῶν ἐν Περγάμῳ ἔτειμον ἡ βου-
λή καὶ ὁ δήμος ὁ Αἰζαι τῶν τῶν
ἐκατόν εὐθεῖαν εὐσεβῆ
καὶ φιλόπολιν ἄρχονθες ταῦτα
τῶν πρῶτων διατεθέστων θεῶν
καὶ εἰς παραξένους γὰς καὶ βολαρ-
χήσαι καὶ στρατηγήσαι ἐπι-
φανῶς καὶ ἱερατεύσαι τοῦ Διὸς φι-
λοτήμως καὶ ἐν στιτόδεια ἐρευνώ-
σαντα τὴν τιμὴν εἰσθησαί τοῖς ἀρβώ-
νοι παρασχόμενα τῇ τῇ Ἀσίᾳ καὶ τῇ πόλει
ἄργοραῖος ἄγαντος Ἀρχιερέως Λατιναίου καὶ
ἰερείς τοῦ Διὸς διὰ βίου καὶ πρῶτων
καὶ ἄρχονθες τῶν μεγάλων πεν-
9. Bithynia and Pontus
   a. Sebastopolis Heracleipolis
      Γ. Ἰούλιος Βάσσων
      ἀπὸ στρατιῶν φιλό-
      πατρίων γενόμενον,
      ὡς καὶ διανομᾶς κα-
      ταλιστῶν τῇ πατρίς[1]-
      δεί καθ’ ἐν ἐκδότι
      τῇ Βουλῇ καὶ ἴδμων ἀνθρίαντα αὐ-
      τοῦ ἀνασταθείν

10. Galatia
   a. Ancyra
      1) Honorary inscription; reign of Hadrian; PHI 7 Asia Minor [Bosch, Quellen
      Τιβ. Κλα(υδίου) Βόκχον, Τιβ.
      Κλα(υδίου) Ἀλεξάνδρου γαλα-
      τάρχου υἱόν, ἐκγονο
      τετράρχου, χιλιαρχή-
      σαντα ἐν λεγών γ' Κυ-
      ρηναική ἀρχιερησα-
      μενον τῷ κοινῷ τῆς
      Γαλατείας, ἀλείφαντα
      μεγαλοπρεπῶς, παλλὰς
      διανομᾶς ἐπίδοντα τῇ πα-
      τρίδι, ἄρξαντα ἐπισήμως,
      σεβαστοφάντων, εἰρηνάρ-
      χων, vac. παί-
      δείρ. κ[αι λόγῳ καὶ] μετριά-
      τητι δι[απρέψ]-
      αντα, ἐτίμησε

τὴν ἐκ βασιλείων

Λατεινίας Κλεοπά-

τραγ, θυγατέρα Λατει-

νίας Ἀλεξάνδρου, β

ἀρχηγοῦς σεβαστο-

τοῦ ἀλέητατος ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων

λαμπρῶτατα [τῶν] πρὸ αὐτοῦ

dιὰ ὅλου τοῦ ἐτους, ἐπὶ (τῆς τοῦ μεγίστου

Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τραιανοῦ

‘Αδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ παρόδου καὶ τῶν

ἰερῶν αὐτοῦ στρατευμάτων δόντως
dιανομάς τῇ πόλει ἀρχαίονος ὁμοῦ

καὶ εἰρημνοχρήστως ἀγνῶς καὶ ἐπι-

στήμοις, πανδείκτη καὶ λόγῳ κοσμοῦ-

τος τὴν μητρόπολιν

5

10

15


[Τι. Ἰουλίον Ἰουστον]

Ἰουλίον[αυόν, γ] ἀρχιε-

ρέα, κ(τ)ή(του) τ(η)(ς) μετρο-

πάλεως, πολύφρα καὶ στε-

φάνω διὰ βίου τετειμημέ-

νον, φιλόπατριν, πάσης

dιενεγκόντα φιλοτειμί-

ας, καὶ ἐν τῇ διανομῇ τῆς

πατρίδα πλουτισματο ἐρ-

γος τέ καὶ περικαλλεστά-

των κοσμήσαντα, καὶ μόνον
tῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ διὰ ὅλης ἐλε-

οθετήσαντα τῆς ὅμερας, ἐ-

πιμελήθετα δὲ καὶ τῆς κατα-

σκευῆς τοῦ βαλανείου, φυλή

Μακαραγηνή ἐτείμικτεν.

