

Herausgegeben von:

Thomas Corsten
Fritz Mitthof
Bernhard Palme
Hans Taeuber

TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte
Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Band 29, 2014

HOLZHAUSEN
DER VERLAG



**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

Band 29

2014

**HOLZHAUSEN
DER VERLAG**

Impressum

Gegründet von:

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert, Ekkehard Weber

Herausgegeben von:

TYCHE – Verein zur Förderung der Alten Geschichte in Österreich

Vertreten durch:

Thomas Corsten, Fritz Mitthof, Bernhard Palme, Hans Taeuber

Gemeinsam mit:

Franziska Beutler und Wolfgang Hameter

Wissenschaftlicher Beirat:

Angelos Chaniotis, Denis Feissel, Jörg Fündling, Nikolaos Gonis,
Klaus Hallof, Anne Kolb, Michael Peachin

Redaktion:

Olivier Gengler, Sandra Hodeček, Claudia Macho, Theresia Pantzer,
Georg Rehrenböck, Patrick Sängler, Kerstin Sängler-Böhm

Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an:

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und
Epigraphik, Universität Wien, Universitätsring 1, 1010 Wien, Österreich.

E-mail: franziska.beutler@univie.ac.at

Richtlinien unter <http://www.univie.ac.at/alte-geschichte>

Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden angezeigt.

Auslieferung:

Verlag Holzhausen GmbH, Leberstraße 122, A-1110 Wien

E-mail: office@verlagholzhausen.at

Online Bestellungen & TYCHE-Digital:

<https://shop.verlagholzhausen.at/hhshop/buch.wissenschaft/Tyche/Jahresbaende.htm>

Umschlag: Militärdiplom aus Carnuntum (ZPE 172, 2010, 271–276; Photo: P. Böttcher),
Inscription aus Ephesos (ÖJh 55, 1984, 130 [Inv. Nr. 4297]; Photo: P. Sängler), P.Vindob. G 2097
(= P.Charite 8).

Bibliografische Informationen der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek und der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die ÖNB und die DNB verzeichnen diese Publikation in den Nationalbibliografien;
detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet abrufbar. Für die Österreichische Bibliothek:
<http://onb.ac.at>, für die Deutsche Bibliothek: <http://dnb.ddb.de>.

Eigentümer und Verleger: Verlag Holzhausen GmbH, Leberstraße 122, A-1110 Wien

Herausgeber: TYCHE – Verein zur Förderung der Alten Geschichte in Österreich
c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und Epigraphik,
Universität Wien, Universitätsring 1, A-1010 Wien.

E-mail: hans.taeuber@univie.ac.at oder bernhard.palme@univie.ac.at

Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Verlagsort: Wien — Herstellungsort: Wien — Printed in Austria

ISBN: 978-3-902976-42-0 ISSN: 1010-9161 eISSN: 2409-5540

Copyright © 2015 Verlag Holzhausen GmbH — Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Stadt Wien

Wien ist anders.

Diese Publikation wurde durch die
freundliche Unterstützung der
Stadt Wien ermöglicht.

I N H A L T S V E R Z E I C H N I S

Christian B a r t h e l: Eine <i>Origo Gentis Blemmyorum</i> in den <i>Dionysiaka</i> des Nonnos von Panopolis	1
Amin B e n a i s s a: A Lease of Crops by a Soldier of the <i>Mauri Scutarii</i> (Taf. 1)	17
Lajos B e r k e s: Die christusliebende Thebais (Taf. 3)	23
Jana G r u s k o v á – Gunther M a r t i n: Ein neues Textstück aus den „Scythica Vindobonensia“ zu den Ereignissen nach der Eroberung von Philippopolis (Taf. 12–15)	29
Todd M. H i c k e y: A Misclassified Sherd from the Archive of Theopemptos and Zacharias (Ashm. D. O. 810) (Taf. 2)	45
Annika B. K u h n: The <i>chrysophoria</i> in the Cities of Greece and Asia Minor in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods	51
Federico M o r e l l i: Il vino del padrone. P.Eirene III 21, P.Wash.Univ. II 105 e P.Laur. IV 185	89
Federico M o r e l l i: SB XXIV 16219: Una lettera di Atias in difesa di una donna	95
Amphilochios P a p a t h o m a s: Ein Mietvertrag über ein Haus aus dem byzantinischen Hermopolites (Taf. 4–5)	99
Amphilochios P a p a t h o m a s: Bemerkungen zu einem „Papyrus aus dem unruhigen Alexandria am Vorabend der arabischen Eroberung“ (SB XVI 12425)	107
Ioan P i s o – George C u p c e a: Ein <i>centurio regionarius</i> aus der <i>legio X Fretensis</i> in Dakien (Taf. 6–7)	115
Ioan P i s o: Zur Reform des Gallienus anlässlich zweier neuer Inschriften aus den Lagerthermen von Potaissa (Taf. 8–9)	125
Jacek R z e p k a: Dolichos of Delphi and the Origins of the Long Run in Panhellenic Games	147
Marjeta Š a š e l K o s: The Problem of the Border between Italy, Noricum, and Pannonia (Taf. 10–11)	153
Georg-Philipp S c h i e t i n g e r: Die letzte Schlacht des Scipio Aemilianus. Überlegungen zu seinen innenpolitischen Absichten im Jahr 129 v. Chr.	165
Peter S i e w e r t – Julia T a i t a: Funktionäre Olympias auf einem hocharchaischen Bronzeblech (BrU 6) (Taf. 3)	183
Konrad S t a u n e r: Finanzliteralität im Imperium Romanum am Beispiel der <i>argentarii</i> und <i>signiferi</i> . Dokumentationsexperten im zivilen und militärischen Finanzwesen (späte Republik – Prinzipatszeit)	193
Karl S t r o b e l: Einige Bemerkungen zur Diskussion um die Errichtung der Provinz Pannonia	255

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Bemerkungen zu Papyri XXVII (<Korr. Tyche> 754–766)	261
Adnotationes epigraphicae V (<Adn. Tyche> 37–44)	267
Buchbesprechungen	279
<p>Rupert B r e i t w i e s e r (Hrsg.), <i>Behinderungen und Beeinträchtigungen / Disability and Impairment in Antiquity</i>, Oxford 2012 (V. Dasen: 279) — Maria Emilia C a v a l i e r e, <i>Dediche di occidentali nel santuario di Apollo a Delfi (VI–IV a.C.)</i>, Oxford 2013 (J. Piccinini: 281) — Takashi F u j i i, <i>Imperial cult and imperial representation in Roman Cyprus</i>, Stuttgart 2013 (F. Camia: 283) — Jens H e r z e r (Hrsg.), <i>Papyrologie und Exegese. Die Auslegung des Neuen Testaments im Licht der Papyri</i>, Tübingen 2012 (P. Sänger: 285) — Elizabeth A. M e y e r, <i>The Inscriptions of Dodona and a New History of Molossia</i>, Stuttgart 2013 (T. Corsten: 291) — Stephen M i t c h e l l, David F r e n c h, <i>The Greek and Latin Inscriptions of Ankara (Ancyra), Vol. I: From Augustus to the end of the third century AD</i>, München 2012 (C. Wallner: 292) — Andrew M o n s o n, <i>Agriculture and Taxation in Early Ptolemaic Egypt. Demotic Land Surveys and Accounts (P.Agr.)</i>, Bonn 2012 (W. Clarysse: 295) — Christoph S c h m e t t e r e r, <i>Die rechtliche Stellung römischer Soldaten im Prinzipat</i>, Wiesbaden 2012 (P. Sänger: 298) — Simone S i s a n i, <i>In pagis forisque et conciliabulis. Le strutture amministrative dei distretti rurali in Italia tra la media Repubblica e l'età municipale</i>, Roma 2011 (L. Cappelletti: 300) — Inge U y t t e r h o e v e n, <i>Hawara in the Graeco-Roman Period: Life and Death in a Fayum Village</i>, Leuven, Paris, Walpole, MA 2009 (M. Langellotti: 303).</p>	
Indices	305
Eingelangte Bücher	309

Tafeln 1–15

Die *Annona Epigraphica Austriaca* erscheint auf der Homepage des Instituts für Alte Geschichte der Universität Wien (<http://altesgeschichte.univie.ac.at/forschung/aea/>) und wie bisher auch in der Zeitschrift *Römisches Österreich*.

