

CHRISTINA KOKKINIA

ON THE INSCRIBING IN STONE OF AUGUSTUS' *RES GESTAE*

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 220 (2021) 281–289

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

ON THE INSCRIBING IN STONE OF AUGUSTUS' *RES GESTAE**

We owe the survival of Augustus' *Res Gestae* to whomever arranged to inscribe that text, in the Latin original and in a Greek translation, on the walls of the Temple of Augustus and Rome at Ankara. That temple is one of three locations in the province of Galatia where copies of the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (*RGDA*) were eternalized in stone, but the two other copies survive in a fragmentary state. They would have each posed an epigraphic riddle without the almost complete text at Ankara, also known as the *Monumentum Ancyranum* and as "the Queen of Inscriptions" since Theodor Mommsen awarded it that distinction.¹ The purpose of this paper is to argue, firstly, that the epigraphic copy of the *RGDA* at Ankara shares certain characteristics with large epigraphic displays from Roman Asia Minor related to euergetism; secondly, that the initial design of the epigraphic décor on the temple deliberately highlighted one specific aspect of Augustus' legacy, his euergetic donations; and finally, that that décor was likely created on the initiative of the earliest Galatian priests of the imperial cult, who sought to present Augustus as their role model.

Shortly after the death of Augustus in 14 CE, five documents were inscribed on the Temple of Augustus and Rome at Ankara. They were placed: at the entrance of the temple, on the front face of the north anta of the antechamber or pronaos; inside the temple, on the inner face of the antae-walls of the pronaos; on one of the exterior walls of the temple.² I list the documents including information relevant to the following discussion:

A: In a prominent position on the doorway of the temple, on the front face of the north anta (on the left, from the perspective of the approaching visitor) was inscribed a long chronological annual **list of priests** of the imperial cult and their expenditures, starting in the year 5/4 BCE and continuing up to the date of inscription.³

B: The two inner faces of the walls of the pronaos received the **Latin** text of the *RGDA* in six columns, three on the left and three on the right wall. Above the three columns on the left wall, a heading was inscribed in large letters.⁴

C: At the lowest part of the sixth column of B, immediately after the text of the *RGDA* and also composed in **Latin**, there was a list of Augustus' benefactions to the Roman people known to scholars as the "**Appendix**". This list is visually indistinguishable from the rest of the inscribed text on the sixth column of the *RGDA* but refers to Augustus in the third person (whereas the *RGDA* is written in the first person) without naming him. It is introduced by an indication of the total amount that Augustus spent on euergetic donations. It appears to summarize a section of the *RGDA* (chapters 15–23), but it is not a mere summary.⁵

D: On the outer face of the south wall of the cella but considerably lower than the Latin text inscribed in the pronaos, a **Greek** version of the *RGDA* was arranged in 18 columns. This version, too, like its Latin counterpart in the pronaos, was provided with a heading in large letters. The Greek translation, as Alison Cooley has shown, was tailored to a local audience and was probably produced locally.⁶

E: Immediately after D in column 18 and continuing onto column 19 of the epigraphic display, there was a **Greek** version of the "**Appendix**", also introduced by an indication of the total amount of money that Augustus had spent.

* Abbreviations of epigraphic publications and reference works follow those of the *Bulletin Épigraphique* 2020 (*REG* 133, 652–676 and <https://aiegl.org/grepiabbr.html>). Journal abbreviations follow *L'Année philologique*.

¹ Mommsen was referring to Latin inscriptions; Mommsen 1887, 387.

² See the ground-plan in *RGDA Cooley*, 9, fig. 3.

³ *I.Ancyra* 2, ll. 1–80 = Coşkun 2014, 39–41, ll. 1–80. (Earlier editions: *OGIS* 2.533 [entire text]; *IGR* 3.177 [ll. 1–3 and 19–33].) On the dating of this list see below, p. 286.

⁴ *I.Ancyra* 1. For other editions see below, n. 9. On the importance of the pronaos as carrier of inscriptions see Roels 2018, 244.

⁵ It adds details missing from the main text; see below, n. 26.

⁶ *RGDA Cooley*, 26–30; cf. Papaioannou 2011.

These documents represent the first phase of inscription of the epigraphic ensemble on Augustus' temple. The inscriptions later extended to other parts of the façade, namely to the lower part of the north anta, as the list of priests (A) grew to include later priests and their benefactions,⁷ and to the south anta, where a text was inscribed that records the promises of imperial high priests to undertake construction works during their time in office.⁸

The above enumeration of documents and phases of inscription will, understandably, appear strange to readers familiar with Augustus' *Res Gestae*. Editions of the *RGDA* at Ankara usually include and/or discuss the texts of the two other copies from Apollonia and Pisidian Antiochia, not the other texts inscribed on the temple.⁹ The historical significance of the *RGDA*, combined with scholars' desire to reconstruct Augustus' exact words, caused epigraphists to focus almost exclusively on its textual and historical analysis, an attitude that has begun to shift only recently.¹⁰ Of course, Augustus' *Res Gestae* deserves the prominent place that it has occupied in discussions of Augustan politics since its discovery in the 16th century. But the texts inscribed on the temple deserve to be studied as an epigraphic dossier in the sense of a large inscription displaying a selection of documents in a monumental context.¹¹