5

10

15


[Τι. Ἰουλίον Ἰουστον Ἰουλι-

αόν, γ] ἀρχηγοῦς κτίστην

tῆς μητρόπολεως, πολύφρα.
κε στεφάνι κα δια βίου τε-
τεμπυμένον, φιλόπατριν,
πάσας [διενεγκώντα φιλο-
tεμειαίος, και [ἐν τε διανομαίος]
<τ>ην πατρίδα π[λατύσαντα ἐρ]-
<γ>οις τε (ὑ)ερικάλ[λεστάτων κοσ]-
κόμαντα, κε [μόνον τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ δι' ὅ]' 
λος ἐλαλήτησαντα [τῆς ἡμέρας, ἐπι]-
μεληθέντα δε κε τῆς κατασκευῆς τοῦ
βαλαγείου, φυλή Σεβαστή τῇ ἐτίμησεν].

5) Honorary inscription; reign of Caracalla; PHI7 Asia Minor [Bosch, Quellen
Τι Ἰουλίου Ἰουστόν Ἰουσ-
ανὸν, γ ἀρχιερέα, κτίστη
tῆς μυηπρόπελος, πορφύρα
κε στεφάνια δια βίου τετεμ-
υμένον, φιλόπατριν, πάσας[α]ς
διενεγκώντα φιλοτεμί-
αίος κε ἐν τε διανομαίος πλου-
tύσαντα την πατρίδα ἐγγος
τε περικαλλεστάτως κοσμή-
σαντα, κε μόνον τῶν πρὸ αὐ-
tοῦ δι' ὅlocs ἐλαλήτησαν-
tα τῆς ἡμέρας, ἐπιμεληθέν-
tα δε κε τῆς κατασκευῆς
τοῦ βαλαγείου, φυλή Δι-
ὸς Ταρπού ἐτίμησεν.

6) Honorary inscription; reign of Caracalla; PHI7 Asia Minor [Bosch, Quellen
Τι Ἰουλίου Ἰουστόν Ἰουσ-
ανὸν, γ ἀρχιερέα, κτίστη
tῆς μυηπρόπελος, πορφύρα
κε στεφάνια δια βίου τετε-
μημένον, φιλόπατριν, πά-
σας διενεγκώντα φιλοτε-
μίαος, κε ἐν τε διανομαῖος πλου-
tύσαντα την πατρίδα ἐγγος
τε περικαλλεστάτως κο-
σμήσαντα, κε μόνον τῶν
πρὸ αὐτοῦ δι' ὅlocs ἐλαλ-
θετήσαντα τῆς ἡμέρας, ἐπιμε-


Τι Ιουλιον 'Ιουπτον 'Ιουνια̃νον, γ άρχιερέα, κτίστην τῆς μνημοπόλεως, πορφύραι κε στεφάνιι διὰ βίου τετημημένου, φιλόπατριν, πάσας διενεχόντα φιλοτιμίας κε εν τε διανομαίς πλούτισαντα την πατρίδα έργοις τε περικαλλευτάτοις κοσμήσαντα, κε μόνον τῶν προ αὐτοῦ δι’ ἐλθείσης ελαιοθητίσαντα τῆς ἡμέρας, ἐπιμεληθέντα δε κε τῆς κατασκευής του βαλανείου, φυλη Διὸς Τραπεζώνν ετήσιας ετήσιας.

11. Pamphylia
   a. Selge


αρχιερασάμενον του οίκου τῶν Σέβαστῶν ἐπιφανεώς ἐπὶ τε διανομαίς καὶ θεωρίαις καὶ μανομαχίαις καὶ κομψεσισι καὶ ἀρχιεραθέτην διὰ βίου καὶ γένους ἀγώνων πολεμικῶν τε καὶ πενταετρικοῖ, πρόεδρον, φιλόπατριν, ἀρχιεραθήτην, ιερεὰ Βύσσης τῆς πόλεως διὰ βίου, ἄνθρωπον ἐν πάσαις φιλοτεμιμίαις καὶ λειτουργίαις κρήσιμον τῇ πόλει, Πά. Πλάγκιον Μαγνιώ[ν Αιλιαλον ᾿Αρριν Περί]-[κλέα κτλ.]
APPENDIX 2: INSCRIPTIONS OMITTED FROM THE CATALOGUE