ANNIKA B. KUHN

The *chrysophoria* in the Cities of Greece and Asia Minor in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*

Sometime in the mid-first century AD Ti. Iulius Reglos, a distinguished notable from Peloponnesian Argos, was publicly honoured for the services and great benefactions which he had lavished on his hometown. In addition to the more traditional forms of civic *timai*, he was recognized by the community with a rather rare and exclusive honour as the dedicatory inscription of the extant statue base reveals: Reglos was awarded ‘the *chrysophoria*, along with purple, for life, as the first and only one (of the Argives)’.¹ The lifelong privilege to ‘wear gold’ (and purple) was obviously the highest expression of honour and dignity bestowed on outstanding citizens at Argos.

The *chrysophoria* was not a specifically Argive mark of distinction. It is attested as a civic honour in inscriptions from several cities in Greece (Athens, Argos, Messene), Asia Minor (Ephesus, Magnesia, Aphrodisias, Tralles, Hadrianoi, Arykanda) and the island of Kos from both the Hellenistic and Roman periods. In comparison with traditional *timai* such as statues, crowns, privileged seating or public praise, the recorded instances of the bestowal of the *chrysophoria* are relatively rare: altogether, the epigraphic evidence yields c. 70 attestations. The low number of references, however, does not imply its insignificance in the range of civic honours. On the contrary, despite (or because of) the undeniably small degree of its epigraphic attestation, it may be rightly assumed that the *chrysophoria* constituted a highly exceptional distinction in the Hellenistic and Roman East.

Concomitant with the scant evidence, little attention has been paid to the *chrysophoria* in modern scholarship. In his entry in *Pauly’s Realencyclopädie* in 1899, Emil Szanto briefly defined it as the right to wear gold robes, sometimes in conjunction with purple, conferred on worthy officials and priests as a civic recognition by Greek *poleis* in imperial times.² His explanation well matches the infor-

* I would like to thank the referees of the journal for their helpful comments on the present article.

¹ *IG* IV 586, ll. 6–7: (...) ἐδόξαμεν (...) καὶ χρυσοφορίαν [μετὰ πορφύρας διὰ βίου καὶ μόνῳ καὶ πρώτῳ (...)].

² E. Szanto, s.v. *χρυσοφορία*, *RE* III.2 (1899) 2517: „Das Recht, goldene Gewänder zu tragen, manchmal zusammen mit dem Recht, Purpur zu tragen, verliehen, kommt in griechischen Städten als Auszeichnung für verdiente Beamte oder Priester in der Kaiserzeit wiederholt vor.“

mation extracted from inscriptions like that in honour of Reglos. Szanto, however, restricts the honorific practice to the wearing of gold garments and, chronologically, to the imperial period. Fifteen years later, Adolf Wilhelm discussed *IG V 1, 1432*, the well-known inscription from Messene on the land tax (*oktobolos eisphora*), which mentions the award of the *chrysophoria* to a local citizen. In this context, he broached the *chrysophoria* in a short excursus:³ he compiled further attestations from both the Hellenistic and Roman periods and defined it as the wearing of gold ornaments in honour of a god, which constituted an exclusive right of cult officials.⁴

For over a century, Wilhelm's survey has remained the only general treatment and assessment of the *chrysophoria*. Since then the topic has only been discussed casually and selectively by modern scholars. They usually refer to Wilhelm's observations and (at times indiscriminately) adopt his general definition. Valuable as it is, Wilhelm's brief outline did not and could not provide a detailed and nuanced study of the subject. On closer inspection, however, the epigraphic evidence reveals a wider and more complex semantic field of the *chrysophoria*, which manifested itself in a variety of forms and functions: in fact, the term does not necessarily refer — as commonly taken for granted — to a uniform honorific practice, and it eludes clear-cut definition. Still, it was obviously used in a rather formal and technical sense to denote an honour of 'wearing gold' that was apparently distinct from the otherwise explicitly and widely attested awards of honorific gold crowns.⁵ In view of its importance, this extraordinary privilege certainly deserves to be given more attention than has hitherto been the case in order to bring out the essential features, contours and nuances of the honorific practice associated with it.

The following analysis intends to provide a comprehensive and in-depth discussion of the major references to the *chrysophoria*, including the evidence that has emerged since Wilhelm's overview a century ago. The main analytical focus is placed on the epigraphic attestations. In order to outline and specify more closely the semantic spectrum of the *chrysophoria* (and cognates like *chrysophorein* and *chryso-phoros*), the central issues of our examination are focussed on the implementation of the honour and its contextualization. It will in particular deal with the question of its function, of who was awarded the *chrysophoria* and why, by whom, on what occasion, with what kind of insignia — and what it reveals about the prevailing attitudes towards 'wearing gold' in the classical world. Considering the geographical distribution and chronological span of the attestations, it is appropriate to approach the issue from a diachronic and synchronic perspective. In each case we have to take account of the local setting and socio-cultural background to narrow down the specific

³ A. Wilhelm, *Urkunden aus Messene*, *ÖJh* 17 (1914) 36–42. Wilhelm already touched upon the privilege of the *chrysophoria* in *Remarques sur deux inscriptions de Delphes*, *BCH* 24 (1900) 216–221, esp. 221.

⁴ Wilhelm, *Messene* (n. 3) 40.

⁵ In this regard, the present article is primarily concerned with the explicit mention of χρυσοφορεῖν (gold-w/bearing), and not with inscriptional occurrences of any gold object (esp. gold crowns) or gold in general.

meaning of *chrysophorein* and simultaneously bring out general characteristics and historical developments of one of the most brilliant marks of distinction in the honorific language of the Graeco-Roman world.

One of the earliest attestations of the *chrysophoria* as an official honour in the Greek-speaking world is reported for Magna Graecia in connection with the cult of Venus of Eryx in Sicily. Diodorus relates that in the third century BC, after the First Punic War, the Romans took a special interest in the re-organization and administration of the temple of Venus Erycina due to Rome's Trojan ancestry, its mythical kinship with Aeneas, the son of Venus/Aphrodite.⁶ In their zeal to exceed all the honours ever paid to the goddess, the Roman Senate passed a *senatus consultum*,⁷ which decreed that those seventeen Sicilian towns that had previously been most loyal towards Rome during the war against Carthage shall 'χρυσοφορεῖν τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ', and that two hundred soldiers shall serve as a sacred guard of the temple.⁸

In this passage Diodorus summarizes the provisions of the Latin decree, as it was rendered in his (Greek?) source. In his terminology he most likely draws on the official usage of *chrysophorein*, referring to an apparently well-known practice that did not require further explanation. It is obvious that χρυσοφορεῖν τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ denotes an extraordinary honour that was first and foremost aimed at promoting the worship of the goddess. It has, therefore, been suggested that the term possibly refers to a religious tax to be paid in gold that was imposed on the seventeen cities for the maintenance of the shrine of Venus.⁹ In the first century BC material contributions were indeed eagerly collected by a Roman *quaestor* who was in charge of the temple's finances.¹⁰ However, since Diodorus states that the cities selected for the *chrysophoria* had distinguished themselves by their loyalty towards Rome, it suggests itself that the grant of the honour signified a special distinction rather than an onerous financial obligation.¹¹ The privileged position of the *poleis* was obviously meant to

⁶ Diod. 4.83.7. For a dating of the *SC* to c. 241 BC see D. Kienast, *Rom und die Venus vom Eryx*, *Hermes* 93 (1965) 484. Given the presence of Roman magistrates mentioned by Diodorus in the preceding passage, W. Dahlheim argues for a date after 227/5 BC, when Rome had taken control of Sicily. See W. Dahlheim, *Gewalt und Herrschaft. Das provinzielle Herrschaftssystem der römischen Republik*, Berlin, New York 1977, 18 n. 6.

