

F. CAMIA

LYKOS, SON OF HERMOLAOS, *HIEREUS HEPTAETERIKOS* OF THE *SEBASTOI*
EMPEROR WORSHIP AND TRADITIONAL CULTS AT THESSALIAN HYPATA
(*SEG* 54, 556)

aus: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 179 (2011) 145–154

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

LYKOS, SON OF HERMOLAOS, *HIEREUS HEPTAETERIKOS* OF THE *SEBASTOI*
EMPEROR WORSHIP AND TRADITIONAL CULTS AT THESSALIAN HYPATA
(*SEG* 54, 556)*

1. Emperor worship in Thessaly: a synthetic overview

Although not as richly documented as in other areas of the Greek peninsula, in Thessaly the cult of the Roman emperors is well attested from the very beginning of the imperial period. Several Thessalian cities set up dedications to Augustus during his lifetime on altars, stelae and statue bases; on these dedications (in the dative or genitive case), the founder of the Principate is called θεός and σωτήρ¹. Following his reform of the Delphic Amphictyony, Augustus was responsible for the ‘*rattachage*’ to proper Thessaly of its perieic ἔθνη. In order to give the Nicopolitans a predominant position within the Amphictyonic council, Augustus cancelled the votes of the Magnets, Malians, Ainians, Achaeans of Phthiotis, and Perrhaebians–Dolopians, which by then would have been ‘counted’ as Thessalians, and therefore be represented by the latter². The existence of a close relationship between the founder of the Principate and the Thessalians is demonstrated by the title Σεβᾶστε(ι)ος which Augustus granted singularly to some πόλεις³ and collectively to the Thessalian κοινόν as a whole; this epithet is attested on inscriptions and coins⁴. It is also worth mentioning here some coins belonging to an Augustan issue of the κοινόν which depict Augustus’ head, with the legend ΘΕΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΘΕΣΣΑΛ, on the obverse, and the image of Livia assimilated to Hera, with the legend ΗΡΑ ΛΕΙΟΥΙΑ, on the reverse⁵. That Livia was also worshipped in Thessaly in her lifetime is attested by the presence of a priestess of Augustus’ spouse, identified with the goddess Hera (as in the above mentioned coin), who was honoured after A.D. 14 by her own πόλις Larisa⁶.

* A preliminary version of this article was presented at a seminar held in Athens at KERA (NHRF) in March 2010. I would like to thank all my colleagues for their useful comments and remarks, which made me rethink some points and greatly improved the resulting article. I also thank G. Petzl for his remarks, and M. Metcalfe and S. Pope for kindly revising the English text. The abbreviations of epigraphical *corpora* are those of the *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (*SEG*).

¹ *IG* IX 2, 93 (Echinos); *IG* IX 2, 424–425 (Pherai); *IG* IX 2, 604; *AD* 1984 [1989], 155, n° 60; *AD* 1997 [2003], 523, n° 13 (Larisa); *IG* IX 2, 1288 (Pythion); *SEG* 43, 241 and *AD* 1997 [2003], n° 60 (Atrax); *SEG* 51, 730 (Phalanna). Cf. Burrer 1993, 18 (and nn. 45–48); Kantiréa 2007, 51–52; Bouchon 2008, 190.

² Paus. 10, 8, 3; cf. Lefèvre 1998, 127; see also Burrer 1993, 4. Augustus’ initiative should not be interpreted as an act of hostility towards the Thessalian κοινόν but, on the contrary, as the official sanction of the integration of the perieic ἔθνη into the territory of the Thessalian confederacy (cf. Sánchez 2001, 426–428); *contra* R. Bouchon considers Augustus’ decision to be a hint of an initial hostile disposition of the emperor towards the Thessalians: Augustus’ attitude would have changed after he assumed – in A.D. 10/11, and not in 27 B.C. as usually thought – the role of στρατηγός of the Thessalian κοινόν (Bouchon 2008). According to Bowersock 1965a, 281–282 (cf. also Bowersock 1965b, 97, 104, 160–161; Bernhardt 1971, 198, nn. 536–537), because of some internal tumult Augustus would have revoked the freedom which Julius Caesar had granted to the Thessalians – Caesar’s grant (App. *BC* 2, 88; Plut. *Caes.* 48) is not mentioned by Pliny the Elder, who only lists Pharsalus as free (*NH* 4, 29). The situation, however, remains uncertain (Larsen 1968, 283, 293–294, states that Augustus recognised the Thessalians’ freedom). Under Nero the Thessalian κοινόν most probably recovered all or some of its previous votes in the Amphictyonic council; cf. Lefèvre 1998, 128 (and n. 626); Sánchez 2001, 428–432. On the history and institutions of the κοινόν of the Thessalians cf. Larsen 1968, 12–26, 281–294; for the imperial period cf. Burrer 1993, 1–20.

³ Hypata, Lamia, Melitaia – that is the capital cities of the Ainians, Malians and Achaeans (of Phthiotis) respectively – and Larisa, the capital city of ‘Great Thessaly’.

⁴ Cf. Robert 1980, 217–219, n. 76. This title can be accompanied by an ethnic (Θεσσαλοί or that of a single city) or be directly associated with the name of an individual; see Helly 1975, 125–127; Burrer 1993, 6 (and n. 31); Zachou-Kontoyanni 2003–2004, 267; according to Bouchon 2008, 190, the Thessalians would enjoy this privilege starting from A.D. 10/11, when Augustus would have been στρατηγός of their κοινόν.

⁵ *RPC* I, 1427; see also Kantiréa 2007, 75 (and n. 3). Cf. the later (reign of Tiberius) issues with the legend PIETAS referring to Livia, copies of an official type of the mint of Rome which spread in several provincial cities of the Empire (Kremydi-Sicilianou 1996, 158–159).

⁶ *IG* IX 2, 333 (assigned by O. Kern to Mylai, but coming from Larisa); cf. Kantiréa 2007, 75 and 233, n° 76; Bouchon 2008, 189 (and 193, n. 6).

Specific cultic manifestations for later emperors are virtually non-existent, except for a few dedications, most of which pertain to statue bases⁷. In any case, emperor worship is well attested epigraphically for the following period in several cities of Thessaly by the presence of imperial festivals and priests.

Imperial festivals are attested, as far as I know, in the following πόλεις: Larisa (*Pelagiotis*), Hypata (*Ainis*), Echinus (*Malis*), and maybe also Demetrias (*Magnesia*). At Larisa *Kaisareia* are attested by a fragmentary inscription, probably an agonistic dedication⁸. Moreover, it is worth mentioning a fragmentary funerary epigram (*IG IX 2, 645*) for a Larisan horseman; below the epigram, in the lower part of the stele (ll. 6–8), the names of two festivals can be read, respectively left (Ἀδριάνια) and right (Ὀλύμπια) of two crowns (engraved in the middle). Although the situation remains uncertain, here the reference is more likely to the famous Athenian *Hadrianeia* and to the even more celebrated *Olympia* of Pisa (Elis) respectively⁹. At Hypata and Echinus, and maybe at Demetrias as well, the existence of an imperial feast can be argued by the reference in inscriptions to ἀγωνοθέται of the Σεβαστοί¹⁰, which must mean that an agonistic festival for the emperors (*Sebasta*) was celebrated.