1. Aegean Islands
   a. Doric Sporades: Asupalaea
      1) Honorary; imperial; PHI7 Aegean Islands General [XII, 3 %9 Suppl. Doric
         Sporades] 219=IG XΠ (3) 219
         ἀ γερουσία ἐτε[μησε τὸν δεῖνα --] -
         νοκράτως [ἐπαίνῳ εἰκόνι χαλ]-
         κέαι καὶ ἄγ[άλματι ἕρωκόφ (?) καὶ]
         χρυσέως στ[εφάνως τοῖς μεγί]-
         στοις ἐκ το[ῦ νόμου -- τὸν ἀποκατα]-
         στασάμενον τὸ συμπεσὸν (?) συν]-
         ἐδριών τάς [γερουσίας ποιησάμε]-
         νόν τε καὶ σε[ῖτου διανομᾶς]
         ὅκ ἁλίγας [ἐκάστοτε πολείτα (?)]
         ἀρετῶς ἐν[κα καὶ εὐνοίας --]
         ὄν ἐχουν δ[ιατελεί εἰς αὐτάν]

2. Ionia
   a. Ephesus
      1) Honorary; reign of Antoninus Pius; PHI7 Ionia [Ephesos] 1448.1-24=IEph.
         4342.
         [ὁ δήμος]
         [τῷ] δήσ πρώτης κα[ί]
         [μοι]νιστής [μνημο][α]-
         [τῷ]λεώς τῇς [Ἀ[σίας]
         καὶ δ[ις νεω]κ[έ]-
         [φο][υ το[ν Σεβα]στώ][ν]
         [Ἐ]φεσίων [πόλ]εως[ν]
         ἐπείμ[ησεν]
         [Τ(ίτον) Φ]λά[σιν]ν "Ιου[λιαν]ν
         π[τ]υταν[ν, νο[ν]ν Φλα(σιν]:
         [Ἀ]ντ[ίοχου] ν ἀναξ[ον]
         [Ε]λεον[ον Τ(ίτον) [Φλα(σιν]ν Πυ[βίων[ος]
         ἀσιάρακον, [ἐπιστάτησθην ἐργον]
         μεγάλου[ν, τὸν φιλοτεχνίας [καὶ]
         [α]ναλώμα[σι ἀργυρίῳ]ν καὶ δ[ιανόε]-
         [μαίς] καὶ [δ[ιαπάνως κραμῳδόν][τα]
         [γραμμ]ατεύ(οντα την πα]τρίδα
         [-][τα[-][α]
2) Honorary; AD 140; PHI7 Ionia [Ephesos] 1109.1-23=IEph. 618=Oliver, Sacred Gerousia 9.

M(αρκαν) Οὖλπιον

'Ιεροκλέους

'Αριστοκράτην

Κεραμικήτην, ἄρχηνερα 'Ασ[η]-

ας ναϊν τῶν ἐν Ἑφέσῳ καὶ [άγω]-

νοθέτην τῶν μεγάλων ['Αδρια]-

νείν τῆς δευτέρας πε[υτᾶ]-

τηρίδος, δόμα τάς ὑπὲ[ρ τής ἄρ]-

χειρ(ω)σύνης μυριάδας [− εἰς]

τῆν κατασκευὴν τ[−]

[κ]αὶ ἄλλας μυριάδας [− εἰς τό]

[...].εριν, δοθέντα [δὲ καὶ λογίσ]-

[τῇ]ν ὑπὸ θεοῦ 'Ἀδριανοῦ [τῆ φι]-

[λ]ογοβάστω γερουσία, φ[−]

.θεντα δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ μεγ[ιστου]

Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρας [Τίτου]

Αἰλίου 'Ἀδριανοῦ 'Αὐτωνεί[νου]

Σεβαστοῦ Εὐσ[εβ]ίοις ε[−]

ὦ ἄμα καὶ δεκάκις δ[αυομόν] ἐποίησε τῇ]

γερουσία λογίσ[ειας ἐνεκεν εἰς]

σι μ(υρίαδας) ἐ', ἡ φιλοσέβ(αστος) [γερουσία]

τῆς [πρώτης καὶ μεγίστης 'Ἐφε]-

[πίσων πόλεως −]


[--][−]

[--][ων ἰ[−]

[−] δίς ἐπ[αρχαν −]

[τελέσ]αυτά παρ[᾽ ἐαυτοῦ]

[φιλοθ]ειῶν [−]

[--] καὶ δ[αυομόν]

[pαλ]ν[[ε]λέστα[τα −]

[--]
b. Didyma

1) Honorary; reign of Hadrian; PHI7 Ionia [Didyma] 475.1-20=RPh 23 (1899):
315-7 no. 32=Did 329.