⁷ Hence this source should be dealt with as an epigraphic rather than a literary testimony of the *chrysophoria*.

⁸ Diod. 4.83.7: ἢ τε σύγκλητος τῶν Ῥωμαίων εἰς τὰς τῆς θεοῦ τιμὰς φιλοτιμηθεῖσα τὰς μὲν πιστοτάτας τῶν κατὰ τὴν Σικελίαν πόλεων οὐσας ἑπτακαίδεκα χρυσοφορεῖν ἔδογματίσει τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ καὶ στρατιώτας διακοσίους τηρεῖν τὸ ἱερόν.

⁹ R. Schilling, *La religion romaine de Vénus depuis les origines jusqu'au temps d'Auguste*, Paris 1954, 247; C. Koch, s.v. *Venus* (7), *RE VIII A.1* (1955) 853.

¹⁰ *Cic. div. in Caec.* 55–56; *Cic. Verr.* 2.21–22.

¹¹ Thus also Kienast, *Venus* (n. 6) 485; C. P. Jones, *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World*, Cambridge/MA, London 1999, 86.

join them together in a cultic alliance of major religious and political significance, a sort of amphictyony, which was to cement Rome's control over Sicily.¹²

What exactly the right of *chrysoaphorein* implied for the Sicilian towns cannot be inferred from Diodorus' passage. In a cult-related context, *chrysoaphorein* may be viewed to refer to 'carrying/bearing gold' in a physical sense. Cult officials charged with bearing ritual objects and offerings during a procession are well attested in the Greek East in all periods. Their names are derived from the objects they were carrying, such as *kanephoroi/liknaphoroi* (basket-bearers), *anthephoroi* (flower-bearers), *thallophoroi* (shoot-bearers), *hieraphoroi* (bearers of sacred objects), *phallophoroi* (phallus-bearers), *bomophoroi* (altar-bearers), *eikonophoroi* (image-bearers), *sebastophoroi* (bearers of the emperor's image).¹³ Accordingly, the *chrysophoroi* (gold-bearers) of the seventeen *poleis* would be in charge of carrying golden cult objects (from the treasury) to the sanctuary as offerings or for the embellishment of the cult statue of Aphrodite.

On the other hand, in several other passages of Diodorus' work there is another, more common usage of the word *chrysoaphorein* in the sense of 'wearing gold jewellery'. In Book 5, Diodorus describes the outward appearance of the inhabitants of the utopian island of Panchaea: 'They wear ornaments of gold (φοροῦσι δὲ καὶ κόσμον χρυσοῦν), not only the women but the men as well, with collars of twisted gold about their necks, bracelets on their wrists, and rings hanging from their ears after the manner of the Persians.'¹⁴ He then touches upon the ornaments worn by their priests, now using the term *chrysoaphorein* as a synonym: 'They wear the same gold ornaments (χρυσοφοροῦσι) as do the women, with the exception of the earrings.'¹⁵ In Book 13, where he describes the luxurious lifestyle of the inhabitants of Sicilian Acragas, Diodorus likewise relates that they wore delicate raiments and — as the context conclusively suggests — 'gold jewellery' (χρυσοφοροῦντες).¹⁶ In all these instances, the meaning of *chrysoaphorein* as wearing gold ornaments is in line with the traditional use of the word in other literary sources, especially with reference to

¹² H. Kunz, *Sicilia. Religionsgeschichte des römischen Sizilien*, Tübingen 2006, 151–153.

¹³ Cf. P. A. Harland, *Christ-Bearers and Fellow-Initiates. Local Cultural Life and Christian Identity in Ignatius' Letters*, *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 11 (2003) 487–497; cf. also H. W. Pleket, *Nine Greek Inscriptions from the Cayster-Valley in Lydia. A Republication*, *Talanta* 2 (1970) 66 n. 15; L. Brody, *The Cult of Aphrodite at Aphrodisias in Caria*, *Kernos* 14 (2001) 103–104. On the *sebastophoroi* see in particular M. Wörrle, *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien. Studien zu einer agonistischen Stiftung aus Oinoanda*, Munich 1988, 216–219.

¹⁴ Diod. 5.45.6: φοροῦσι δὲ καὶ κόσμον χρυσοῦν οὐ μόνον αἱ γυναῖκες, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες, περὶ μὲν τοὺς τραχήλους ἔχοντες στρεπτοὺς κύκλους, περὶ δὲ τὰς χεῖρας ψέλια, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ὄτων παραπλησίως τοῖς Πέρσαις ἐξηρητημένους κρίκους.

¹⁵ Diod. 5.46.2: χρυσοφοροῦσι δ' ὁμοίως ταῖς γυναῖξι πλὴν τῶν ἐνωτίων.

¹⁶ Diod. 13.82.8: καθόλου δὲ καὶ τὰς ἀγωγὰς εὐθὺς ἐκ παίδων ἐποιούντο τρυφεράς, τὴν τ' ἐσθῆτα μαλακὴν φοροῦντες καθ' ὑπερβολὴν καὶ χρυσοφοροῦντες, ἔτι δὲ στλεγγίσι καὶ ληκύθοις ἀργυραῖς τε καὶ χρυσαῖς χρώμενοι.

women who ‘wear gold’.¹⁷ If *chrysophorein*, then, has the same meaning in the *senatus consultum* concerning the cult of Venus Erycina, it will arguably have signified that (sacred) envoys from each of the seventeen Sicilian cities had the right to wear gold adornment in the cult processions of Venus Erycina. Although the literary examples provide some vivid idea of the many different ways of wearing gold attachments subsumed under the expression of *chrysophorein*,¹⁸ it must remain an open question what kind of adornment is meant in the cult of Venus Erycina and what ritual function it had. It must be emphasized at this point that the connotations of *chrysophorein* in the literary sources may well be different from its more formal use in the honorific decrees and, above all, in a ritual context, where the protagonists of the ritual activities were expected to conform with the strict cultic norms of performance and appearance.

*

The association of the *chrysophoria* with a ritual setting recurs in a decree of the Delphic Amphictyony dating from c. 117/6 BC, which renewed certain prerogatives of the Athenian association of the Dionysiac *technitai*.¹⁹ As stated in lines 25–27, it encompassed the reconfirmation of the right of the guild’s priests to wear the ‘ancestral crowns’ ([το]ὺς πατρίους στεφάνους) in all cities, which consequently must have been a privilege which the Athenian *technitai* had been granted well before 117/6 BC.²⁰ In the following lines (30–33), further details of the provisions are given: the association’s priests shall be allowed to ‘*chrysophorein*’ in honour of the gods in

¹⁷ See e.g. Arist. *Oec.* 2.1349a; Eur. *Hec.* 130; Diod. 13.82; Strab. 4.4.5; 11.5; 15.1.59; Herod. 4.2.3; Athen. 13.609e–610a. Several authors specify this ‘wearing of gold’ as the decoration of hair with gold ornaments: Hdt. 1.82; Plut. *de mul. vir.* 26; Athen. 12.16. For biblical references see *I.Maccabees* 10.89; 11.58; 14.43–44.