In addition to the already mentioned priesthood of Livia identified with Hera, priesthoods of the imperial cult are also attested at Hypata, Echinus and Demetrias. It seems that at Hypata and Echinus the office of priest of the emperors was closely associated with that of ἀγωνοθέτης of the imperial games, judging by the expression “ἀρχιερέυς (or ἱερέυς) and ἀγωνοθέτης of the Σεβαστοί” which occurs in inscriptions of these two πόλεις. A group of manumission texts of the 2nd century A.D. informs us that at Echinus the “ἱερεῖς and ἀγωνοθέται of the Σεβαστοί” used to receive by the treasurer of the city the manumission tax due by the ex-slaves¹¹. At Hypata, in the first half of the 2nd century A.D. T. Flavius Eubiotus was honoured for having served as ἀρχιερέυς and ἀγωνοθέτης of the θεοὶ Σεβαστοί “ἐπὶ τοῖς δύο στεφάνοις”¹². The latter expression appears also in an honorary inscription from Delphi¹³ for another imperial high-priest of Hypata, L. Cassius Petraeus – who was ἀρχιερέυς most likely in the age of Trajan – and indicates that the two individuals had promised to provide the prizes (crowns) for the victors in the *Sebasta*¹⁴. Thus, at Hypata there probably existed a close relationship between the office of high-priest of the emperors and the celebration of the imperial festival, and it seems that among the duties of the imperial priests there was also that of providing the prizes for the victors in the imperial ἀγῶνες. It must not have been difficult for Petraeus and Eubiotus to cope with this task, as they were two of the most distinguished members of the Thessalian imperial aristocracy. They both held the most important offices in the Amphictyonic κοινόν, *i.e.* those of ἐπιμελητής of the Amphictyonic council and ἀγωνοθέτης of the Pythian games, and were acquaintances of the historian Plutarch. Petraeus dedicated at Delphi at his own expense a statue of the

⁷ Tiberius: *SEG 23, 449* (Demetrias); *SEG 37, 484* (Larisa). Claudius: *IG IX 2, 81* (Lamia); *IG IX 2, 605* and *606a* (Larisa). Nero: *SEG 45, 551* (Atrax); Vespasian: *IG IX 2, 606b* (Larisa). Titus: *SEG 23, 450* (“νέος Apollon” – Demetrias). Domitian: *IG IX 2, 607* (Larisa). Trajan: *IG IX 2, 608* (Larisa). Hadrian: *IG IX 2, 611* (Larisa); *IG IX 2, 1028* (unidentified ancient location in the Pelagiotis). Antoninus Pius: Šašel Kos 1979, n° 170 (Thaumakoi). Septimius Severus and/or Caracalla: *IG IX 2, 329* (Aeginium); 349 (Cyretiae); 609 (Larisa); 1136–1137 (Demetrias); *SEG 3, 466* (Avaritsa). Carus: *IG IX 2, 1138* (Demetrias). Cf. Burrell 1993, 17 (and nn. 30–39). A cult of Rome and the θεοὶ Σεβαστοί is attested at Hypata (*IG IX 2, 32*: beginning of the 2nd century A.D.?; cf. Sekunda 1997, 220).

⁸ *IG IX 2, 614b* (Larisa; 1st century A.D.). Only the last five lines of the inscription are preserved; after the mention of a festival called [Θε]σσαλῶν Πο[σειδών]ια (ll. 1–2), the reference is made to ἄλλα Καισάρηα (l. 4), which must evidently mean that in the lost part of the text some Καισάρηα held at Larisa were referred to. Cf. Axenidis 1947, 36–37, who considered it to be most likely that the *Kaisareia* of Larisa were organized by the Thessalian κοινόν – see *infra*, n. 53); Gallis 1988, 226.

⁹ Cf. Axenidis 1947, 37, who does not, however, completely rule out the possibility that the ἀγῶνες referred to below the epigram were celebrated at Larisa.

¹⁰ For the epigraphic references see *infra*, nn. 11 (Echinus), 12–13 (Hypata), and 18 (Demetrias).

¹¹ Gounaropoulou 1987 (*SEG 36, 543–546*); see also *IG IX 2, 92* (*SEG 39, 493*), l. 4: [τ]ῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ ἀγωνοθέτῃ τῶν Σεβαστῶν. Date: 133/4 – *ca.* A.D. 150. Cf. Burrell 1993, 20.

¹² *IG IX 2, 44*, ll. 5–6.

¹³ *Syll³ 825C*, ll. 2–3: τὸν ἀρχιερέα ἐπὶ τοῖς δυσὶν στεφάνοις.

¹⁴ This is the meaning of such expressions, *e.g.* that which occurs in the two honorary inscriptions for Eubiotus and Petraeus; cf. Robert 1940, 193 (and n. 5).

Emperor Trajan¹⁵, while Eubiotus – member of one of the most prestigious families of Roman Thessaly¹⁶ – was the first known Helladarch of the Amphictyony, and in the role of ἐπιμελητής presided over the restoration of the sanctuary of Asklepios at Delphi¹⁷.

The same relationship between imperial priesthood and presidency of the imperial festival may have existed at Demetrias as well, although in this case this statement rests on a very fragmentary inscription in which Ch. Habicht has proposed to read [ἀγωνοθέτης] καὶ ἀρχιερέ[υς τῶν Σεβασ]τῶν¹⁸.

Finally, a priest of the imperial cult is attested also in the Thessalian κοινόν. A certain Androneikos of Metropolis, “ἀρχιερέυς of the κοινόν of the Thessalians and ἀγωνοθέτης of the *Pythia*”, was honoured at Delphi with a statue by the Amphictyons¹⁹. Unfortunately we do not have any further information on this individual, and even the chronology of the inscription cannot be stated for certain. If the presence of a Greek *nomen simplex* might point to a relatively early date²⁰, the paleography seems rather to speak for the 2nd century A.D.²¹ To date this is the only certain piece of evidence at our disposal about the cult of the emperors in the context of the Thessalian κοινόν. Something more on the theme, however, may perhaps be added – albeit at a speculative level – based on an inscription analyzed below.