[ὑδροφόρος Ἰουλία] πατ[ο]ίος Ἰουλίαν Καλλιτ[-]
[.α. ιπτετελεκτα τά]

μισθήσια τοις θεοῖς καὶ

[iποποιστικός] ιπτετελεκτα τά

[τοῖς κατακόρους τό ιερὸν ἐ-]

[παράδειγμα? ] τε καὶ ἐλαίοθε-

[ήτος καὶ] θέωρε ης ἐπί τε τοῦ-

[τοῖς τε] τιμηθείσης ὑπὸ

[τε τῆς] βουλής καὶ τοῦ δήμου-

[προφθευτῶν] Μ(άρκος) 'Ουλίπιον Σωτ(έου]

[ϕιλο]δοξοῦ, ταμειεύον-

[τοὺς Κηρίθοις τοῦ Ἀπατο-

[νοῦ, ἐπὶ στε(φανη)φόρου Μ(άρκος) 'Αν-

[τ]ωνίου 'Αδριανοῦ Καπί-

[τοῦς]

2) Honorary; 129-100 BC; PHI7 Ionia [Priene] 66III.45, 90-100=IPriene 108.89-100.

σκευασματικαὶ ἐπὶ δὲ στεφανοφόρου Κέκτητος οὗ μόνου

[προφθευτῶν] γενομένης τῆς [τὸ]ίερ] 

[κρείας, ἀ] καὶ παραστά-

[σεως ἐνεχύρων, διαλαβ[ων] καὶ οὐαίαν πάν-

[tων τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τ]ων καθηκοντῶν διαλαβ[ων] ἡ[. ο[...]?

[— τὸν ἄρειφον —]
3. Caria

a. Olymos


[ ]EMA[ ]

[ ] πα[πα][γγνόμενος ουθένα καίρόν πα[πα]-

[λιπτού - κατά] τήν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν, ἐναποδεικνύμενος[νος]

[τήν πρὸς τὸ πλῆθ[θον εὐφορίαν ἦν οὖν καὶ ὁ δῆμο[ν]

[έ Ολυμπέων φαίνεται μεθείν] δεικτόμενος ἐν χαρίσματι ἀπόδοσει,

[ἀλλὰ μεμνημένος τῶν καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῆν ἄνδρων φαίνεται

[τὴν καταξίαν αὐτοῦ χάριτα καὶ τιμὴν ἀ]πονέμων ἀγα[θία]

[τόφων δεδοχθαί ἐπημήνησαι Φαίδρον Μ]ουσχίωνος ιερεῖ[κα]

[Δαμόκλων Ἀγαθῶν Παρεμβορέθεα καὶ στ]εφανώσαι [αὐτόν]

[χρυσῶι στεφάνῳ στήσας δὲ γραπτὴν αὐτοῦ εἰκόνα [ἐν]

[τῶν ἱερῶν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἐν τῶι ἐπιφανεστάτωι] τόπωι, αὐ[τοῦ]

[ὑφηγηθεμένου, οὐτερ ἄν αὐτοὶ ἐπιτηθεῖσα] τατον [εἰναι]

[φαίνεται καὶ ἐπιγράφῃς πονηρωθαι τῇμεν ὑπὸ]

[ὁ δήμος ὁ Ολυμπέων ἐτιμησεν Φαίδρον Μουσχίωνος ιε]ρεϊ

[Δαμόκλων Ἀγαθῶν ἐπαίνιοι, εἰκόνα γραπτὴ] καὶ χρου[στῶ]

[στεφάνῳ, ὅτι — πα]γενόμενος[νος;]

[ὑπόλυτομοι καὶ ἐκεῖνοι αὐτοῦ παρέσχεν, πάσῃ] προνοια [χρη];

[σάμενος εἰς πάντα τὰ ἐπείγοντα, μετὰ δὲ ταύτη[ν, ἐπιτήθη [κρεά]

[κόμος; ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἀποδεικθεῖς, ὅτε ἦν ἰδιωσία, ἐμ πά[ς]ας

[ταῖς διανοιαῖς ταῖς κατὰ τῶν νόμων; γεγενημέναις [ἐκάστοις]