¹⁸ On ancient gold jewellery see B. Deppert-Lippitz, *Griechischer Goldschmuck*, Mainz 1985; J. Ogden, *Ancient Jewellery*, London 1992; D. Williams, J. Ogden, *Greek Gold. Jewellery of the Classical World*, London 1994; D. Williams, *The Art of the Greek Goldsmith*, London 1998.

¹⁹ *CID* IV 117 (= *FD* III 2, 69); cf. also the Athenian copy: *IG* II² 1134, ll. 1–63.

²⁰ *CID* IV 117, ll. 25–27 (= *FD* III 2, 69): (...) παρακαλοῦντας ἀνανεώσθαι [τ]ὰ [νόμιμα καὶ πάτ]ρια τῶν τε θεῶν [καὶ τῶν Ἀθῆν]ησιν τεχνιτῶν τίμια, ἵνα ἔχωσιν ἐξουσίαν οἱ καθιστάμενοι ἱερεῖς ὑ[π]ὸ [τῶν ἐν Ἀθήναι]ς τεχνιτῶν [στεφανηφορεῖν το]ὺς πατρίους στεφάνους ἐμ πάση πόλει, ὑπὸ μηδενὸς κωλυόμενοι (...). On the organization of the associations of Dionysiac *technitai* see B. Le Guen, *Les associations de technites dionysiaques à l’époque hellénistique*, 2 vols., Nancy 2001; J. Lightfoot, *Nothing to Do with the Technitai of Dionysus?*, in: P. Easterling, E. Hall (eds.), *Greek and Roman Actors. Aspects of an Ancient Profession*, Cambridge 2002, 209–224; S. Aneziri, *Die Vereine der dionysischen Techniten im Kontext der hellenistischen Gesellschaft. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte, Organisation und Wirkung der hellenistischen Technitenvereine*, Stuttgart 2003; B. Le Guen, *L’association des Technites d’Athènes ou les ressorts d’une cohabitation réussie*, in: J. C. Couvenhes, S. Milanezi (eds.), *Individus, groupes et politique à Athènes de Solon à Mithridate*, Tours 2007, 339–364; S. Aneziri, *World Travellers. The Associations of Artists of Dionysus*, in: R. Hunter, I. Rutherford (eds.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture*, Cambridge 2009, 217–236.

all *poleis* — a privilege which no city, magistrate or individual shall hamper. Should anyone violate this right, a fine would have to be paid in honour of the god.²¹ Some years later, in a letter to the Athenian Council and People in c. 112 BC, the Delphic Amphictyony again confirmed the Athenian *technitai*'s privilege of the *chrysophoria* along with the right of *asylia*, *ateleia* and *synergasia*, 'observing that the Romans, the common benefactors, have come to the same opinion'.²²

The decree and letter provide some interesting information about the privilege of the *chrysophoria*. It is a specific group, the guild's priests, who are explicitly entitled to this prerogative in honour of the gods. Yet, although the *chrysophoria* ranks among such privileges as *asylia* and *ateleia*, it appears to be so extraordinary and rare that it had obviously been contested by several *poleis* and, therefore, required official endorsement by the Amphictyonic League. Moreover, there might be an indication of the concrete meaning of the priests' *chrysophorein*: if there is an analogy between the wearing of the 'ancestral crowns' (line 26) and the activity of *chrysophorein* (line 31), the *chrysophoria* would refer to a specific gold item of the priests' vestments: a gold crown.

In fact, in modern scholarship the *chrysophoria* has occasionally been identified with the wearing of a gold crown — and vice versa.²³ The equation is not unfounded: gold crowns, and crowns in general, played a crucial role in the symbolic communication in Greek society and religion. The award of a gold crown, which is already attested at Athens in the late 5th century BC,²⁴ represented one of the highest distinctions in the hierarchy of honours. It was bestowed by the cities as a special award on (primarily external) benefactors, on whole institutions and, above all, on victors of sacred athletic or musical competitions (especially of the Panathenaic Games). The crown itself was consecrated to a deity.²⁵ Besides this honorific context,

²¹ CID IV 117, ll. 30–33 (= FD III 2, 69): δεδόχθαι τοῖς Ἀμφικτύουσιν τοὺς ἱερεῖ[ς] [τοὺς καθισταμένους ὑπὸ τῶν] τεχνιτῶν τῶ[ν ἐν Ἀθήναις χρ]υσοφορεῖν τοῖς θεοῖς κατὰ πάσας τὰς πόλεις κατὰ τὰ π[ά]τρια, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ(?) στεφανη[ο]ρεῖν, καὶ μὴ ἐξε[ί]να[ι] κωλύειν αὐτοὺς] μῆτε πόλιν μῆτε ἄρχοντα μῆτε ἰδιώτην· ἂν δὲ τις [κωλύη, τοῦτον(?) μὲν ἀποτεῖσα]ι σ[τα]τῆρας ἱεροῦς τ[ῶ]ι Ἀπόλλωνι(?).

²² CID IV 120, ll. 25–28 (= SEG 52, 121): ὁμοίως δὲ κα[ὶ] τοῖς παρ' ὑμῖν τεχνίταις τὰ ὑπάρχοντα [φι]λάνθρωπα περὶ τε τῆς ἀσυλίας καὶ ἀ[τ]ελείας ν καὶ χρυσοφορίας, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῆς συ[νε]ργασίας, ν θεωροῦντες καὶ τοὺς κοινοῦ[ς] ἐ[υ]εργέτας Ῥωμαίους ν ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς γεγονότας γνώμης. Cf. IG II² 1134, ll. 77–109.

²³ Thus already Wilhelm, *Messene* (n. 3) 40–41. See also L. Robert, *Nouvelles remarques sur l'édit d'Eriza*, BCH 54 (1930) 262–263; Kienast, *Venus* (n. 6) 485 n. 3; Le Guen, *Associations* (n. 20) 97.

²⁴ For early evidence see Athen. 6.234–235; Plat. *Ion* 530; see also the controversy between Aischines and Demosthenes concerning the award of a gold crown: Aesch. *Ctes.*; Demost. *De cor.* On this dispute see H. Wankel, *Demosthenes. Rede für Ktesiphon über den Kranz*, Heidelberg 1976. For a discussion of the evidence of a gold crown see M. Blech, *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen*, Berlin, New York 1982, 141–145 and 153–161.

²⁵ On the gold crown as an honorific award see Blech, *Kranz* (n. 24) 109–181. Cf. also H.-W. Ritter, *Diadem und Königsherrschaft. Untersuchungen zu Zeremonien und Rechtsgrundlagen des Herrschaftsantritts bei den Persern, bei Alexander dem Großen und im Hellenismus*, Munich 1965, 74–76; A. Alföldi, *Caesar in 44. v. Chr. Studien zu Caesars Monarchie und*

some priests were vested with a gold crown as part of their priestly insignia, a privilege that was explicitly laid down in cult regulations.²⁶ The gold crown was often combined with the right of the sanctuary's priest to be clothed in purple garments, another important symbol of status in antiquity.²⁷