2. Lykos, son of Hermolaos: a new Thessalian priest of the imperial cult

A recent epigraphic publication²² has added a new element to our knowledge of Roman imperial cult in Thessaly, revealing a previously unknown imperial priest. His name is Lykos, son of Hermolaos, and he was honoured, following a decree of the Amphictyonic council (Ἀμφικτυόνων δόγματι), by the delegates (σύεδροι) of the Thessalian κοινόν and by his own πόλις Hypata²³, where the honorary inscription was found. The costs for the dedication and erection of the statue of Lykos were covered by his son out of his own pocket²⁴. The inscription has been dated to the early 2nd century A.D. by the *editor princeps* M. Zachou-Kontoyanni, who identifies the Hermolaos appearing in a manumission text from Hypata, tra-

¹⁵ *Syll*³ 825B; on Petraeus see Puech 1992, 4867–4868.

¹⁶ On which see Larsen 1953; Sekunda 1997, 226 (strongly objected by B. Helly, *BE* 1998, n° 218).

¹⁷ *Syll*³ 825C; *IG IX*, 2 44; *CID IV* 154. For the office of Ἑλλαδάρχης of the Amphictyons see Sánchez 2001, 441–442. On Eubiotus see Puech 1992, 4847–4849 and Sekunda 1997, 216, n° 11. It should be noted here that according to Bousquet 1961, 90–92, Petraeus’ and Eubiotus’ high-priesthood should be referred to the Thessalian κοινόν, as they, like Androneikos of Metropolis, “ἀρχιερέυς of the κοινόν of the Thessalians” (see *infra*), were also ἀγωνοθέται of the Pythian Games. Fr. Burrel too refers their priesthood to the κοινόν (Burrel 1993, 18–20). As a matter of fact, however, to date there is only one certain reference to an imperial priest of the Thessalian κοινόν, the above mentioned Androneikos; the other priests of the imperial cult attested in Thessaly are to be regarded as ‘municipal’ priests. For another reference to a priest of the imperial cult, and ταγός of the Thessalian κοινόν, see *IG IX* 2, 34 (Hypata; 1st century A.D.).

¹⁸ *Demetrias V* (1987), 275–276, n° 9 (*SEG* 37, 463) (late Roman), ll. 1–3.

¹⁹ Bousquet 1961, 90–92 (*SEG* 19, 402); *CID IV* 163.

²⁰ But see *infra*, n. 29.

²¹ Lefèvre (*CID IV* 163): 2nd century A.D. Kantiréa 2007, 155 (with n. 2) and 233, n° 77, dates the inscription, and the activity of Androneikos, to the age of Nero, who had favoured the Thessalians, probably increasing the number of their votes in the Amphictyonic council (see *supra*, n. 2).

²² Zachou-Kontoyanni 2003–2004 (*AnnÉp* 2004, 1316; *SEG* 54, 556; see also *BE* 2005, 263): Ἀμφικτυόνων δόγματι | Σεβαστήων Θεσσαλ[ῶν] | οἱ σύεδροι καὶ πατρὶς Ἑπά[τα] | Λύκον Ἑρμολάου Σεβάστηον | ἱερέα ἑπταετηρικὸν δις τῶν | Σεβαστῶν καὶ Διὸς Καραιο[ῦ] | γενόμενον καὶ ἱερέα τῶν | Σεβαστῶν καὶ Διὸς Σωτή[η]ρος καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς δις, | στρατηγήσαντα καὶ πολειτευσάμενον ἄριστα [τὸ δι]ληνεκὲς συνηγορήσα[ν]τα | καὶ πρεσβεύσαντα, τῆς περὶ πάντα ἀρετῆς [καὶ] | χ[ρηστό]τητος ἕνεκεν Δὲ [Καραιοῦ?]. | [Χορ]ηγήσαντος τὰ δε[πρανήματα] | [ἐκ] τῶν ἰδίων Ἀπολλο[δ]όρου? | [τοῦ] υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. The text is inscribed on a marble statue base, only partially preserved (dimensions: H.: 0.78 m – W.: 0.55 m – D.: 0.55 m. H. Lett.: 0.025–0.02 m), seen by the first editor in a private house in modern Hypata.

²³ *SEG* 54, 556, ll. 1–5. The individual is otherwise unknown, but the name Lykos is attested for two Thessalian federal στρατηγοί (cf. *IG IX* 2, 1295, III, ll. 20–21; 546, ll. 3–4). For the formula Ἀμφικτυόνων δόγματι see e.g. the honorary inscription from Delphi for the sophist from Hypata T. Flavius Alexander, who was also σύεδρος of the Thessalian κοινόν (*CID IV* 158; 2nd century A.D.).

²⁴ *SEG* 54, 556, ll. 16–18.

ditionally dated to the Flavian age²⁵, with the father of Lykos²⁶. However, it is far from certain that the two individuals named Hermolaos are one and the same person, and even if we admit this, a different chronology – for example in the last part of the 1st century A.D. – is possible as well. With regard to this, a hint for an earlier chronology might be represented by the title ἱερεύς borne by Lykos. By the 2nd century A.D. the title most commonly used to indicate a priest of the imperial cult had become ἀρχιερεύς, which is the title borne also by the other two known imperial priests from Hypata, the already mentioned T. Flavius Eubiotus and L. Cassius Petraeus²⁷. One could suppose that at Hypata, as in other cities of the Roman East, the title ἱερεύς was replaced sometime during the 1st century A.D. by the title ἀρχιερεύς²⁸. If this was the case, a date by the end of the 1st century A.D. might be tentatively suggested for the honorary inscription for Lykos²⁹. In any case, the reference at the beginning of the text to an official decision of the Amphictyonic council points to the decades after Nero's reform³⁰, following which the Thessalians recovered a prominent role within the Amphictyonic council, as shown by the fact that in the period from Domitian to Hadrian all of the known ἐπιμεληταί of the Council were Thessalians (or Delphians), while in the same period only Thessalian ἀγωνοθέται (from Hypata) of the Pythian games are known³¹, among whom the *Hypataioi* Petraeus and Eubiotus.

The inscription from Hypata informs us that Lykos was honoured for his virtue and honesty, having served in politics in the best possible way, both in the Thessalian league, as στρατηγός, and in the πόλις of Hypata, a fact which explains the presence as dedicators of both the σύνεδροι of the κοινόν and Lykos'

²⁵ *IG IX 2*, 19 (l. 11); for a much earlier chronology (second half of the 1st century B.C.) of this manumission text see Sekunda 1997, 209–210, n° 2 (cf. *LGPN III. B*, s.v. Ἑρμόλαος (3)). Apart from this one and that in the inscription for Lykos, the only other occurrence of the name Hermolaos from Thessaly is not from Hypata; cf. *LGPN III. B*, s.v. Ἑρμόλαος (4).

²⁶ Zachou-Kontoyanni 2003–2004, 275.

²⁷ There are of course exceptions to this 'rule', as for example, for Thessaly, the above mentioned manumission texts from Echinus (*SEG 36*, 543–546), where ἱερεῖς and ἀγωνοθέται of the Σεβαστοί appear.