The *Monumentum Ancyrinum* was unique of its kind when it was discovered in 1555, and remained so for more than three centuries.¹² Until then, no other text of such length was known that was carved in stone and occupied such a prominent place on a public building. The early date of its discovery must be one reason why this epigraphic monument was "disembodied" in the hands of modern scholarship. The monument perplexed Mommsen who, in his first edition, suggested that the inscription did not post-date the temple but was executed at the same time as the walls were constructed.¹³ The intensive archaeological exploration of Turkey in the 19th and 20th centuries led to the discovery of other buildings with inscriptions of Roman imperial date so large as to dominate the impression presented by the building. The inscriptions on Opramoas' building in front of the theatre at Rhodiapolis, those covering the east wall of the entrance to the theatre at Ephesos, and those covering the north parodos wall of the theatre at Aphrodisias are examples of large dossiers that have survived well enough for us to be able to understand their original design.¹⁴ They all became known more than three centuries after the *RGDA*, because they had to be either excavated or

⁷ *I.Ancyra* 2, ll. 81–96. On the dating of these lines see below, p. 287 with n. 51.

⁸ *I.Ancyra* 4 (*IGR* 3.158). The text on the right anta is assumed to date from the reign of Trajan because of the *gentilicium* Cocceius, most likely acquired under Trajan's predecessor Nerva, of a man named in the inscription, Κοκκέτιος Σέλευκος, also known from *I.Pessinous* 12; cf. *I.Ancyra* I, 153.

⁹ Mommsen 1865/1883; *RGDA Scheid*; *RGDA Cooley*; on *I.Ancyra* 1 see below, n. 11. In Mommsen's editions only the stones found at Apollonia are included; the fragments at Antiochia were discovered later. On these see most recently Drew-Bear and Scheid 2005.

¹⁰ Elsner 1996, 34–35 and work by Cooley, in particular Cooley 2014, point to the need to view the inscriptions that preserve the *RGDA* as physical objects. Kearsley 2015 offers a careful study of the layout of both the Latin and the Greek versions of the *Res Gestae* at Ankara.

¹¹ *I.Ancyra* I is organized thematically and devotes chapter 5.1 to the imperial temple, but within that chapter the texts are presented in chronological order and therefore an inscribed altar or base for a priest of Claudius found elsewhere (no. 3) is placed between the text of the left anta of the temple (no. 2) and that of the right anta (no. 4).

¹² Only the Latin text was known at the time. The Greek text became gradually accessible as the houses that were built onto the temple's south exterior wall were torn down; for a detailed history of the text's recovery see Ridley 2003, 3–25; cf. *RGDA Cooley*, 43–46; Eck 2016, 21–22.

¹³ Mommsen abandoned this idea in his second edition. Mommsen 1865, VI on one of two reasons why he thought the temple dated from Tiberius' reign: "deinde quod eius aedis parietes ipso hoc de quo agimus indice rerum gestarum divi Augusti ita implentur, ut eum non tam facto operi postea inscriptum esse credideris, quam statim in ipso opere faciendo incisum"; but see Mommsen 1883, XIII: "Inscriptio utraque non eo tempore incisa est, quo aedes facta est, sed post intervallum et ut ad recipiendam eam quaedam in parietibus tollerentur vel mutarentur."

¹⁴ Opramoas: *TAM* II 905, cf. Kokkinia 2000; Ephesos: *I.Ephesos* Ia 27, cf. Kokkinia 2019; Aphrodisias: *I.Aphrodisias and Rome* 4; 6–21; cf. Kokkinia 2016 for this display's connection with euergetism. Largest of all was the "philosophical inscription" of Diogenes at Oinoanda, but that impressive epigraphic ensemble was demolished in antiquity and there remain some uncertainties concerning its contents, layout, and purpose; see most recently Haake 2020; cf. Kokkinia 2020, 43–44.

pieced together or both, whereas the temple at Ankara, although modified and used for different purposes,¹⁵ remained standing with its inscriptions well preserved up until the present day.

Large epigraphic displays incorporating multiple discrete texts that were carved on buildings are also known from Hellenistic Asia Minor, notably the inscriptions on the temple of Athena at Priene,¹⁶ those on the walls of a stoa at the agora of Magnesia-on-the-Maeander,¹⁷ and those (probably) on the Temple of Cybele at Pessinus.¹⁸ Though they are varied in theme and content, these Hellenistic dossiers have some characteristics in common. To quote Susan Sherwin-White's assessment, "they are selections of public documents, picked out by the community (or responsible authority) to create and broadcast a particular theme and message" and they "give us a picture of a positive and symbiotic relationship between polis and king in which the king's chief functions are as a source of justice and protection".¹⁹ Substitute "emperor" for "king" and the same is true of the imperial dossiers. They include documents issued by Roman office-holders, honorific decrees, sometimes lists or extracts from legal documents, in a complex rhetorical demonstration of power-sharing between Roman and local elites, instigated by the latter.²⁰ In addition, the imperial dossiers have strong links to euergetism, and they underline the role of individual citizens in initiating and maintaining good relations between local communities and representatives of Roman power.²¹ Though exceptional in many respects, the inscriptions on the temple at Ankara belong to this long epigraphic tradition and share traits with those other dossiers. They not only consist of a number of documents chosen, deliberately arranged, and displayed in a monumental setting so as to deliver a message to the widest possible audience, but, as I want to argue below, they are linked to euergetism, through documents A, C, and E.