Against this background, a definition of the *chrysophoria* of the *technitai*'s priests as the right to wear gold crowns appears probable at first sight. Given the frequent combination of a gold crown with a purple dress as priestly insignia, the ed. pr. of the inscription of the Delphic Amphictyony therefore went on the assumption that the priests of the Athenian guild were entitled to wear purple in addition to their (purported) gold crown: accordingly, the fragmentary infinitive -ορεῖν in line 31 of the decree, which immediately follows the mention of the priests' *chrysophorein*, was reconstructed with [πορφυροφ]ορεῖν ('to wear purple').²⁸ The lacuna before the infinitive -ορεῖν, however, poses a hermeneutic dilemma because an alternative reading should equally be considered. On grounds of spacing, it has been convincingly argued that it could be more suitably filled with the word [στεφανηφ]ορεῖν.²⁹ Instead of purple garments (*porphyrophorein*), line 31 would then refer to the wearing of the 'ancestral crowns' mentioned before in line 26.³⁰ This in turn implies that *chrysophorein* here has a meaning that is different from wearing a crown. On the basis of this reading, an interpretation of the *chrysophoria* of the Athenian *technitai*'s priests that specifies the honour as the right to put on a gold crown does not seem to

ihren Wurzeln, Bonn 1985, 132–158; A. Chaniotis, *Griechische Rituale der Statusänderung und ihre Dynamik*, in: M. Steinicke, S. Weinfurter (eds.), *Investitur- und Krönungsrituale*, Cologne, Weimar 2005, 52–57. On crowns in stephanitic games and the gold crown at Magnesia see W. Slater, D. Summa, *Crowns at Magnesia*, GRBS 46 (2006) 275–299. In Hellenistic times, this honorific tradition of awarding a gold crown developed into a kind of special tax towards the ruling power ('wreath money').

²⁶ See, for example, *I.Priene* 174; 201; 202. Cf. also *SEG* 26, 1334 (Skepsis: regulations for the priest of Dionysos, 2nd century BC): according to line 11, the priest is to 'wear a gold crown': καὶ στέφανοι (sic!) φορεῖν χρυσοῦν. On the priest's dress cf. Robert, *Eriza* (n. 23); L. Robert, *Une vision de Perpetue martyre à Carthage en 203*, CRAI (1982) 258–261; M. Reinhold, *History of Purple as a Status Symbol in Antiquity*, Brussels 1970, 36; Chaniotis, *Rituale* (n. 25) 49–52.

²⁷ On purple as a status symbol see in general Reinhold, *Purple* (n. 26); H. Blum, *Purpur als Statussymbol in der griechischen Welt*, Bonn 1998; O. Longo (ed.), *La porpora. Realtà e immaginario di un colore simbolico. Atti del convegno di studio, Venezia, 24 e 25 ottobre 1996*, Venice 1998. On purple garments in Greek society see A. Grand-Clément, *Pourpre et vêtements dans les sociétés grecques antiques*, in: G. Boëtsch, D. Chevè, H. Claudot-Hawad (eds.), *Décors des corps*, Paris 2010, 89–97.

²⁸ *FD* III 2, 69 with p. 77–78; thus also Aneziri, *Techniten* (n. 20) 313–314 n. 35.

²⁹ F. Lefèvre, *Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes, vol. IV: Actes amphictioniques*, Paris 2002, 283, based on the reconstructions in *IG* and *SIG*. Thus already Wilhelm, *Remarques* (n. 3) 221.

³⁰ Aneziri, *Techniten* (n. 20) 314 argues in favour of *porphyrophorein*. She points out that the combination of *chrysophoria* and *stephanephoria* appears to be uncommon. However, see below the evidence from Tralles.

be cogent. Instead, their *chrysothoria* appears to have denoted the wearing of some gold insignia *except* for a gold crown. A more precise specification is admittedly not possible.

Why did several *poleis* take umbrage at the *technitai*'s right to the *chrysothoria*? A potential background to the necessary confirmation of the guild's privileges may have been the long-standing dispute in this period (134–112 BC) waged between the Athenian association and their Isthmian counterpart, the Isthmian-Nemeian *koinon* of *technitai*, after the Romans had ruled a *synergasia* between the two guilds.³¹ In the wake of their controversy, the Isthmian *poleis* may have challenged several privileges of the Athenian guild. However, the cities' objections against the *chrysothoria* can in part be accounted for when we consider the prevailing attitudes towards gold in general and the exclusivity of wearing gold in contemporary Greek society.³² Due to its natural rarity and special physical characteristics, gold was a metal of extremely precious value which in ancient civilizations carried an aura of divine power. Accordingly, the Greek gods and goddesses were abundantly equipped with gold attributes, their temples and cult statues lavishly adorned with gold ornaments.³³ In the 'secular' sphere, by analogy, gold and other precious substances like purple or pearls were employed as basic markers of social status and wealth. Given this mythic-religious and status-related connotation of gold, restrictions on its use were a common concern of early sumptuary legislation, moralist criticism of luxury, and sacred laws. From the late seventh century BC onwards, sumptuary laws limited the possession of gold for private display or as funerary offerings.³⁴ Sparta in particular imposed on men and women the prohibition of owning gold or silver (money). Gold-embroidered garments were to be the accessories only of prostitutes.³⁵ Women in particular were exhorted to abstain from the extravagance of precious textiles or jewellery.³⁶ In some *poleis* they were prohibited by law from decorating themselves with gold ornaments.³⁷ Without

³¹ For the details of the controversy see *FD* III 2, 70. On the circumstances underlying the dispute see Aneziri, *Techniten* (n. 20) 307–316 (appendix 1.2.2). Cf. also P. Sánchez, *L'Amphictionie des Pyles et de Delphes. Recherches sur son rôle historique, des origines au II^e siècle de notre ère*, Stuttgart 2001, 407.

³² On the history and cultural significance of gold through the ages see S. La Niece, *Gold*, London 2009; S. L. Venable, *Gold. A Cultural Encyclopedia*, Santa Barbara 2011. For Roman connotations see below.

³³ Cf. A. Hermann, M. Cagianò di Azevedo, s.v. *Farbe*, *RAC* 7 (1969) 403; D. Janes, *God and Gold in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge 1998, 19–20; T. Pekáry, *Das römische Kaiserbildnis in Staat, Kult und Gesellschaft. Dargestellt anhand der Schriftquellen*, Berlin 1985, 66–68.

³⁴ See Diod. 12.21 on the Locrian Code. On the private use of gold at Sparta see R. Bernhardt, *Luxuskritik und Aufwandsbeschränkungen in der griechischen Welt*, Stuttgart 2003, 250–251.

³⁵ Xen. *Lak. pol.* 7.6; Plut. *Lys.* 17.6; Plat. *Nom.* 741e–742c; Athen. 521b. According to Xenophon and Plato, however, gold was still abundantly owned by the Spartans: see Plat. *Alk.* 1.122e; Xen. *Lak. pol.* 14.3. On the purported law that restricts gold jewellery to *hetairai* see Clem. Al. *Paid.* 2.10(2).105.2. Cf. Bernhardt, *Luxuskritik* (n. 34) 207 and 250. On the prohibition of purple at Sparta see Plut. *mor.* 228b; Athen. 15.687a.

³⁶ On this aspect see most recently K. Zamfir, *Men and Women in the Household of God. A Contextual Approach to Roles and Ministries in the Pastoral Epistles*, Göttingen 2013, 366–372.

³⁷ *FHG* II 211 (Sparta); Arist. *Oec.* 2.1349a (Ephesus); *Hdt.* 1.82 (Argos).

doubt, there was also a politically motivated stigmatization of wearing gold ornaments: in view of the traditional antagonism between Greeks and Persians, the gold-wearing Medea had become a stereotypical image of the enemy.³⁸ In the sacred sphere, too, the wearing of gold ornaments (or other exclusive adornments) by worshippers was subject to sacred regulations,³⁹ obviously to avoid tensions among the worshippers: the carrying of luxurious valuables in the sanctuary might cause envy and disturbances.⁴⁰ It follows that any gold attributes worn by the god's highest official, the sanctuary's priest, could only be deemed appropriate on condition that they were worn solely in honour of the gods and consecrated to them.