[τῶν μετεχόντων τὴν καθήκουσαν μεροῦς μέχρι τοῦ;δὲ]

[ἀσκοῦν διαστελεῖ ἀνακρίδων δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶνι τῶν σωτῆς[φο]-

[—I - ἀναγόμαθαι δὲ τόδε;]  


[καὶ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος θείων τῶν Ὀλυμπέων ἐν τωδε ἐπ[τι]φανεστάτῳ]

[τότων τὸ δὲ γινόμενον εἰς τὴν ἀναγραφὴν ἀνάλογα δοῦναι τοῖς]

[ταμίας ἓκ τῶν κοινῶν προσθέδων τῶν μη εἰς ἀλλα ἀποτετ[αγ]-

[μένων.]
b. Panamara

1) Honorary; no date; PHI7 Caria [Panamara] 234.1-7=IKStrat 299=BCH 28 (1904): 243 no. 51.

[ierw] - úí[í], Tatiainó [ ... ] ier[ei[a] 'A[riostn[i]-
[κφ, - θυγάτη, Μάγα[λον 'Ιεροκομίας], το δίς εν Κομφρίος,
[ὑποδεξαμένου μεγαλοπρεπῆς πῶν] τα τούς ἄνελθοντας ἵνα τὸ ἱερῷ,
[πᾶναν τῶν και ἥλικιαν, ἀπέδοσαν τῇ δίπταν τοὺς κομίσασιν, ἀπέδοσαν
[δὲ καὶ τὰς διανομὰς καὶ τὰλλα πάντα ἐπ]οίησαν, τὰς τῶν Παναμαρείων ὃ-
[mέρας δέκα ἄδιαλλίπτως ἐγκυμνασάρ]χησαν καὶ τὴν τετράδα τῇ παρ[α]-
[λήψι τοῦ θεοῦ –]

4. Lycia

a. Rhodiapolis


[iως ἐ-
[πὶ πάσιν τοῖς καὶ πρῶτοι καὶ νῦν] τειμᾶν τε αὐτοῦ καὶ "καθαμάζων καὶ

E1
[νεῦ τὰς ἀξιολογωτάτας τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχείᾳ] πόλεω[ν, τειμάσθαι] δὲ [ταῖς

G14
[a', καὶ b']
[kαὶ γ' καὶ δ' τεμω[ὰς, συνκαταθεμένου καὶ τοῦ κα]τάςτο[ν ἡγεμόνος,

[ψιθ]ξε[θαι δέ αὐτόν]]
[ἐν τῷ ἑθελε καὶ πρῶτον τειμᾶν πορφύρα διὰ βίου καὶ προέδρια

di[ηθεὶ καὶ ταῖς]
[kατ’ ἐτο[ς τεμω[άς, ἐπὶ τῷ δωρεᾷ, ἣν εἰς διανομήν] τοὺς ἀρχοτάτας?

E5
[ἐπὶ δ[εδοκεν καὶ πολεί-]
[τε[ιαὶς] ἐν ταῖς ἀξιολογωτάταις πόλεις τετειμῆσθαι, καὶ ὑπὸ ἧμε]ρ[όνο

[καὶ ἐπηρόμοι]]
[τού Σεβαστοῦ μεμαρτυρηθῆσαι, ἐπὶ τε τοῖς ἀναλύμασιν καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ το[ῦ]

[βίου ἁρετή? – – –]

5. Mysia

a. Pergamon

1) Honorary; Hellenistic; IPerg245c ll 41-51.

tα Σέλευκο[ν τῷ πρῶτος Λυσι]μαχοῦ μάχηι ἐπὶκρατήσαντος ὁ úιὸς αὐτοῦ

Διαδεξάμενος

τὴν βασιλείαν ('Αντίοχος τὴν πεδ[ίαν κόσμοι]αὐτοῖς ἐπιλύσαν μετ' ἀντί-

τα τουτίς πίστεως

τριακοντάτα καὶ π[οροσ]οισέραξεν ἀλλ' [τ }//λαντα πεντήκοντα καὶ περὶ

τούτων τὰς πίστεις

ἐγγράφοις παρατίθε[σθαι]ν, δόντος ε[ἰς τ]αύτα Πιταναίοις καὶ Φιλέταίρου

τ[άλαντα τεσσαράκτα]?-

κοντα, καθότι ἐκ τῆς ἀνα[γεγραμμένης πα]λο[' ῥημῖν ἐν τῶι ἱερῷ τῆς

'Aθηναι[' ἐπιστόλο[ο]ν[τον στῇ]-

λῆς, καὶ ὡς ἡ παρακτητικὴ τῆς χ[ώρας κυρε]ία καὶ διὰ τῶν ἐγγράφω[ν ἐπὶ
6. Pamphylia
a. Selge