Augustus' words have upstaged the other documents inscribed on the temple at Ankara to the extent that the so-called "Appendix" (C, Latin and E, Greek) has only recently become a subject of research. One reason for its neglect must be that Mommsen did notice it, but expressed a scathing judgement of it, in a chapter of his edition titled "Graeci Hominis Additamentum":

"There follows a concluding paragraph that does not originate from Augustus and is badly written in Latin as well as in Greek, and unimportant as concerns its subject, for of the deeds of such a great man it comprises only what he spent from private sources on buildings, plays and donations, as if Augustus were not the emperor of the Romans but the *duumvir* of some small town instead."²²

The "Appendix" or *additamentum* or *clausula* thus ridiculed by Mommsen must have been composed by a native Greek speaker who was fluent in Latin as well.²³ It was not only engraved at Ankara but also at Antiochia, and it had its own heading of sorts in both the Latin and the Greek version:

¹⁵ Güven 1998, 34.

¹⁶ *I.Priene B-M* 1–4, 11(?)–12, 132–133(?), 134–135 and 149, with pl. 184–185: on the creation of this "archive" in the 3rd c. BCE see Sherwin-White 1985. Cf. also the inscriptions of the "North" or "Sacred" Stoa, *I.Priene B-M* 63–70 (pl. 182–183), which honor benefactors and date mostly from the 2nd c. BCE.

¹⁷ *I.Magnesia* 16–88: mostly documents issued in the last decade of the 3rd c. BCE but some later texts are also included. The date, phases of inscription and exact layout of this large display are not established beyond doubt.

¹⁸ *I.Pessinous* 1–7: letters of Attalid kings that date from the middle of the 2nd cent. BCE but were engraved sometime in the 2nd half of the 1st cent. BCE. They testify to the existence of an epigraphic culture in the region when the province of Galatia was created in 25 BCE. An eighth letter has been discovered that was probably carved in stone soon after it was received; see Avram and Tsetschladze 2014; cf. *SEG* 64, 1296.

¹⁹ Sherwin-White 1985, 74; 87.

²⁰ Lists of honors are included in the dossier of Iason at Kyaneai, *JGR* 3.704; extracts from legal documents in the "Archive Wall" at Aphrodisias' theatre, *I.Aphrodisias and Rome* 4; 6–21.

²¹ Kokkinia 2020.

²² Mommsen ²1883, 156: "Sequitur clausula non profecta ab Augusto male scripta tam Latine quam Graece et argumento exilis, nam ex rebus gestis tanti viri non comprehendit nisi de suo quae erogarit in aedificia ludos donationes, tamquam duumvir oppiduli alicuius Augustus fuisset, non imperator populi Romani."

²³ *RGDA Cooley*, 19 on the "Appendix" having been composed for the benefit of provincial readers; Papaioannou 2011, 68–69 on certain errors in the main text of the *RGDA* that signal that the translator was not "a life-long partaker of the Roman

Summa pecun[i]ae, quam ded[it vel in aera]rium [vel plebei Romanae vel di]missis militibus, denarium sexien[s milliens].²⁴

Συγκεφαλαίωσις ἡριθμημένου χρήματος εἰς τὸ αἰράριον ἢ εἰς τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ῥω[μαί]ων ἢ εἰς τοὺς ἀπολελυμένους στρατιώτας ἕξ μυριάδες μυριάδων.²⁵

Whoever penned the “Appendix” introduced the listing of Augustus’ donations with the above phrase, containing an indication of the total amount of his expenses. They also added some details that are absent from the main text.²⁶ Clearly, then, the sums expended were important to the author of the “Appendix”. They were also important to the author of another element of this epigraphic display that has received little attention, namely the headings of the two versions of the *RGDA* (B, Latin and D, Greek):

Rerum gestarum divi Augusti, quibus orbem terra[rum] imperio populi Rom(ani) subiecit, et inpensarum, quas in rem publicam populumque Romanum fecit, incisarum in duabus aeneis pilis quae su[n]t Romae positae exemplar sub[i]jectum.²⁷

Μεθρημηνευμέναι ὑπεγράφησαν πράξεις τε καὶ δωρεαὶ Σεβαστοῦ θεοῦ, ὅς ἀπέλιπεν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης ἐνκεχαραγμένας χαλκαῖς στήλαις δυσίν.²⁸

It has been noted before that the two headings, like the two versions of the *RGDA* itself, are tailored to different audiences, with the Greek version entirely omitting the reference to Augustus having made the world subject to the Roman people.²⁹ It has also been noted that the Greek version of the *RGDA*, including its heading, was so positioned on the south wall as to be more easily readable than the Latin version inside the pronaos.³⁰ What has not yet been noted is that both headings mention explicitly the *impensa* / δωρεαὶ next to Augustus’ *res gestae* / πράξεις, although the expenses form the subject of just nine out of the 35 chapters of the *RGDA* (15–23).³¹ Those who were responsible (and most likely paid) for the spectacular epigraphic display on the temple chose to highlight one particular aspect of Augustus’ legacy both in the “Appendix” and in the headings of the two versions of the *RGDA*: his private expenses for the common good. In a recent discussion, Rosalinde Kearsley underlines the need to determine the purpose of the “Appendix”. She suspects, rightly, that there was “a deliberate rationale informing the whole of the project’s design”³² and suggests that the “Appendix” was the result of an attempt by the governor “to use the example of Augustus to

cultural experience”, although he must have been fluent in Latin. Cooley 2014, 227–229 argues convincingly that the “Appendix”, along with other paratextual elements, “ensured that what had started as a text steeped in imperial discourse took on a local provincial flavor”. Kearsley attributes the “composition, translation, and layout of the Appendix” “to individuals in Ankara, in particular the imperial legate” with help from administrative staff (Kearsley 2015, 180, with n. 84).