Over time, gold (and purple) did not remain singular attributes of deities and their priests. Concomitant with the emergence of the Hellenistic monarchies, their connotation was extended to the realm of royal symbolism: gold and purple were incorporated as royal insignia by the Hellenistic rulers, whose ritual crowning with a gold diadem marked their elevation to the status of god-like kings.⁴¹ Against this background, the exclusivity of gold and purple as distinguishing marks of divine and royal status may have been reason enough for several rival *poleis* to oppose to the entitlement of the priests of the Athenian guild to the *chrysophoria*, which, therefore, had again to be officially guaranteed.

*

If we go on the assumption that the *chrysophoria* did not necessarily imply the wearing of a gold crown, we have to focus on the question of whether there were other typical (or even mandatory) priestly insignia of gold associated with the *chryso-phoria*. In this respect, the Hellenistic cult regulations from Kos that define the garb and the insignia of a priest in greater detail may be most instructive. One such sacred

³⁸ Cf. the references to the Persian habit of *chrysophorein* in Lyc. 1.109; Diod. 5.46; Dio Chrys. 2.51; Lucian. *dial. mort.* 14.2.

³⁹ See, e.g., *LSCG* 33 (cult of Demeter near Patras: maximum weight of one obol for gold jewellery); *LSCG* 68 (cult of Despoina at Lykosura: prohibition of gold that is not intended for dedication); *SEG* 36, 1221 = *NGSL* 16 (Letoon in Xanthos: prohibition of gold and gold rings); see also for the imperial period *LSCG* 14. Cf. also Plut. *mor.* 819e. On clothing regulations in the sacred sphere see H. Mills, *Greek Clothing Regulations: Sacred and Profane?*, *ZPE* 55 (1984) 255–265; N. Deshours, *Les Mystères d'Andania*, Bordeaux 2006, 102–106; J. B. Connelly, *Portrait of a Priestess. Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece*, Princeton 2007, 90–92; L. Gawlinski, *The Sacred Law of Andania. A New Text with Commentary*, Berlin 2012, 107–133, esp. 126–127.

⁴⁰ See *LSCG* 6 (Kios); Aristoph. *Ach.* 257–258. On this aspect see A. Chaniotis, *Dynamic of Emotions and Dynamic of Rituals. Do Emotions Change Ritual Norms?*, in: C. Brosius, U. Hüsken (eds.), *Ritual Matters. Dynamic Dimensions in Practice*, London 2010, 215–220. The association of gold jewellery with prostitutes might also have been a reason for its prohibition in sanctuaries. See Deshours, *Mystères* (n. 39) 126.

⁴¹ On the insignia of the Hellenistic ruler see Ritter, *Diadem* (n. 25); R. R. R. Smith, *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, Oxford 1988; A. Lichtenberger et al. (eds.), *Das Diadem der hellenistischen Herrscher. Übernahme, Transformation oder Neuschöpfung eines Herrschaftszeichens?*, Bonn 2012.

law does mention the *chrysophoria*, which is also chronologically the next epigraphic source on the *chrysophoria* that has come down to us. In the *diagraphē* of the priesthood of Zeus Alseios in Kos (1st century BC), the outward appearance of the priest is described (or rather prescribed) in detail:⁴² he shall wear a purple *chiton*, an olive crown (στέφανον θάλινον) with a gold ἄφαμμα (knot/gold attachment)⁴³ during the sacred games — and he shall *chrysophorein* (χρυσοφορεῖτω).⁴⁴ The context suggests that ‘wearing gold’ pertains to the priest’s attire. Accordingly, it may describe the right to wear a gold-embroidered *himation* (note that the *chiton* is already defined as made of purple cloth). In the light of some further contemporary *diagraphai* for priesthoods from Kos, it seems, however, more likely that a particular priestly insignia is meant.⁴⁵ In the regulation concerning the sale of the priesthood of Herakles Kallinikos (1st century BC), the priestly dress is described in similar terms: during choral agons, the priest shall wear a white *chiton* and a crown of poplar leaves; in addition, he shall wear an ἄφαμμα — and gold rings.⁴⁶ The enumeration of *chiton*, crown and knot echoes the dress code for the priest of Zeus Alseios, with one remarkable difference: the fourth feature of the apparel, expressed by the general term *chrysophorein* in the *diagraphē* for the priesthood of Zeus Alseios, is now specified by the reference to gold rings. Gold rings also appear in another regulation from Kos, which concerns the priesthood of Nike: during his priestly activities her *hiereus* was obliged to wear a purple *chiton*, an olive crown (just as the priest of Zeus Alseios) — and, again, gold rings.⁴⁷

⁴² IG XII 4, 1, 328 (= *Iscr.Cos* ED 215A = *SEG* 55, 493bis).

⁴³ On the gold ἄφαμμα as an attachment to the crown see A. Chanotis, E. Stavriano-poulou, *Epigraphic Bulletin for Greek Religion*, Kernos 10 (1997) 301; R. Parker, D. Obbink, *Sales of Priesthoods on Cos I*, *Chiron* 30 (2000) 425. In the *diagraphē* of the priesthood of Herakles Kallinikos (IG XII 4, 1, 320), the ἄφαμμα is listed as a separate item.

⁴⁴ Cf. IG XII 4, 1, 328, ll. 15–18: ἐχέτω δὲ καὶ κτῶνα πορφύρεον, φορεῖτω δὲ καὶ στέφανον θάλινον ἔχοντα ἄφαμμα χρύσειον ἐν τοῖς συντελουμένοις ἀγῶσιν καὶ χρυσοφορεῖτω. It is interesting to note that the Asiatic guild of Dionysiac artists had their privileges confirmed by Sulla and the Senate in a letter to the Koans; the privileges were recorded on a marble stele (IG XII 4, 1, 252). We do not know whether the Ionian-Hellespontine guild also had the right of the *chrysophoria* like the Athenian *technitai*, but the occurrence of *chrysophorein* in the Koan inscription might not be coincidental against this background. On the Dionysiac artists in Kos see R. K. Sherck, *Cos and the Dionysiac Artists*, *Historia* 15 (1966) 211–216.

⁴⁵ On clothing regulations for priests in Kos see S. Paul, *Roles of Civic Priests in Hellenistic Cos*, in: M. Horster, A. Klöckner (eds.), *Cities and Priests. Cult Personnel in Asia Minor and the Aegean Islands from the Hellenistic to the Imperial Period*, Berlin, Boston 2013, 262–265.

⁴⁶ IG XII 4, 1, 320, ll. 22–24 (= *Iscr.Cos* ED 180 = *SEG* 45, 1129): (...) καὶ φορεῖτω κιθῶνα διάλευκον· ἐστε[φ]ανώσθω δὲ καὶ στεφάνωι λευκίνωι, ἐχέτω δὲ καὶ ἄφαμμα καὶ χρυσεός δακτυλός.

⁴⁷ *LSCG* 163 = *Iscr.Cos* ED 89. On all other occasions he had to wear a white *chiton*. See also IG XII 4, 1, 323 (= *SEG* 55, 933 = D. Bosnakis, K. Hallof, *Alte und neue Inschriften aus Kos II* (Nr. 20–24), *Chiron* 35 (2005) 249–251 no. 22), where the edd. pr. identify another instance of the priest’s *chrysophoria* (l. 13): (...) ἔχων δι[ά]λευκον κιθῶνα· φορεῖτω δὲ καὶ στέφαν[ον] δάφρινον καὶ χρ[υ]σοφορεῖτω –]. The translation offered by the digital edition of the *Inscriptiones Graecae* (*Telota*) equally renders *chrysophorein* by ‘wearing gold rings’.