²⁸ Cf. *SEG 54*, 556 (apparatus). This change occurred in Athens most likely during the reign of Claudius, the well known Ti. Claudius Novius of Oion being the first ἀρχιερεύς of the Σεβαστοί; cf. Spawforth 1997, 188–191; Byrne 2003, *Claudii*, n° 213; Kantiréa 2007, 175–178.

²⁹ The fact that Lykos does not have Roman citizenship could in theory be a further indication of a relatively early chronology for our inscription. However, generally speaking, in Thessaly the Roman citizenship seems to have had quite a limited diffusion even amongst prominent individuals such as Lykos. With regard to this, it is worth noting that few of the known στρατηγοί of the Thessalian κοινόν of imperial age did possess the *civitas* (cf. the list given in *IG IX 2*, p. XXV). As for the priests of the imperial cult, it is sufficient to mention the group of manumission texts from the πόλις of Echinus, dated to the second quarter of the 2nd century A.D., where six different "ἱερεῖς and ἀγωνοθέται of the Σεβαστοί" are referred to, none of them a Roman citizen (*SEG 36*, 543–546; see *supra*, n. 11). On the diffusion of Roman citizenship in imperial Thessaly cf. the remarks by Larsen 1953, 92 ("In Thessaly ... the number of Roman citizens seems to have been small even in the second century after Christ. The inscriptions, in fact, give the impression that Thessaly was somewhat of a land apart.") and 93 ("A very few of the prominent Thessalians were honored with Roman citizenship.").

³⁰ Lefèvre 1998, 128 (and n. 626); Sánchez 2001, 428–432; v. *supra*, n. 2.

³¹ Sánchez 2001, 440.

motherland³². In addition to his political activity, Lykos assumed the priestships of the emperors and of three local cults, previously unattested at Hypata: Zeus Καραϊός, Zeus Σωτήρ and Athena³³.

This is the basic information that one can draw from the honorary inscription for Lykos. However, the present text can be further exploited in order to highlight aspects of the imperial priesthood and more generally of the organization of the cult of Roman emperors at Hypata – and maybe in Thessaly at large as well.

As I have already noted, the inscription reveals the existence of another priest of the imperial cult from Hypata, in addition to the above mentioned Petraeus and Eubiotus. This is in line with the pre-eminence of Hypata, among the other Thessalian cities, in second century Thessaly, as clearly expressed by Apuleius, according to whom *Hypata cunctae Thessaliae antepollet*³⁴. Was Hypata the official seat (or one of the seats) of the imperial cult administered by the Thessalian κοινόν? I shall come back to this point further on. Let us now have a closer look at the priestly offices held by Lykos.

3) ἱερεὺς ἑπταετηρικός of the Σεβαστοί

The text of the honorary inscription for Lykos states that “he has been ἱερεὺς ἑπταετηρικός of the Σεβαστοί and Zeus Καραϊός twice, and ἱερεὺς of the Σεβαστοί and Zeus Σωτήρ and Athena twice”³⁵. The epithet ἑπταετηρικός is worthy of further consideration, as it apparently occurs in the inscription from Hypata for the first time³⁶. However, other analogous epithets, such as τριετηρικός or πεντ(α)ετηρικός, occur in several inscriptions and in the literary sources in most cases in connection with games, indicating that the latter were celebrated every two and four years respectively³⁷. How to interpret the same epithets when

³² *SEG* 54, 556, ll. 10–15. The participle στρατηγήσαντα (l. 10) should be referred to the charge of στρατηγός of the Thessalian κοινόν (as also stated by the first editor), as at Hypata local magistrates called στρατηγοί are so far not known – in the imperial age the supreme magistrates of Hypata were most likely the ταγοί (*IG IX* 2, 34; 1st century. A.D.), who replaced the ἄρχοντες probably after the incorporation of the city and the region of Ainis into the Thessalian league in the age of Augustus; cf. F. Stählin, *RE IX* 1 (1914), s.v. Ἡ Ὑπάτα, col. 240. As for the expression πολειτευσάμενον ἄριστα (ll. 10–11), one might be tempted to see in it a reference to the honors of the ἀριστοπολιτεία, formally bestowed by a πόλις on those benefactors who had been excellent citizens, although it should be noted that the institution of the ἀριστοπολιτεία is so far attested only at Sparta and Messene (see in particular *IvO* 445, 446, 449, where the formula πολειτευσάμενον ἄριστα might be used with reference to citizens of Messene; cf. Luraghi 2008, 301–302, and n. 36; in general on the ἀριστοπολιτεία see Robert 1934, 268, n. 4; Robert 1960, 573–576; Schwertfeger 1981, 254; Marchetti–Kolokotsas 1995, 197, n. 50; cf. also *I.Beroia* 106, an honorary inscription for T. Flavius Cassander, ἀρχιερεὺς and ἀγωνοθέτης of the Macedonian κοινόν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους κ(α)ὶ τῆς πατρίδος ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἄριστα πολειτευσάμενον (ll. 12–14): the expression refers here to the honorand’s activity towards both the κοινόν and his own πόλις. For the participle συνηγορήσαντα referred to a κοινόν (again of the Macedonians) cf. *I.Beroia* 101, ll. 6–8 (with commentary).

³³ *SEG* 54, 556, ll. 5–9. Photius’ *Lexicon* (s.v. Καραϊός) reports that the cult of Zeus Καραϊός was present in Thessaly and in Boeotia (Theodoridis 1998, 189); the inscription for Lykos is the first epigraphic reference of this cult for Thessaly. In Boeotia it is attested at Akraiphia, Anthedon, Haliartos, Koronea, Orchomenos, Thebes and Thespie (Schachter 1994, 93–94, 97, 104–106, 122, 149, 151); it is also attested epigraphically in Acarnania (at Astakos: *IG IX*² 1, 434, l. 1); cf. Roesch 1982, 104–117. For epigraphic references of Zeus Σωτήρ and Athena in Thessaly see e.g. *I.ThessEnipeus* I 59–60 (Pharsalus; second half of the 2nd century B.C.); *SEG* 34, 558 (Larisa; ca. 150–130 B.C.); *SEG* 37, 461 (Demetrias; late Hellenistic–Roman imperial period); *Gonnoi* II, p. 265, s.v. Ἀθηνᾶ.

³⁴ *Apul. Met.* 1, 5; cf. also Heliod. *Aethiop.* 2, 34; see Burrer 1993, 19; Zachou-Kontoyanni 2003–2004, 269; Weir 2004, 69, n. 451.

³⁵ *SEG* 54, 556, ll. 5–9.