²⁴ Latin text in Ankara; *RGDA Scheid*. Of the copy in Antiochia only a few fragments survive (*RGDA Scheid*, ccxxii–ccxxiii). Translation *RGDA Cooley*: The total amount of money which he gave either to the treasury or to the commoners of Rome or to discharged soldiers: 600,000,000 *denarii*.

²⁵ Greek text in Ankara; *RGDA Scheid*. (The fragments found at Apollonia do not include the “Appendix”) Translation *RGDA Cooley*: Summary of money paid to the treasury or to the people of Rome or to soldiers who had been discharged: 600,000,000 *denarii*.

²⁶ Mentioning gifts to individual senators and, in Cooley’s translation, “gifts to colonies and cities in Italy, to cities in the provinces that had suffered as a result of earthquake and fires”. Only the Greek version differentiates between communities in Italy and those in the provinces; *RGDA Cooley*, 19; 276–277; cf. in more detail Cooley 2014, 226–228.

²⁷ *RGDA Scheid*. Translation *RGDA Cooley*: Below is a copy of the achievements of the deified Augustus, by which he made the world subject to the rule of the Roman people, and of the expenses which he incurred for the state and people of Rome, as inscribed upon two bronze columns which have been set up at Rome.

²⁸ *RGDA Scheid*. Translation *RGDA Cooley*: Translated and inscribed below are the achievements and gifts of the god Augustus, which he left engraved at Rome upon two bronze tablets.

²⁹ *RGDA Cooley*, 28; Cooley 2014, 221; Kearsley 2015, 178.

³⁰ Kearsley 2015, 176–177.

³¹ In her commentary to the heading of the *RGDA*, Cooley notes simply that “a summary of these expenses was also added to the end of the *RGDA* in what is known as the ‘appendix’” (*RGDA Cooley*, 104).

³² Kearsley 2015, 178.

encourage conduct that would make the province of Galatia more easily governable".³³ If Kearsley's interpretation is accurate, then the *RGDA* at Ankara provides evidence of the first and last time that a governor is known to have used such means to stimulate the energetic zeal of provincials. The governor of Galatia in 14 CE might, of course, have acted in an extraordinary way. Still, the governor was not the only player in the field of local provincial politics. Kearsley's interpretation draws upon the most widespread assumption concerning how the *RGDA* came to be inscribed on the walls of a temple in a remote province, according to which multiple copies of Augustus' *Res Gestae* were created following an instruction issued centrally from Rome, which the provincial governor of Galatia implemented with particular zeal.³⁴ This assumption, in turn, as the entire discussion on why the *RGDA* was inscribed at Ankara, has been strongly influenced by our knowledge of the epigraphic copies of Diocletian's Price Edict and by the discussion on the *Tabula Siarensis* and the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre*.

The Price Edict was carved in multiple copies in the eastern provinces.³⁵ A copy found at Aizanoi that includes a governor's edict may suggest that the governors of certain provinces "stimulated" the edict's inscribing in stone.³⁶ The Price Edict, however, is a Tetrarchic document issued in 301 CE. Its wide epigraphic publication in the eastern provinces arguably belongs to a new era of Roman provincial administration and, possibly, a new era of the epigraphic habit as well. In addition, that edict was of great relevance to everyday life, and its inscribing in stone may have served practical purposes to some extent.³⁷ The *Tabula Siarensis* and the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre*, both discovered in the 1980s, were issued on the occasion of Germanicus' death. We know that the governor of Baetica N. Vibius Serenus caused the *SC de Cn. Pisone Patre* to be inscribed on the bronze plate that is known as copy A of that text, and Werner Eck, very plausibly, argued that several other copies, too, that were also found in Baetica, may have been produced as a result of the ambition of that same man.³⁸ Inscribing on bronze, however, is very different from carving documents on the walls of buildings. Stone inscriptions on buildings were highly visible (if less readable sometimes) and much more permanent than inscriptions on bronze plates.³⁹ Monumental inscriptions carved on walls must have had a different symbolic weight because they transformed the appearance of public buildings in a way that was hard to reverse. It is not evident that a Roman governor would aim to permanently alter the appearance of temples in his province. Cooley was therefore right to shift the focus from central Roman to local provincial motives, and to suggest that the provincial assembly, acting on the instigation of the governor, may have been responsible for the stone copies of the *RGDA* in Galatia.⁴⁰ Recently, and independently, Eck has made the same suggestion.⁴¹

³³ Kearsley 2015, 180. Kearsley mentions (180, n. 81) but does not take into account the implications of a re-dating of the list of priests (A), on which see below, p. 286.

³⁴ Eck 1993, 206; Elsner 1996, 48–49 (without mention of the governor); Eck 1998, 7–8; *RGDA Scheid*, xiv–xvii (also discussing previous literature); *I. Ancyra* I, 150; Eck 2016, 19.

³⁵ *Edictum Diocletiani Lauffer*.

³⁶ Crawford and Reynolds 1975, 163; Eck 1993, 205–206: "Einige der Gouverneure haben offensichtlich die Publikation mit solchem Nachdruck und mit einer Argumentation gefordert, die es vielen Städten geraten erscheinen ließ, das kaiserliche Edikt auf Stein, d.h. auf dauerhaftem Material, zu veröffentlichen."