Gold rings, then, represented a characteristic feature of the priestly vestments in Kos. The ring, especially the signet ring, is well attested as a magisterial or priestly status symbol in the Greek *poleis*.⁴⁸ Its emblematic value is well reflected in the synonymous use of the word *symbolon* for *daktylon*.⁴⁹ Along with purple garments, gold rings in particular were prestige markers of the *philoï* of the Hellenistic rulers, with the ring featuring a portrait of the king.⁵⁰ The outstanding significance of gold rings is already testified in one of the earliest Greek sumptuary laws: according to the Locrian Code, men are generally forbidden to wear gold rings.⁵¹ Some sacred laws expressly mention (gold) rings as forbidden items in the sanctuary, possibly because of their association with magic.⁵² In view of the high symbolic meaning of gold rings, it is legitimate to assume that the provision of the *chrysophoria* for the Koan priests implied the exclusive authorization for priests to wear gold rings in honour of a god.⁵³

*

The specific meaning of the *chrysophoria* as the right to wear gold rings finds further corroboration in the well-known epigraphic dossier from Messene concerning the *oktobolos eisphora*.⁵⁴ The dossier, which has been dated to the first century BC,⁵⁵

⁴⁸ On the ring in Greek culture see A. Fourlas, *Der Ring in der Antike und im Christentum. Der Ring als Herrschaftssymbol und Würdezeichen*, Münster 1971, 68–76. Cf. also F. Marshall, *Catalogue of the Finger Rings. Greek, Etruscan, and Roman*, London 1907.

⁴⁹ Plin. *HN* 33.10.

⁵⁰ See Athen. 5.212d; Plut. *Luc.* 3. Cf. Wilhelm, *Messene* (n. 3) 38.

⁵¹ Diod. 12.21.

⁵² See *LSCG* 68; *SEG* 36, 1221 = *NGSL* 16. For the imperial period see *LSCG* 14; 59. On the prohibition of rings in sanctuaries see C. Le Roy, *Un règlement religieux au Létôon de Xanthos*, RA (1986) 279–300, esp. 286–289; Gawlinski, *Andania* (n. 39) 126.

⁵³ The specific reference to gold rings by ‘*chrysophorein*’ is also attested in the literary sources. Dionysios of Halicarnassos, quoting the reports (in Greek) by Fabius and Cincius, relates that the Sabines used to wear rings, which he specifies as *chrysophoroi* (Dion. Hal. 2.38). Appian (*Lybica* 493) also reports in his *Punic Wars* that after the battle of Nopheris (149 BC) Hasdrubal recognized the Roman tribunes among the corpses because they wore gold rings (= *chrysophorein*) in contrast to the iron rings of the common soldiers (= *siderophorein*). See n. 85 for the rare epigraphic attestations of gold rings.

⁵⁴ *IG V 1*, 1432.

⁵⁵ On the Republican dating see L. Migeotte, *La date de l’oktôbolos eisphora de Messène*, *Topoi* 7 (1997) 51–61; L. Migeotte, *L’organisation de l’oktôbolos eisphora de Messène*, in: C. Grandjean (ed.), *Le Péloponnèse d’Epaminondas à Hadrien*, Bordeaux, Paris 2008, 229–230. For a more precise dating to c. 100 BC see Wilhelm, *Messene* (n. 3) 92–103; T. C. Brennan, *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic*, 2 vols., Oxford 2000, 521–523 (104 BC, based on the identification of Memmius with C. Memmius, *tr. pl.* 111 BC); R. Kallet-Marx, *Hegemony to Empire. The Development of the Roman Imperium in the East from 148 to 62 B.C.*, Berkeley 1995, 352 has argued that a date before the late first century BC is improbable because of the calculation in *denarii* and the presence of Roman residents at Messene. For a dating to the imperial period see W. Kolbe in *IG V 1*, xv, 311 (30s/40s AD) and A. Giovannini, *Rome et la circulation monétaire en Grèce au I^{er} siècle avant Jésus-Christ*, Basel 1978, 119–121 (35–44 AD). See, however, the criticism below n. 74. Ph. Gauthier, *Epigraphie et institutions*

contains two honorific decrees for Aristokles, the *grammateus* of the Messenian *synedrion*. Aristokles is praised for successfully collecting a special tax which the Romans had demanded as an additional contribution. Aristokles' commitment and efficiency in raising the sum of 100,000 *denarii* must have been so outstanding that he was awarded a special honour: the first decree relates that, apart from a bronze statue, 'the praetorian legate Vibius personally gave him in the presence of all the citizens the right to wear a gold ring, and the councillors themselves accorded (him) the same honour along with the statue.'⁵⁶ In the second decree, the conferral of this honour is expressed in a different wording: the praetorian legate Vibius and the proconsul Memmius each gave him in recognition of his merits the '*chrysophoria*', as did the Messenian *synedroi*.⁵⁷

The *chrysophoria* here unmistakably implies the right to wear a gold ring. Unlike the cases of the *chrysophoria* in Delphi and Kos, it is not a priest who is granted the *chrysophoria*, but a magistrate who is honoured publicly for his services towards the *polis*. It is, of course, conceivable that Aristokles' entitlement to the *chrysophoria* was confined to cultic events like processions or sacred competitions. It may as well have been attached to a civic priesthood that Aristokles possibly held. What, in addition, certainly deserves particular attention is the information provided in the inscription about who the initiator of the honorific decree for Aristokles was. It is not the hometown that nominates its *grammateus* and eminent citizen for the great honour; the Messenian *synedrion* merely agrees to a privilege that had been conferred on Aristokles by an external power, the Roman government as represented by the praetor and the proconsul of Macedonia. This raises the general question to what extent the *chrysophoria* is located in both a Roman and Greek honorific context. In fact, on closer inspection, a Roman element also surfaces in two other cases already mentioned: it was the Roman Senate that conferred the *chrysophoria* on the seventeen Sicilian towns by a *senatus consultum*; moreover, the Delphic Amphictyony, which was then under the control of the Romans, granted the *chrysophoria* to the Athenian *technitai* as long as the Romans had no objections. This is not to say that the *chrysophoria* was a 'Roman' honour.⁵⁸ We should bear in mind that Rome's symbolic language was largely influenced by cultural interactions between Greece and Rome and that the evidence we have so far discussed dates from a period of increased

grecques, EPHE Livret-Annuaire 13 (1999) 92 has reviewed the evidence and literature and follows Migeotte's dating; likewise C. Grandjean, *Les Messéniens de 370/369 au I^{er} siècle de notre ère. Monnayages et histoire*, Athens 2003, 251–252; Deshours, *Mystères* (n. 39) 51.

⁵⁶ IG V 1, 1432, ll. 11–12: (...) Οὐίβιος δὲ ὁ στραταγὸς ἔδωρῆσατο αὐτῶι παρόντων τῶ[ν] π[ο]λιτῶν κατὰ πρόσωπον, ὅπως φορῆι δακτύλιον χρυσοῦν αὐτοῖ τε οἱ σύνεδροι τιμὰν ἔδωκαν [αὐτῶι τ]ῶν αὐτῶν μετὰ τὰς εἰκόνας (...).

⁵⁷ IG V 1, 1432, ll. 36–37: Μέμμιος τε ὁ ἀνθύπατος καὶ Οὐίβιος ὁ στραταγὸς ἔδωρῆσατο αὐτῶι χρυσοφορίαν ἕκαστος, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ σύνεδροι (...).

⁵⁸ Note that there is no direct equivalent term in Latin.