³⁶ A search in the *PHI* online epigraphic database as well as in the *ThLG* has given no occurrences for ἑπτ(α)ετηρικός. The feminine substantive ἑπτ(α)ετηρίς is attested in an uncertain *locus* of Aristotle’ *Athenaion Politeia* (54, 7), indicating a festival taking place at Delos every six years (cf. Rhodes 1981, 606–607, and see *infra*, n. 46), and in Eusebius’ *Historia Ecclesiastica* (7, 23, 4) indicating a period of seven years. For the corresponding terms τριετηρίς and πεντ(α)ετηρίς see the following note. The adjective ἑπταετήρος is attested in Nonnus’ epic poem *Dionysiaca* a few times with reference to a seven years long conflict (Nonnus *Dion.* 25, 3; 39, 275; 40, 254) and once meaning “seven-year-old” (37, 704–705, referred to a mule); with the latter meaning it is also found in Photius’ *Bibliotheca* (Henry 1959, I, p. 187, ll. 30–31 [= Bekker 63b, 30–31]), referred to Valentinianus III.

³⁷ See e.g. *IG V* 1, 658, ll. 4–6 and 662, ll. 5–6 (Sparta); *IG IX* 1, 282, l. 5 (Opous, Eastern Lokris); *IC I* xviii, 55, ll. 6–8 (Lytos); *SEG* 14, 730, ll. 6–7 (Iasos); *I.Milet* I 9, 371, ll. 9–10 (Miletus); *I.Napoli* I 50 (Neapolis); see also Zachou-Kontoyanni

used in association with a priestly title? The most likely answer is to connect them, even in these cases, to a festival (for the god served by the priest in question) which took place at regular intervals. This assertion finds a confirmation in a group of inscriptions from the city of Side in Pamphylia, which attest the existence of *ιερείς* and *ἀρχιερείς πενταετηρικοί*³⁸. Particularly interesting is the case of the *ἀρχιερείς* of the imperial cult, as at Side (μεγάλοι) *πενταετηρικοί ἀγῶνες* are attested which are to be interpreted in all probability as imperial contests³⁹: the *ἀρχιερείς πενταετηρικοί* of the emperors attested at Side must be those imperial high-priests who served in connection with the celebration of the imperial pentaeteric contests. One should then ask whether the priests who bear the title *πενταετηρικός* remained in office for the entire period from one celebration of the festival to the following one (*i.e.* for an entire *πενταετηρίς*). That this was likely the case – at least at Side – can be argued on the basis of some examples such as that of a couple who served the imperial priesthood “for a four-year term”⁴⁰, or that of a priest of Apollon who served for 24 years, apparently holding six four-year terms (*πενταετηρίδες*) in a row⁴¹. At the same time, it is to be noted that at Side those same priests who are called *πενταετηρικοί* appear in some cases without any particular epithet. The imperial high-priests, for example, are attested in more cases just as *ἀρχιερείς* of the *Σεβαστοί* (or some specific emperor) without any further temporal specification⁴². In these cases an abbreviated form of the same priestly title was maybe used: as a consequence, all of the imperial *ἀρχιερείς* at Side would remain in office for four years. One could also suppose, however, that at Side there were two categories of imperial *ἀρχιερείς*: those who served for one year (they too, maybe, in connection with an annual imperial contest, distinct from the pentaeteric one), and those who served in connection with the imperial pentaeteric festival and remained in office for the entire period from one celebration of this festival to the following one, assuming the epithet *πενταετηρικός*. Something similar could be supposed also for the other priests of Side who sometimes bear the title *πενταετηρικός*⁴³.

Generally speaking, one could also suggest, as an alternative interpretation, that an epithet such as *πενταετηρικός* (or similar ones), when used in association with a priest, did not always refer to the duration of his priestly tenure, but could indicate in some cases that that priest had served in the very year in which a pentaeteric festival was celebrated. That such an interpretation is linguistically possible is proved by the observation that the epithet *πενταετηρικός* occurs, in association with terms like *στρατηγός* and *ἄρχων*, in some inscriptions from communities of Roman status (*i.e. coloniae* and *municipia*) to render the office of *duovir quinquennalis*, the annual supreme magistrate who every five years was responsible for the *census* of the population – or in any case it refers to magistrates with analogous duties⁴⁴.

2003–2004, 273, n. 45. Cf. the terms *τριετηρίς* and *πεντ(α)ετηρίς*, indicating a period of two (three inclusively) and four (five inclusively) years, or a festival taking place every two (three inclusively) and four (five inclusively) years respectively; see LSJ, s.vv.

³⁸ Priesthood of Apollon: *I.Side* 71; cf. also *I.Side* 129 (see *infra*, and n. 41). Priesthood of Isis and Sarapis: *I.Side* 81. Priesthood of Aphrodite: *I.Side* 98. Priesthood of the emperors: *I.Side* 73, 77; cf. also *I.Side* 103 (see *infra*, and n. 40). Cf. also *I.Side TEP* 1, ll. 6–7: *συντερασάμενον τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ Αὐρηλία Κιλλαραμωτιανῆ Εἴη τῇ προκαθεζομένη θεῷ Ἀθηνᾶ πενταετηρίδι*, and *I.Side* I, pp. 200–201 (Nollé).

³⁹ *I.Side* 75 (ll. 3–4) and 77 (l. 4).

⁴⁰ *I.Side* 103, ll. 3–5: *κατὰ τετρα[ετί]αν ἀρχιερασάμενον τοῖς Σεβαστοῖς*. It may be worth mentioning the case of the priests of Hadrian Πανελλήνιος: in the context of the *Panhellenion* founded by Hadrian, the charges of *ιερεύς* of Hadrian Πανελλήνιος and/or *ἀγωνοθέτης* of the *Panhellenion* were often held by the *ἄρχων* of the *Panhellenion*, whose tenure lasted four years, from one celebration of the pentaeteric *Panhellenion* to the following one; see Oliver 1970; Spawforth–Walker 1985; Wörrle 1992 (esp. 342–345). Cf. also *IG VII* 3097 (Lebadea), ll. 4–5: *ιερητεύσας πενταετηρίδα ἐκ τῶν ιδίων*.

⁴¹ *I.Side* 129, ll. 9–10: *τῶν κδ' ἐτῶν αὐτοῦ ἱερ[ωσύνης ἔνεκεν]*; cf. *I.Side* I, p. 114 (Nollé).

⁴² *I.Side* 44, 71, 75, 81 (?), 116 (high-priests of the imperial cult). Cf. also 75, ll. 5–6 (priest of Apollon); 74, l. 1 (priest of Isis and Sarapis?); l. 6 (priest of Athena).

⁴³ It is worth mentioning the case of the priesthood of Athena: while a woman served together with her husband the cult of Athena for a *πενταετηρίς* (*I.Side TEP* 1, ll. 6–7 – see *supra*, n. 38), a priestess of Athena is referred to as “for life” (*διὰ βίου*) (*I.Side* 74, l. 6).