1) Honorary; second century?; IKSelge 17

[- -] συνεργισμένος, ἵστατο τῇ πόλει, ἔχων τὴν "Ἀρείων αὐτοῦ τῷ κατ.[- -] ἐσκευα-]
κότος σὺν τῷ πελαγός, ἐπόθεν οὐδεὶς ἑβδομήνην [±-- ±--] ἔτη ἐπικοινώνησε πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
μυ[±--] ἑτησίων διαπέφυγον, ἐπικοινώνησε τῇ πόλει [±-- ±--] Ἐπικοινώνησε πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
[- -] κτίσματος τῆς πόλεως καὶ τοῦ Ἀρείου τῶν ἐν τῷ κατ [±-- ±--] πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
κότος σὺν τῷ πελαγός, ἐπόθεν οὐδεὶς ἑβδομήνην [±-- ±--] ἔτη ἐπικοινώνησε πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
[- -] κτίσματος τῆς πόλεως καὶ τοῦ Ἀρείου τῶν ἐν τῷ κατ [±-- ±--] πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
κότος σὺν τῷ πελαγός, ἐπόθεν οὐδεὶς ἑβδομήνην [±-- ±--] ἔτη ἐπικοινώνησε πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
[- -] κτίσματος τῆς πόλεως καὶ τοῦ Ἀρείου τῶν ἐν τῷ κατ [±-- ±--] πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
κότος σὺν τῷ πελαγός, ἐπόθεν οὐδεὶς ἑβδομήνην [±-- ±--] ἔτη ἐπικοινώνησε πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
κότος σὺν τῷ πελαγός, ἐπόθεν οὐδεὶς ἑβδομήνην [±-- ±--] ἔτη ἐπικοινώνησε πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
κότος σὺν τῷ πελαγός, ἐπόθεν οὐδεὶς ἑβδομήνην [±-- ±--] ἔτη ἐπικοινώνησε πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
κότος σὺν τῷ πελαγός, ἐπόθεν οὐδεὶς ἑβδομήνην [±-- ±--] ἔτη ἐπικοινώνησε πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
κότος σὺν τῷ πελαγός, ἐπόθεν οὐδεὶς ἑβδομήνην [±-- ±--] ἔτη ἐπικοινώνησε πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
κότος σὺν τῷ πελαγός, ἐπόθεν οὐδεὶς ἑβδομήνην [±-- ±--] ἔτη ἐπικοινώνησε πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
κότος σὺν τῷ πελαγός, ἐπόθεν οὐδεὶς ἑβδομήνην [±-- ±--] ἔτη ἐπικοινώνησε πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
κότος σὺν τῷ πελαγός, ἐπόθεν οὐδεὶς ἑβδομήνην [±-- ±--] ἔτη ἐπικοινώνησε πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
κότος σὺν τῷ πελαγός, ἐπόθεν οὐδεὶς ἑβδομήνην [±-- ±--] ἔτη ἐπικοινώνησε πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
κότος σὺν τῷ πελαγός, ἐπόθεν οὐδεὶς ἑβδομήνην [±-- ±--] ἔτη ἐπικοινώνησε πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
κότος σὺν τῷ πελαγός, ἐπόθεν οὐδεὶς ἑβδομήνην [±-- ±--] ἔτη ἐπικοινώνησε πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
κότος σὺν τῷ πελαγός, ἐπόθεν οὐδεὶς ἑβδομήνην [±-- ±--] ἔτη ἐπικοινώνησε πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
κότος σὺν τῷ πελαγός, ἐπόθεν οὐδεὶς ἑβδομήνην [±-- ±--] ἔτη ἐπικοινώνησε πολλὰ πολλὰ καὶ σε]-
εἰς συμαίνεσιν 1 τῆς πατρίδος [καὶ εἰς διανομὰς βουλευτῶν καὶ 20 ἐκκλησίας ἱερῶν]
καὶ τέκνων αὐτῶν. Κ[ατὰ] τὰ γεγονότα αὐτῇ ἡμῖν ψηφίσματα τὸν Ἰ[η
cαθιστάμενα] [ἀνέστησεν]
1 ἡ πατρίς ἐκ
δημοσίων χρημάτων.
### APPENDIX 3