³⁷ The majority of epigraphic copies was in Latin and therefore to a limited extent suitable as reference for the man on the street. Apparently only the copies carved in stone in Achaia were translated into Greek; *Edictum Diocletiani Lauffer*, 2.

³⁸ Eck 1993; cf. Eck, Caballos, and Fernandez 1996, 179f.

³⁹ Though inscriptions on bronze were also monuments as opposed to mere documents: Williamson 1987; Peachin 2013.

⁴⁰ Already Deininger (1965, 66–69) assigns an important role to the "Provinziallandtag". Cooley points out that the Roman state generally "did not issue empire-wide orders for documents to be set up as monumental inscriptions", but suggests that "the provincial governor saw to the publication of the *RGDA* within his province"; *RGDA Cooley*, 19; 21; cf. Cooley 2012, 171–179. In an article published in 2014, Cooley holds a different opinion concerning the role of the governor: she argues that the creation of a Greek version of the *RGDA* makes "more sense if we hypothesize that the local elites themselves were the active agents in setting up and reinterpreting the text to suit their interests rather than if we assume that the provincial governor instructed the communities of Galatia to set up the *RGDA* in their cities"; Cooley 2014, 218. Coşkun (2014, 46; 54) attributes the inscribing of the *Res Gestae* to the initiative of the governor ("auf statthalterliche Veranlassung").

⁴¹ Eck 2016, 19.

It is in fact impossible in the case of the *RGDA* at Ankara to prove or to disprove that either the assembly or the governor or both were somehow involved, since we have no evidence of either. In favor of a joint initiative by the provincial governor and the *κοινόν*, Cooley adduces a famous parallel: the epigraphic publication, in several cities of the province of Asia, of a set of documents concerning the introduction of a new calendar in honor of Augustus.⁴² These documents, however, differ from the *RGDA* no less significantly than those concerning Germanicus. The dossier concerning the new calendar displayed seven documents, including an edict of the proconsul Paulus Fabius Maximus, in Latin and in Greek, dated ca. 9 BCE, and a decree of the provincial assembly of Asia. Both Fabius Maximus' edict and the decree of the Asian assembly include provisions for epigraphic publication on stelai of white marble, to be set up in temples of the imperial cult at cities that were *conventus* centers. Both contain a great deal of state rhetoric, and in this respect they may be said to be somewhat comparable to the *RGDA*, but in all other respects they are very different from Augustus' *Res Gestae*. They differ most importantly in respect of their stated purpose and their immediate relevance to public life in the provinces. The decision to change the calendar of the province introduced a lasting, significant change of an administrative nature and it was probably important that the relevant documents be permanently displayed in the province: this is the most plausible reason why the proconsul and the assembly acted in accord in prescribing epigraphic publication. The epigraphic copies that have come down to us, however, are almost certainly not the ones intended by the governor and the assembly. With the exception of the copy from Metropolis, all other fragments are inscribed not on stelai of white marble but on stone blocks, and, with the exception of Apameia, none of the cities where fragments have been found were *conventus* centres. It seems, then, that Fabius Maximus' edict and the documents related to it had an epigraphic afterlife that went beyond what the proconsul and the provincial assembly had prescribed. Possibly, someone wanted them made more widely available, and we can speculate on other reasons why additional copies were inscribed on walls at various locations and on a stele in the court of a club house at Metropolis.⁴³ But Augustus' *Res Gestae* was neither an edict nor a decree nor did it introduce changes of any sort in the province of Galatia. Its inscription on walls of buildings must have served, at least in part, different purposes than the inscription of the documents introducing the Asian calendar.

The question of why the *RGDA* was inscribed at Ankara is closely connected to the questions of who added the "Appendix" and why emphasis was given to expenses in the two headings. It would not have been hard to answer these questions, I think, had text A not been until recently misdated to a period later than the inscription of the *RGDA*. It has never been doubted that the "Appendix" is contemporary with the main text of the *RGDA*, and therefore the two lists of benefactions, those of the priests on the anta and those of Augustus in the "Appendix", seemed disconnected. Altay Coşkun, however, recently re-dated the governorship of the last governor mentioned in the priest list to 12–16 CE, as a consequence of which the priests listed in ll. 1–80 of the left anta received dates between the years 5/4 BCE and 13/14 CE.⁴⁴ Based on the new dates and, in addition, on the similarity between the lettering of the list and that of the *RGDA*, and on the fact that there is an un-inscribed space after l. 80 on the left anta, Mitchell and French, very plausibly, concluded that the list up to l. 80 was cut shortly after the death of Augustus, together with the *RGDA*.⁴⁵ By

⁴² The best treatment is Laffi 1967; see Dreyer and Engelmann 2006, 175–182 for a new copy from Metropolis.

⁴³ The club house of the *Presbyteroi*: Dreyer and Engelmann 2006, 175–176.

⁴⁴ Coşkun 2009; 2010. The governor was T. Helvius Basila, *I.Ancyra* 2, l. 72.