⁴⁴ Corinth: *Corinth* 8.1, n° 76 (l. 4); nn° 80–81 (ll. 1–2); *Corinth* 8.3, n° 138 (ll. 3–4) (reign of Hadrian): *στρατηγός πενταετηρικός*; all these inscriptions refer to the same individual, the well known Epidaurian notable Cn. Cornelius Pulcher (Devijver, *Prosopographia*, I, C 245; Rizakis–Zoumbaki–Kantiréa 2001, ARG 117, COR 228), who in the Roman colony

Let us now turn to the inscription for Lykos and to the latter's priestly title ἱερεὺς πενταετηρικός. Based on the presence of this particular epithet, it can be argued that a sexennial festival for the emperors and – as will appear clear from what follows – Zeus Καρραίος was celebrated at Hypata⁴⁵. It is worth noting the peculiarity of this chronological interval. I know only one other sexennial festival: it was celebrated at Delos and is mentioned in a passage of the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia* together with the famous pentaeteric festival of Apollon⁴⁶. In any case, the new inscription from Hypata confirms the existence in the Thessalian city of a close link between the office of imperial priest and the imperial festival, a connection already attested by the other two imperial priests from Hypata mentioned above: T. Flavius Eubiotus was both ἀρχιερεύς and ἀγωνοθέτης of the θεοὶ Σεβαστοί, while L. Cassius Petraeus, although he did not assume the charge of ἀγωνοθέτης – which is not mentioned in the honorary inscription for him from Delphi⁴⁷ – as ἀρχιερεύς was engaged in providing the prizes (crowns) for the victors in the *Sebasta*⁴⁸. The fact that the offices of ἀρχιερεύς and ἀγωνοθέτης are not specified by any temporal epithet (such as ἑπταετηρικός or similar ones) in the inscriptions for Eubiotus and Petraeus should lead to the conclusion that they remained in office for one year only and that the imperial festival of the *Sebasta*, which they presided over, was celebrated every year. It seems, therefore, that the six-yearly imperial festival over which Lykos presided was a special celebration distinct from the annual *Sebasta*. One could also say that at Hypata the annual festival in honour of the emperors was celebrated every six years in a more solemn way⁴⁹. Those priests who served in connection with the heptaeteric imperial festival will have assumed the title ἑπταετηρικός. As for the duration of their priesthood, they may have remained in office for the entire period between two celebrations of the festival – as seems to have been the case for the πενταετηρικό ἀρχιερεῖς of the imperial cult at Side – or only in the year in which the festival was celebrated. In the first case, Lykos will have held his priesthood for 12 years in total, as he served twice as ἑπταετηρικός ἱερεὺς⁵⁰.

4) Imperial cult and traditional cults at Hypata

Independent of the duration of Lykos' tenure as priest of the Σεβαστοί, the reference in the honorary inscription to traditional cults allows us to make some further considerations about the nature of the festival for the emperors which took place every six years at Hypata. The fact that Lykos was “ἑπταετηρικός ἱερεὺς of the Σεβαστοί and Zeus Καρραίος” (twice), and “ἱερεὺς of the Σεβαστοί and Zeus Σωτήρ and Athena”

of Corinth ran through the whole *cursus honorum* up to the presidency of the Isthmian games; see also *IG IV 795*, ll. 3–4: δυνάδρων ἀντιστράτηγον (= Lat. *praefectus iure dicundo*, i.e. a substitute for the *duovir quinquennalis*; cf. Rizakis–Camia 2008, 234–235, and n. 8). Patrai: Rizakis 1998, n° 37 (Patrai – 4th century A.D.), l. 4: ἀρχὸν πενταέτηρον; see *ibidem*, p. 122. Rhegium: *I.Reggio Calabria* 8 (ll. 1–2) e 12 (1st century A.D.): ἄρχων πενταετηρικός; cf. Costabile 1984, 128–140 (esp. 130 ff. and 134, n. 79); *I.Napoli*, p. 51. L. D'Amore (*I.Reggio Calabria*, p. 35) thinks that this magistrate at Rhegium performed some special duties maybe connected with the organization of ἀγῶνες. Cf. *I.Napoli* I 33 (after the institution of the *municipium* (89 B.C.)), l. 3: ἄρχοντα τὸν διὰ πέντε ἐτῶν τιμητικόν (see also *I.Napoli* I 30, ll. 5–6): although there has been much debate on the matter, in the expression a *duovir* – or *quattuorvir*, a function which is attested once at Neapolis, in the same inscription – *quinquennalis censoria potestate* is most likely to be seen (cf. Mason 1974, s.v. τιμητικός); see the remarks by E. Miranda (*I.Napoli* I, pp. 50–51). See also G. E. Bean, *Turk Ark. Dergisi* 19.2 (1970), 99–102, nn° 2, 3 and 7 (Cremna; late Roman): δυνάδρια πενταετηρική, and Mason 1974, s.v. πενταετηρικός, and p. 113.

⁴⁵ Cf. Zachou-Kontoyanni 2003–2004, 273, n. 45.

⁴⁶ Arist. *Ath.* 54, 7. For the possibility that this passage refers not to two distinct festivals, one quadrennial and the other sexennial, but to the one and the same (quadrennial) Delian festival, which would have been made sexennial after 330 B.C., see Rhodes 1981, 607.

⁴⁷ *Syll³* 825C. But it may be that this is an abbreviated form of the titlature attested for Eubiotus (cf. Burrer 1993, 19–20).

⁴⁸ See *supra*, nn. 13–14. Cf. the title of the ἀρχιερεύς of the Macedonian κοινόν: ἀρχιερεύς τῶν Σεβαστῶν καὶ ἀγωνοθέτης τοῦ κοινοῦ Μακεδόνων; cf. Deininger 1965, 92 (and n. 8).

⁴⁹ Cf. the well known case of the Athenian Panathenaic festival: the (pentaeteric) Great *Panathenaia* were celebrated in the third year of each Olympiad, while the (annual) Lesser *Panathenaia* were celebrated in the other years. At Ephesos also are attested both annual and pentaeteric *Ephesia*; cf. Arnold 1972, 18, n. 7.

⁵⁰ Cf. the case of the priest of Apollon Dionysios (see *supra*, n. 41). *Contra*, Zachou-Kontoyanni 2003–2004, 273–274, argues for the existence of only one (regular) celebration of the known *Sebasta*, which would have taken place every seven years.