Table 2.1a.: Verbs and Verb forms used with διανομή

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Θέμα</th>
<th>Βόησις</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1</strong></td>
<td>+ διανομή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1.a</strong></td>
<td>δώσε (4.d.3 x2, 5, 7 x2, 8, 9 x2, 6.e.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1.b</strong></td>
<td>δώσα (4.d.2, 4, 12, 14 x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1.c</strong></td>
<td>δόστα (1.a.1, 1.b.1, 2; 3.c.2; 4.b.15; 4.c.1; 6.h.1; 7.g.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1.d</strong></td>
<td>δώσαν (4.b.9; 4.d.11; 6.g.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1.e</strong></td>
<td>δόντες (6.e.2, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1.f</strong></td>
<td>δόντος (4.h.4, 11; 10.a.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1.g</strong></td>
<td>δεδοκότα (6.c.5 x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1.h</strong></td>
<td>δεδοθήκα (4.b.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1.i</strong></td>
<td>δεδονα (6.b.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1.j</strong></td>
<td>δεδοθαν (4.a.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1.k</strong></td>
<td>εδώκεν (4.d.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1.l</strong></td>
<td>εδωκαμεν (6.f.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1.m</strong></td>
<td>εδωκαν (6.f.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.2</strong></td>
<td>+ διανομής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.2.a</strong></td>
<td>δώστα (1.d.1; 6.a.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.2.b</strong></td>
<td>διδόθακα (4.e.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.2.c</strong></td>
<td>εδώκεν (3.b.1 x3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.2.d</strong></td>
<td>εδωκαν (6.f.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.3</strong></td>
<td>+ εις διανομή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.3.a</strong></td>
<td>δώσει (4.b.7 x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.3.b</strong></td>
<td>διδοθεί (4.b.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.3.c</strong></td>
<td>εδωκαν (7.a.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.4.a</strong></td>
<td>επιδότα διανομάς (10.a.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Καταλείπω</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.1</strong></td>
<td>+ διανομή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.1.a</strong></td>
<td>καταλιπότα (5.c.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.1.b</strong></td>
<td>καταλείπεται (9.a.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.1.c</strong></td>
<td>λέγεται δημόπολ εάν τού τόκου αυτών (4.d.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.2</strong></td>
<td>+ εις διανομή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.2.a</strong></td>
<td>καταλιπότα κατά διαθήκη (5.b.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.2.b</strong></td>
<td>καταλιπότα είς ομοιότης μέρους κληρονόμου (7.h.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.2.c</strong></td>
<td>καταλείποντα αδελφίας δορεάς (7.c.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>'Ανατίθημι</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.1</strong></td>
<td>+ εις διανομή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.1.a</strong></td>
<td>ἀναθείτα ἀφηγορίου (6.c.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.1.b</strong></td>
<td>ἀναθείτα ἀφηγορίου ἄρχα ἐ (6.c.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.1.c</strong></td>
<td>ἀναθείτας τοῦ τόκου ἀπὸ δημάρχου μυρίων χρησίμων (6.c.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.1.d</strong></td>
<td>ἀναθεικός ἀφηγορίου (6.c.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.1.e</strong></td>
<td>ἀναθεικότα ἐχθρίατο (6.c.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Λαμβάνω</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D.1.a</strong></td>
<td>λαμβάνων διανομή (4.b.1 x2, 2 x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ποιέω</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.1.a</strong></td>
<td>ἐποιήσατο διανομή (2.a.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.b</td>
<td>ἐποίητος διανομήν (3.a.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.c</td>
<td>πεποιημένος ἐπίδοσεις διανομῶν (4.d.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.d</td>
<td>πεποιημένον ἐπίδοσες εἰς διανομάς (7.b.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.e</td>
<td>ποιήμενος διαφεύγει εἰς διανομήν (7.b.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xωρεώ</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.1.a</td>
<td>χωρεῖ εἰς διανομήν (7.b.1, 2, 3, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.1</td>