⁴⁵ *I.Ancyra* I, 150. When Coşkun re-edited the list of priests in 2014, he preferred a different reading. Based on the observation that the inscriptions on the right anta begin at roughly one third of the height of the anta and at the same height as l. 81 of the left anta, Coşkun concludes that the list of priests on the left anta originally began at the same height as the text on the right anta, that is, on block XIII (now erased), and that later the need was felt to inscribe the names of the earlier priests on the blocks of the left anta above block XIII (Coşkun 2014, 54). It is very doubtful, however, that such a conclusion can be supported without compelling arguments concerning the layout and lettering of the lines inscribed above block XIII of the left anta. The inscriptions on those blocks show no signs of having been added as an afterthought. To the contrary, the lines are nowhere crowded and the size of the letters diminishes only gradually (see Krencker and Schede 1936, pl. 43).

contrast, the new dating of the list of priests led Cooley to suggest that the list was “inscribed as a conscious response to the addition of the *RGDA* itself on the temple”.⁴⁶

I want to suggest instead that the *RGDA*, the “Appendix”, and the list of those who served as imperial priests in 14 CE or earlier all formed part of the initial epigraphic décor on the temple, and that the priests are the most likely instigators of its creation. Though many questions are still debated concerning the constitution of the province of Galatia, the provincial κοινόν and other κοινά within the province, and the role and dating of the ἱερεῖς or ἀρχιερεῖς,⁴⁷ it should be safe to assume that the priests listed on the left anta were those responsible for the sub-province (ἐπαρχία) of Galatia (i.e. Galatia ‘proper’) within the Roman *provincia Galatia*, the ‘speakers of the ἔθνος’ in the sense this term is used by Marco Vitale.⁴⁸ These men, the leaders of Galatian tribes turned civic benefactors, included Pylaimenes the son of Galatia’s last king Amyntas, who served twice.⁴⁹ They had every incentive, as well as the financial means and the necessary connections with the Roman authorities to conceive of, to propose to the civic institutions of the young polis and/or the provincial assembly, and to carry out the epigraphic programme on Augustus’ temple at Ankara. That programme included the “Appendix” and the headings that stressed Augustus’ expenses because it aimed to eternalize Augustus as the archetypical civic benefactor and the Galatian nobles’ role model.

If this interpretation is correct, the headings and the “Appendix” make Augustus’ munificence look like the munificence of a provincial office-holder not through ignorance, as Mommsen claimed, but by design. The “Appendix” and the headings gave emphasis to Augustus’ benefactions because the entire epigraphic programme on the temple was meant to help broadcast the ideological framework within which an important group in the local provincial elite operated: those who had the means and incentives to undertake the costly priesthood of Augustus and Rome and to underwrite social peace in their province in the style favoured by Rome since the days of Flamininus.⁵⁰ In other words, the purpose of the “Appendix” and the two headings was to indicate the purpose of the inscribed *RGDA*. The list of priests, on the other hand, was continued after 14 AD in order to include future members of the leading families of Galatia.⁵¹ But, as was the case with other grand epigraphic schemes, most notably that on the temple of Zeus at Aizanoi, the epigraphic list of priests was continued only unsystematically.⁵²

Assuming the initiative for creating this epigraphic monument lay with local notables, why, then, have we found another two copies of the *RGDA* in the province of Galatia, at Antiochia and at nearby Apollonia? Imitation and rivalry between communities, both of which caused the epigraphic habit to acquire distinctly local features, may have been at play in the creation of multiple copies of the *RGDA* in Galatia. Unfortunately, we know far too little about the other copies. One was inscribed, perhaps, on a monumental gateway; the other, probably, on the podium of a group of statues of the imperial family. One was in Latin, the other

⁴⁶ Cooley 2012, 176.

⁴⁷ See i.a. Mitchell 1993, 100–117; Strobel 2007, 375–377; Coşkun 2010; Vitale 2012, 117–132; Edelmann-Singer 2015, 95–98. See Vitale 2012, 125 for an attractive hypothesis according to which the Galatian κοινόν in its earliest phase represented only the three tribes but later grew to include the entire sub-province.

⁴⁸ ‘Speaker of the ἔθνος’ and ‘eparchy-arch’ are useful terms coined by Vitale for priestly officials of the imperial cult responsible for sub-provinces; on sub-provinces (“Teilprovinzen”) Vitale 2012; on ‘eparchy-archs’ Vitale 2016.

⁴⁹ In 2 BCE and 7 CE (Coşkun 2014, 40). Pylaimenes was overlooked as successor to his father when Galatia was annexed by Rome, nevertheless he apparently presented a helmet to L. Calpurnius Piso who governed Galatia ca. 14–13 BCE (*Anth. Pal.* 6. 241, identified by Cichorius 1922, 328–330); Mitchell 1993, 62; 107.

⁵⁰ Liv. 34.51.6 on Flamininus’ treatment of Thessalian cities in 194 BCE: *A censu maxime et senatum et iudices legit, potentioremq; eam partem civitatum fecit, cui salva et tranquilla omnia esse magis expediebat.*

⁵¹ *I.Ancyra* 2, ll. 81–96; *ibid.*, p. 150: “an addition of the early Tiberian period.”