(also twice), must mean in my opinion that the emperors were associated with the cult of three traditional gods (Zeus Καραιός, Zeus Σωτήρ and Athena), according to a practice which is attested throughout the Greek world by literary, epigraphic, archaeological and numismatic evidence⁵¹. One could object that in the phrase “ἱερεὺς of the Σεβαστοί and Zeus Καραιός” the term ἱερεὺς might be implied before Zeus: in other words, Lykos would have assumed two distinct and independent priesthoods, that of Zeus and that of the Σεβαστοί. Yet in this case it would be difficult to explain why the priesthood of Zeus Καραιός has been registered separately from the other cults mentioned in the inscription (Zeus Σωτήρ and Athena), and why the imperial priesthood has been mentioned twice in two different points of the text. To put it differently, if Lykos had assumed the imperial priesthood independently of the priesthood of Zeus Καραιός, why not register the latter together with the three other cults of traditional gods, given that he had assumed all of them twice? And why mention a second time the priesthood of the Σεβαστοί? It is much simpler to argue for the existence of a joint priesthood of the emperors and Zeus Καραιός⁵². In the same way, there must have been also a priesthood of the Σεβαστοί in association with Zeus Σωτήρ and Athena.

5) An imperial festival in the context of the Thessalian κοινόν?

It is now possible to delineate a picture of the imperial cult in the πόλις of Hypata. The worship of the emperors was served by priests who were also responsible for the management of an annual imperial festival (*Sebasta*); it seems to have been quite common for these priests to assume also the charge of ἀγωνοθέτης of the imperial ἀγῶνες. Every six years a special festival in honour of the emperors took place in association with the traditional cult of Zeus Καραιός. The priests who served in connection with that festival – for the entire interval between two celebrations of it (ἑπταετηρίς) or only in the very year when the festival took place – and most likely took care of its organization and/or founding were called ἑπταετηρικοί. In addition to Zeus Καραιός, two other traditional cults were associated with the emperors, those of Zeus Σωτήρ and Athena. At Hypata therefore there must have been a joint cult of the emperors and Zeus Καραιός, which was linked to a festival celebrated every six years, and another cult of the Σεβαστοί in association with Zeus Σωτήρ and Athena. It is not known if the latter envisaged a celebration as well (maybe the annual *Sebasta*?).

Considering the pre-eminence of the πόλις of Hypata in Roman Thessaly – also reflected in some way in the evidence pertaining to the imperial cult – it might be supposed that the imperial festival taking place at Hypata every six years in association with the cult of Zeus Καραιός had a special status, going beyond the local level so as to be regarded as a festival of the Thessalian κοινόν, which maybe took part in its organization, or in any case ‘endorsed’ it. This hypothesis of course does not exclude that other imperial festivals, organized or ‘sponsored’ by the κοινόν, took place in other πόλεις of Thessaly as well. With regard to this, Th. D. Axenidis considered it to be most likely that the *Kaisareia* of Larisa were organized by the Thessalian κοινόν⁵³. On a more general level, it may be worth noting that a comparison between various (regional, over-regional, provincial and ‘Panhellenic’) κοινά of the Greek world in the imperial period shows that several cult ‘centres’ could coexist within the same ‘federal’ organization, as most recently underlined by S. Zoubaki⁵⁴. It is therefore perfectly likely that also in Thessaly imperial festivals which were organized, or simply ‘sponsored’, by the κοινόν took place in several cities. One of these festivals may have been that celebrated at Hypata every six years for the emperors in association with Zeus Καραιός. In this case, Lykos, though a local priest of the imperial cult, would have been responsible for a festival of the Thessalian κοινόν.

⁵¹ Cf. Kantiréa 2007, *passim*, and most recently Camia 2009.

⁵² Cf. the remarks of A. Chaniotis in *SEG* 54, 556. See also Camia 2009, 209–212.

⁵³ Axenidis 1947, 36, followed by Gallis 1988, 226; v. *supra*, n. 8. A Boeotian agonistic inscription of the 1st century A.D. mentions a festival of the κοινόν held in Larisa: *IG VII* 1857, l. 4 (κοινὸν Θεσσαλῶν ἐν Λαρείσῃ) (see also Moretti 1953, n° 84); cf. Burrer 1993, 16 (and n. 26), who thinks that the festival referred to in the Boeotian inscription could be either the *Kaisareia* or the *Eleutheria* (on which see Axenidis 1947, 15–24). See also Harter-Uibopuu 2003, 213–214.

⁵⁴ Zoubaki 2010, 123–125.

6) Concluding remarks

In the absence of other available data, the ‘federal’ character of the six-yearly imperial festival which took place at Hypata must remain a mere hypothesis, which unfortunately cannot be proven. Notwithstanding this, if analysed in the light of the evidence at our disposal and against the background of the situation of emperor cult in Greece and the Greek-speaking part of the Empire at large, the honorary inscription for Lykos allows us to give a better picture of the worship of the Roman emperors in a city of the Empire.

This document reveals the name of a priest of the imperial cult who also held the office of στρατηγός of the Thessalian κοινόν, thus providing one further proof of the fact that the imperial priesthood was usually assumed by individuals of high standing. It also reveals the existence at Hypata of a previously unknown imperial festival, evidently distinct from the annual *Sebasta*, which took place every six years and was celebrated in association with the cult of Zeus Καραϊός. It seems that at Hypata the priests who served in connection with that festival – for a six-year term (ἑπταετηρίς) or only in the year in which that festival took place – assumed a special title (ἑπταετηρικός) that underlined the connection between priestly office and imperial festival. This confirms and strengthens the idea of a close relationship at Hypata – as well as in other cities of the Empire – between the imperial festival and the office of priest of the imperial cult: in the Thessalian city the imperial priests apparently used also to assume jointly the presidency of the imperial festival, or in any case to take care of its organization and some practical aspects, namely the provision of prizes for the victors in the ἀγῶνες.

Finally, the inscription for Lykos shows that at Hypata the emperors were worshipped in association with three traditional cults (Zeus Καραϊός, Zeus Σωτήρ and Athena), thus confirming that the integration of Roman emperors into the local *panthea* of Greek cities, and their association with traditional cults, represented one of the most common and peculiar characteristics of emperor worship in the Greek world.