<td>+ εἰς διανομήν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.1.a</td>
<td>κεκάστησεν άδιόν διώξεν (7.b.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.1.b</td>
<td>καρδισμένον ἁρπαῖο (7.b.7, 7.c.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διωρεώ</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.1.a</td>
<td>διδωσομένον ἀργοί (7.e.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.1.b</td>
<td>δοθημένου κατά διαθήκην (7.d.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mερήμαι</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.a.1</td>
<td>διανομή μεσοίζεται (3.c.1 x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual attestations</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>διανομήν γενέσθαι (4.b.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>ἐστι διανομή (4.b.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>διδώσατε ἀργούν (7) εἰς διανομὰς (6.e.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ἔπωροντο τὰς διανομὰς (6.d.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>τιθέοντο τὸ παλέον ἑδος τῶν διανομῶν (1.c.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>ἔπετελε διανομή (4.b.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>προκατάγχοντα διανομήν (4.d.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>ἀποτελεῖ τοιὴ δυναμαί μέρας εἰς διανομήν (4.d.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>ἀναπληρῶν ταῖς διανομαίς (6.d.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>ἔριζαν ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τῆς πανθρῖνας διανομῆς (7.f.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>καλεῖ ἐπὶ διανομὴ (6.e.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>ἀναινευμένος διανομής (4.d.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participles of Office</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.1</td>
<td>+ διανομάς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.1.a</td>
<td>ἄγιοντέτευ (8.a.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.2</td>
<td>+ ἐν διανομάς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.2.a</td>
<td>ἄγιοντετεύνα (5.a.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.2.b</td>
<td>πλούτιστα ἡ πατρία (10.a.3-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.2.c</td>
<td>ἀναλαμπότως τά ἱερασίων (6.e.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.3.1</td>
<td>ἀγριεραγμένου ἐπὶ διανομάς (11.a.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.4.1</td>
<td>μετὰ διανομᾶς (6.f.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.5.1</td>
<td>εὐδακμῆτρας ἡμῶν εἰς διανομᾶς (4.b.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.6.1</td>
<td>γυμνοσχησάμεν ἀνοίγει (4.c.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Verb</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.1</td>
<td>διανομήν (2.a.1; 4.b.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.2</td>
<td>διανομῆς (6.b.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.3</td>
<td>διανομῆ (4.b.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.5a: Catalogue entries recording occasions on which διανομαί were provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Entries</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office or public service</td>
<td>1.b.1, 1.d.1, 3.b.1 (x2), 3.c.2, 4.b.1 (x2), 4.b.2 (x2), 4.b.4, 4.b.9, 4.b.11, 4.b.15, 4.c.2, 4.d.1, 4.d.2, 4.d.3, 4.d.4, 4.d.5, 4.d.6, 4.d.7, 4.d.8, 4.d.9, 4.d.10, 4.d.11, 4.d.12, 4.d.14, 5.c.1, 6.a.1, 6.c.5 (x2), 6.d.2, 6.e.4, 6.f.1, 6.f.4, 6.g.1, 7.g.1, 10.a.1, 10.a.3, 10.a.4, 10.a.5, 10.a.6, 10.a.7, 11.a.1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festival celebration</td>
<td>2.a.2, 3.b.1, 3.c.1 (x2), 4.b.3, 4.b.6 (x2), 4.b.7 (x2), 4.b.8, 4.b.12, 4.d.3, 4.d.7, 4.d.8, 4.d.9, 4.d.14, 6.e.1, 6.e.2, 6.e.3, 6.e.5, 6.f.2, 6.f.3, 7.a.1, 7.b.1, 7.b.2, 7.b.3, 7.b.4 (x2), 7.b.5, 7.b.6, 7.c.1, 7.e.1, 7.f.1, 7.h.1, 8.a.1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthday or funeral</td>
<td>4.a.1, 4.b.16, 4.d.13, 4.e.1, 5.b.1, 5.c.1, 6.b.1, 6.c.2, 6.c.3, 6.c.4 (x2), 6.c.5, 7.c.2, 7.d.1, 9.a.1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statue dedication</td>
<td>1.a.1, 4.b.14, 4.c.1, 6.c.1, 6.h.1, 7.b.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Customary' διανομή</td>
<td>1.c.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial visit</td>
<td>10.a.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>3.a.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1.b.2, 2.a.1, 4.b.5, 4.b.13, 6.d.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4.b.10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 1: Black Sea Region
(CAH [2] vol. 10, map 7, facing pg. 117)
Map 2: The Aegean Sea and Western Asia Minor (Livy, vol. 10, Map 2, Loeb Classical Library)
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