⁵² The temple at Aizanoi was built in the reign of Domitian and featured an elaborately framed inscription field, provided at the time of construction, on the walls of its pronaos, cella and opisthodomos (only the north wall of the cella survives); see Naumann 1979, 16–17 and 34–35; Posamentir and Wörrle 2006 (date, earlier literature); cf. recently Roels 2017. That inscription field preserves two groups of texts dating respectively around 125 and 157 CE but is otherwise empty. However, blank inscription fields were not routinely added to ancient temples upon construction, and it is probably unwise to infer the date of a building based on whether its walls were smoothed for inscription during construction or not, as do Mommsen ²1883, XIII (cf. above, n. 13), Fittschen 1985, 312–313, and *I.Ancyra* I, 150. The blank epigraphic space at Aizanoi was probably due to bad planning and represents an exception to the rule that wall surfaces were prepared for inscription as and when required.

in Greek. Both are in too fragmentary a state to allow us to understand the overall design of the epigraphic monuments to which they belonged, and therefore interpretation of their purpose remains speculative.⁵³ All we can be certain about with our present state of knowledge is that there were at least two more monuments that included epigraphic displays of Augustus' *Res Gestae*, at two neighbouring cities in the southern part of the province of Galatia.⁵⁴ We can also be fairly certain that the three epigraphic versions of the *RGDA* in Galatia share the same prototype.⁵⁵ There might have been "an approved official Greek translation of the *RGDA*", as Cooley suggests,⁵⁶ or the Greek text may have been created and circulated through non-official channels. We might dare to speculate that the Roman colonists at Antiochia started a trend by inscribing the *Res Gestae* of Augustus the founder of their colony, and Apollonia and Ancyra followed by inscribing the same text in different settings.⁵⁷ On the evidence presented above, the copy at Ankara seems to have formed part of the earliest example of a large epigraphic dossier linked to civic euergetism of the Roman imperial era, one that was created earlier than other known dossiers advertising Graeco-Roman-style euergetism, and outlived them all by far.

References

- Avram, A. and Tsatskhelidze, G. 2014. A New Attalid Letter from Pessinus, *ZPE* 191, 151–181.
- Botteri, P. 2003. Ancyra, Antiochia e Apollonia. Rappresentazione delle *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, in: L. de Blois et al. (eds), *The Representation and Perception of Roman Imperial Power*, Amsterdam, 240–249.
- Cichorius, C. 1922. *Römische Studien: Historisches, Epigraphisches, Literaturgeschichtliches aus vier Jahrhunderten Roms*, Leipzig.
- Cooley, A. 2012. From Document to Monument. Inscribing Roman Official Documents in the Greek East, in: J. Davies and J. Wilkes (eds), *Epigraphy and the Historical Sciences*, Oxford, 159–182.
- 2014. Paratextual Readings of Imperial Discourse in the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, *CCG* 25, 215–230.
- Coşkun, A. 2009. Das Edikt des Sex. Sotidius Strabo Libuscidianus und die Fasten der Statthalter Galatiens in augusteischer und tiberischer Zeit, *Gephyra* 6, 159–164.
- 2010. Der Ankyraner Kaiserkult und die Transformation galatischer und phrygisch-galatischer Identitäten in Zentralanatolien im Spiegel der Münzquellen, in: A. Coşkun et al. (eds): *Repräsentation von Identität und Zugehörigkeit im Osten der griechisch-römischen Welt*, Frankfurt 2009 [2010], 173–211.
- 2014. Neue Forschungen zum Kaiserkult in Galatien. Edition der Priester-Inschriften des Ankyraner Sebasteions (Dittenberger II 1903/70, 533 = Bosch 51) und Revision der frühen Provinzialgeschichte, in: J. Fischer (ed.), *Der Beitrag Kleinasien zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte der griechisch-römischen Antike*, Vienna, 35–73.
- Crawford, M. H. and Reynolds, J. 1975. The Publication of the Prices Edict; A New Inscription from Aezani, *JRS* 65, 160–163.
- Deininger, J. 1965. *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit, von Augustus bis zum Ende des dritten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.*, Munich.
- Drew-Bear, Th. and Scheid, J. 2005. La copie des *Res Gestae* d'Antioche de Pisidie, *ZPE* 154, 217–260.
- Dreyer, B. and Engelmann, H. 2006. Augustus und Germanicus im ionischen Metropolis, *ZPE* 158, 173–182.
- Eck, W. 1993. Das s.c. de Cn. Pisone patre und seine Publikation in der Baetica, *CCG* 4, 189–208.
- 1998. *Augustus und seine Zeit*, Munich.

⁵³ Despite the serious efforts undertaken by Botteri and Cooley, to name but two: Botteri 2003; Cooley 2012, 176–178.

⁵⁴ Peter Thonemann suggested that a fragment of a Greek inscription that was found at Sardis belonged to a fourth copy of the *RGDA*, in this case outside the province of Galatia (Thonemann 2012). But the rare sequence of letters ΙΣΚΑΙΔΕ on that fragment clearly points to a group of texts mentioning the priestly office ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν τρισκαίδεκα πόλεων, known from another six inscriptions at Sardis (*I.Sardis* I 47–48; *I.Sardis* II 350, 352, 379, 384); cf. Hallmannsecker 2020.

⁵⁵ This is obvious in the Greek versions of Ankara and Apollonia, since a substantial part of the text inscribed at Apollonia survives and can be compared to that at Ankara. The Latin text at Antiochia, though very fragmentary, included the "Appendix" and, therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the same prototype was used here, too, as at Ankara.

⁵⁶ *RGDA* Cooley, 22.

⁵⁷ Cooley convincingly argues that "the setting up of the *Res Gestae* [at Antiochia]" was "symptomatic of a desire to imitate Rome, and to forge close ties to the capital"; *RGDA* Cooley, 14. Cooley also proposes that "the decision to set up the *RGDA*" at Apollonia "was perhaps a local one, prompted by the 'emperor-loving' élite, in a spirit of rivalry with Antioch"; *RGDA* Cooley, 18.