Bibliographical abbreviations

- Arnold (I. R.) 1972: Festivals of Ephesus, *AJA* 76, 17–22.
 Axenidis (Th. D.) 1947: *Οἱ ἀρχαῖοι Θεσσαλικοὶ ἀγῶνες καὶ ἡ πολιτιστικὴ τῶν σημασία*, Αθήνα.
 Bernhardt (R.) 1971: *Imperium und Eleutheria. Die römische Politik gegenüber den freien Städten des griechischen Ostens*, Hamburg.
 Bowersock (G. W.) 1965a: Zur Geschichte des römischen Thessaliens, *RhM* 108, 277–289.
 – 1965b: *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford.
 Bouchon (R.) 2008: L’empereur Auguste, Tibère et les Thessaliens: Intégration de la Thessalie dans l’*imperium Romanum*, in *Proceedings of the 1st International Congress on the History and Culture of Thessaly*, Thessaloniki, I, 184–193.
 Bousquet (J.) 1961: Inscriptions de Delphes, *BCH* 85, 69–97.
 Burrer (Fr.) 1993: *Münzprägung und Geschichte des thessalischen Bundes in der römischen Kaiserzeit bis auf Hadrian (31 v. Chr. – 138 n. Chr.)*, Saarbrücken.
 Byrne (S. G.) 2003: *Roman Citizens of Athens*, Leuven–Dudley, Ma.
 Camia (F.) 2009: Imperatori romani tra gli dei greci. Riflessioni sull’associazione tra culto imperiale e culti tradizionali in Grecia a partire dalla documentazione epigrafica, in F. Camia – S. Privitera (eds.), *Obeloi. Contatti, scambi e valori nel Mediterraneo antico*, Paestum 2009, 205–222.
 Costabile (F.) 1984: *Istituzioni e forme costituzionali nelle città del Bruzio in età romana*, Napoli.
 Deininger (J.) 1965: *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit*, München.
 Devijver, *Prosopographia*: H. Devijver, *Prosopographia militiarum equestrum quae fuerunt ab Augusto ad Galienum*, I: *Litterae A–I* (1976), II: *Litterae L–V: Ignoti-Incerti* (1977), III: *Indices* (1980), IV–V: *Suppl. I–II* (1987–1993), Leuven.
 Gallis (J. K.) 1988: The Games in Ancient Larisa: an Example of Provincial Olympic Games, in W. J. Raschke (ed.), *The Archaeology of the Olympics. The Olympics and Other Festivals in Antiquity*, Madison, 217–235.
 Gounaropoulou (L.) 1987: Τέσσερις καινούριες απελευθερωτικές επιγραφές από τον Αχινό Λαμίας, in *Αμνητός. Τιμητικός τόμος για τον καθηγητή Μ. Ανδρόνικο*, Θεσσαλονίκη, 251–259.

- Harter-Uibopuu (K.) 2003: Kaiserkult und Kaiserverehrung in den Koina des griechischen Mutterlandes, in H. Cancik – K. Hitzl (eds.), *Die Praxis der Herrscherverehrung in Rom und seinen Provinzen*, Tübingen, 209–231.
- Helly (B.) 1975: Actes d'affranchissement thessaliens, *BCH* 99, 119–144.
- Henry (R.) 1959: *Photius, Bibliothèque*, I, Paris.
- Kantiréa (M.) 2007: *Les dieux et les dieux Augustes: le culte impérial en Grèce sous les Julio-claudiens et les Flaviens (Meletemata 50)*, Athènes.
- Kremydi-Sicilianou (S.) 1996: *Η νομισματοκοπία της Ρωμαϊκής Αποικίας του Δίου*, Αθήνα.
- Larsen (J. A. O.) 1953: A Thessalian Family under the Principate, *CPh* 48, 86–95.
– 1968: *Greek Federal States: their Institutions and History*, Oxford.
- Lefèvre (F.) 1998: *L'Amphictionie pyléo-delphique: histoire et institutions*, Athènes.
- Luraghi (N.) 2008: *The Ancient Messenians. Construction of Ethnicity and Memory*, Cambridge.
- Marchetti (P.) – Kolokotsas (K.) 1995: *Le nymphée de l'agora d'Argos. Fouille, étude architecturale et historique (Études péloponnésienes XI)*, Paris.
- Mason (H. J.) 1974: *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions*, Baltimore.
- Moretti (L.) 1953: *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche*, Roma.
- Oliver (J. H.) 1970: *Marcus Aurelius. Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East (Hesperia Suppl. 13)*, Princeton.
- Puech (B.) 1992: Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque, in *ANRW* 2.33.6, 4831–4893.
- Rhodes (P. J.) 1981: *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford.
- Rizakis (A. D.) 1998: *Achaie II. La cité de Patras: Epigraphie et histoire (Meletemata 25)*, Athènes.
- Rizakis (A. D.) – Camia (F.) 2008: Magistrature municipali e svolgimento delle carriere nelle colonie romane della provincia d'Acaia, in C. Berrendonner – M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni – L. Lamoine (eds.), *Le quotidien municipal dans l'Occident romain*, Clermont-Ferrand, 233–245.
- Rizakis (A. D.) – Zoubaki (S.) – Kantiréa (M.) 2001: *Roman Peloponnese I. Roman Personal Names in their Social Context (Meletemata 31)*, Athens.
- Robert (L.) 1934: Études d'épigraphie grecque, *RPh* 8, 267–292 (= *OMS* II, 1166–1191).
– 1940: *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec*, Paris.
– 1960: *Hellenica XI–XII*, Paris.
– 1980: *A travers l'Asie Mineure. Poètes et prosateurs, monnaies grecques, voyageurs et géographie*, Paris.
- Roesch (P.) 1982: *Études Béotiennes*, Paris.
- Sánchez (P.) 2001: *L'Amphictionie des Pyles et de Delphes*, Stuttgart.
- Šašel Kos (M.) 1979: *Inscriptiones Latinae in Graecia repertae. Additamenta ad CIL III*, Faenza.
- Schachter (A.) 1994: *Cults of Boiotia 3. Potnia to Zeus (BICS Suppl. 38.3)*, London.
- Schwertfeger (T.) 1981: Die Basis des Claudius Calligenes, *OIB* 10, 249–255.
- Sekunda (N.) 1997: The Kylloi and Eubiotoi of Hypata during the Imperial Period, *ZPE* 118, 207–226.
- Spawforth (A. J. S.) 1997: The Early Reception of the Imperial Cult in Athens, in M. C. Hoff – S. I. Rotroff (eds.), *The Romanization of Athens*, Oxford, 183–201.
- Spawforth (A. J. S.) – Walker (S.) 1985: The World of the Panhellenion I. Athens and Eleusis, *JRS* 75, 78–104.
- Theodoridis (C.) 1998: *Photii patriarchae lexicon (E–M)*, I, Berlin–New York.
- Weir (R. G.) 2004: *Roman Delphi and its Pythian Games*, Oxford.
- Wörle (M.) 1992: Neue Inschriftenfunde aus Aizanoi I, *Chiron* 22, 337–376.
- Zachou-Kontoyanni (M. H.) 2003–2004: Λύκος Ερμούλαου Σεβαστήος Υπαταίος Στρατηγός Θεσσαλών, *Αρχαιολογία* 12, 265–276.
- Zoubaki (S.) 2010: The Elean Relations with Rome and the Achaean Koinon and the Role of Olympia, in A. D. Rizakis – C. Lepenioti (eds.), *Roman Peloponnese III. Society, Economy and Culture in the Imperial Roman Order: Continuity and Innovation (Meletemata 63)*, Athens, 111–127.

Francesco Camia, Institute for Greek and Roman Antiquity, The National Hellenic Research Foundation,
Vas. Konstantinou 48, 11635 Athens, Greece
fcamia@eie.gr