- 2016. Res gestae divi Augusti. Die Königin der Inschriften, in: J. Baltrusch and Ch. Wendt (eds), *Der Erste. Augustus und der Beginn einer neuen Epoche*, Darmstadt, 17–30.
- Eck, W., Caballos, A., and Fernandez, F. 1996. *Das Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre*, Munich.
- Edelmann-Singer, B. 2015. *Koina und Concilia: Genese, Organisation und Sozioökonomische Funktion der Provinziallandtage im Römischen Reich*, Stuttgart.
- Elsner, J. 1996. Inventing Imperium. Texts and the Propaganda of Monuments in Augustan Rome, in: J. Elsner (ed.), *Art and Text in Roman Culture*, Cambridge, 32–53.
- Fittschen, K. 1985. Zur Datierung des Augustustempels in Ankara, *AA*, 309–315.
- Güven, S. 1998. Displaying the *Res Gestae* of Augustus: A Monument of Imperial Image for All, *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 57, 30–45.
- Haake, M. 2020. Philosophy and Philanthropy: Diogenes of Oenoanda and an Act of Mega-Euergetism, in: T. Oğuz et al. (eds), *Philanthropy in Anatolia through the Ages*, Istanbul, 121–132.
- Hallmannsecker, M. 2020. The Ionian Koinon and the Koinon of the 13 Cities at Sardis, *Chiron* 50, 1–27.
- Kearsley, R. 2015. The Epistolary Genre of Classical Antiquity and the Epigraphy of Early Imperial Galatia: the 'Appendix' to the Res Gestae, in: S. Procházka et al. (eds), *Official Epistolography and the Language(s) of Power*, Vienna, 173–184.
- Kokkinia, Ch. 2000. *Die Opramoas-Inschrift von Rhodiapolis. Euergetismus und soziale Elite in Lykien*, Bonn.
- 2016. The Design of the 'Archive Wall' at Aphrodisias, *Tekmeria* 13 (2015–2016), 9–55.
- 2019. A Roman Financier's Version of Euergetism: C. Vibius Salutaris and Ephesos, *Tekmeria* 14 (2017–2018) [2019], 215–252.
- 2020. Large Epigraphic Dossiers and Euergetism in Roman Asia Minor, in: T. Oğuz et al. (eds), *Philanthropy in Anatolia through the Ages*, Istanbul, 39–45.
- Krencker, D. and Schede, M. 1936. *Der Tempel in Ankara*, Berlin.
- Laffi, U. 1967. Le iscrizioni relative all'introduzione nel 9 A.C. del nuovo calendario della provincia d'Asia, *SCO* 16, 5–98.
- Mitchell, S. 1993. *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor*, Oxford.
- Mommsen, Th. 1865 / 1883. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti. Ex Monumentis Ancyrano et Apolloniensi*, Berlin.
- 1887. Der Rechenschaftsbericht des Augustus, *HZ* 57, 385–389.
- Naumann, R. 1979. *Der Zeustempel zu Aizanoi nach den Ausgrabungen von D. Krencker und M. Schede*, Berlin.
- Papaioannou, S. 2011. The Translation Politics of a Political Translation. The Case of Augustus' *Res Gestae*, in: S. McElduff and E. Sciarrino (eds), *Complicating the History of Western Translation: The Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective*, Manchester, 63–74.
- Peachin, M. 2013. Augustus' Res Gestae and the Emerging Principate, in: W. Eck et al. (eds), *Studia Epigraphica in Memoriam Géza Alföldy*, Bonn, 255–276.
- Posamentir, R. and Wörrle, M. 2006. Der Zeustempel von Aizanoi, ein Großbau flavischer Zeit, *MDAI(I)* 56, 227–246.
- Ridley, R. 2003. *The Emperor's Retrospect. Augustus' Res Gestae in Epigraphy, Historiography and Commentary*, Leuven.
- Roels, E. 2017. Der Tempel als monumentaler Schriftträger. Die Inschriften am Zeus-Tempel in Aizanoi, in: M. Böttner et al. (eds), *5300 Jahre Schrift*, Heidelberg, 51–53.
- 2018. The Queen of Inscriptions Contextualized. The Presence of Civic Inscriptions in the Pronaos of Ancient Temples in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor (Fourth Century BCE–Second Century CE), in: E. M. van Obstall (ed.), *Sacred Thresholds. The Door to the Sanctuary in Late Antiquity*, Leiden, 221–253.
- Sherwin-White, S. M. 1985. Ancient Archives. The Edict of Alexander to Priene. A Reappraisal, *JHS* 105, 69–89.
- Strobel, K. 2007. Die Galater und Galatien: Historische Identität und ethnische Tradition im Imperium Romanum, *Klio* 89, 356–402.
- Thonemann, P. 2012. A Copy of Augustus' Res Gestae at Sardis, *Historia* 61, 282–288.
- Vitale, M. 2012. *Eparchie und Koinon in Kleinasien von der ausgehenden Republik bis ins 3. Jh. n. Chr.*, Bonn.
- 2016. 'Priest' – 'Eparchy-arch' – 'Speaker of the ethnos'. Areas of Responsibility of Highest Officials of the Eastern Provincial Imperial Cult, *Mnemosyne* 69, 82–111.
- Williamson, C. 1987. Monuments of Bronze: Roman Legal Documents on Bronze Tablets, *ClAnt* 6, 160–183.