Roman intervention in the East, so a Roman colouring should not be surprising.⁵⁹ Still, it is indispensable to accord due heuristic attention to the issue of a certain Roman involvement in the *chrysophoria*, i.e. the significance of gold in general and the gold ring in particular in Roman society must be equally taken into consideration in a comprehensive assessment of the ‘Greek’ *chrysophoria*.⁶⁰

At Rome, just as in Greece, gold ornaments (as well as purple) constituted symbolic expressions of divine power, that were primarily reserved for the worship of the highest Roman god, Jupiter Optimus Maximus.⁶¹ Only on the special occasion of the celebration of a triumph was the successful Roman general allowed to slip into the guise of Jupiter and wear the triumphal ornaments including the *toga picta* with the *tunica palmata* (a gold-embroidered garment), while a gold laurel crown, which was owned by the *res publica*, was held above his head by a public slave.⁶² Beyond this ceremonial sphere, a gold crown (*corona aurea*) formed part of the *dona militaria*, which a general could award in recognition of outstanding achievements on the battlefield,⁶³ whereas a tradition of crowning citizens with a gold wreath in the Greek honorific manner is unknown from Republican Rome.⁶⁴ Given the ‘symbolic capital’

⁵⁹ As for the specific custom of wearing a ring, we learn from the Elder Pliny that it was originally a Greek habit adopted by the Romans: Plin. *HN* 33.9. On the Greek influence on Roman honours see A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Roman Arches and Greek Honours. The Language of Power at Rome*, PCPS 36 (1990) 143–181.

⁶⁰ For a general account of jewellery as a status symbol in Roman culture, see A. Stout, *Jewelry as a Symbol of Status in the Roman Empire*, in: J. L. Sebesta, L. Bonfante (eds.), *The World of Roman Costume*, Madison 2001, 77–100; see also J. Edmondson, A. Keith (eds.), *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture*, Toronto 2008.

⁶¹ His characteristic dress consisted of the *tunica palmata* (a gold-embroidered garment) as well as a gold wreath. Gold crowns were also dedicated to Jupiter as votive offerings by both Romans and non-Romans. See B. Bergmann, *Der Kranz des Kaisers. Genese und Bedeutung einer römischen Insignie*, Berlin 2010, 8–9.

⁶² Dionysios of Halicarnassus (3.61–62) provides an alternative aetiology of the triumphal costume: the Etruscans offered their marks of sovereignty to King Tarquin: a gold crown, an embroidered purple robe, a throne of ivory, an ivory sceptre, and twelve lictors. He goes on to explain (3.62.2): ‘All these ornaments were retained by the kings who succeeded him, and, after the expulsion of the kings, by the annual consuls — all except the crown and the embroidered robe; these alone were taken from them, being looked upon as vulgar and invidious. Yet whenever they return victorious from a war and are honoured with a triumph by the Senate, they then not only wear gold (*chrysophorein*), but are also clad in embroidered purple robes.’ On this complex matter see M. Beard, *The Roman Triumph*, Cambridge/MA 2007, esp. 272–277 and 225–233; cf. also A. Abaecherli-Boyce, *The Origin of ornamenta triumphalia*, *CPh* 37 (1942) 130–141; H. S. Versnel, *Triumphus. An Inquiry into the Origin, Development and Meaning of the Roman Triumph*, Leiden 1970, *passim*. The carrying of the gold crown above the head of the triumphator is shown on a cup from Boscoreale, which depicts the triumph of Tiberius (now in the Musée du Louvre).

⁶³ On the *dona militaria* in general and the *corona aurea* in particular see P. Steiner, *Dona militaria oder die militärischen Auszeichnungen der Römer*, *BJ* 114/115 (1906) 1–98; V. Maxfield, *The Military Decorations of the Roman Army*, Berkeley, Los Angeles 1981, esp. 80–81; S. Pfahl, *Die Rangabzeichen im römischen Heer der Kaiserzeit*, Düsseldorf 2012.

⁶⁴ Plin. *HN* 33.38.

with which prestige-generating symbols of power such as gold and purple were charged, it is not surprising that members of the Roman aristocracy deemed these assets increasingly attractive for their self-presentation and personal adornment — a development that was concomitant with the immense influx into Rome of precious artefacts as war booty. However, in the oligarchic society of Republican Rome, which did not accept individual social pre-eminence among the nobility, the use of such luxury items was carefully curbed from early times by sumptuary laws: the *lex Oppia* of 215 BC restricted the lavish use of gold jewellery by women to one ounce, and the *lex Iulia sumptuaria* of 46 BC aimed to control access to purple.⁶⁵

As for the significance of the gold ring in Roman society — which brings us back to our discussion of the Messenian documents — it too meant far more than a mere piece of jewellery.⁶⁶ In his comprehensive chapter on the use of gold, Pliny the Elder offers an instructive insight into the history and special role of the gold ring in Roman society.⁶⁷ He points out how the ring gradually came to signify high social status and privilege — a deplorable development in Pliny's view: 'The worst crime against mankind was committed by the man who first put a ring upon his fingers.'⁶⁸ Outlining the chronology of ring-wearing at Rome, Pliny notes that in early Republican times not even Roman senators or triumphators wore gold rings, but iron rings. In those days, only Roman envoys put on gold rings to insinuate high rank abroad, while they still used iron rings at home.⁶⁹ According to Pliny, it was around 300 BC that members of the Roman nobility began to adorn their fingers with gold rings. Most importantly, by the first century AD, the gold ring became the official status symbol of the equestrian order, as ratified in the Tiberian laws of 23/4 AD.⁷⁰ Pliny sarcastically comments on this, stating that it was the gold ring alone that created the second Roman order, which inserted itself between the Senate and the plebs.⁷¹ In this way, the grant of the right to

⁶⁵ See Cato's speech (Liv. 34.4) to prevent the repeal of the *lex Oppia* and his analysis of Rome's moral decline, which in his view is reflected in the use of gold and purple. Cf. also Zon. 9.17.1–3. On sumptuary laws see D. Podes Myles, *Forbidden Pleasure. Sumptuary Laws and the Ideology of Moral Decline in Ancient Rome*, unpublished PhD thesis, London 1987; E. Zanda, *Fighting Hydra-like Luxury. Sumptuary Regulation in the Roman Republic*, London 2011.

⁶⁶ On the ring in Roman culture see in general Fourlas, *Ring* (n. 48) 76–81. Cf. also Marshall, *Catalogue* (n. 48); M. Müller, *Ergänzender Kommentar zu Isidors gesammelten Angaben*, in: M. Müller, M.-L. Babin, J. Riecke (eds.), *Das Thema Kleidung in den Etymologien Isidors von Sevilla und im Summarium Heinrici I*, Berlin, New York 2012, 460–472.

⁶⁷ Plin. *HN* 33.8–41. On these chapters see J. Isager, *Pliny on Art and Society. The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art*, London 1991, 59–62; R. Hawley, *Lords of the Rings: Ring-wearing, Status, and Identity in the Age of Pliny the Elder*, in: E. Bispham, G. Rowe, E. Matthews (eds.), *Vita vigilia est. Essays in Honour of Barbara Levick*, London 2007, 103–111. See also the brief account in Cass. Dio 48.45.7–9.

⁶⁸ Plin. *HN* 33.8: *Pessimum vitae scelus fecit qui primus induit digitis, nec hoc quis fecerit traditur.*

⁶⁹ Plin. *HN* 33.13.

⁷⁰ Plin. *HN* 33.32. See also Cass. Dio. 48.45.7–9.

⁷¹ Plin. *HN* 33.29. See A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Rome's Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge 2008, 351. On the equestrian gold ring see A. Stein, *Der römische Ritterstand. Ein Beitrag zur Sozial- und Personengeschichte des römischen Reiches*, Munich 1927, 31–49; A. Alföldi, *Der früh-*

wear the gold ring, the *ius anuli aurei* (which also implied *ingenuitas*), opened up membership in the equestrian order.

Against this background, it has been maintained that in the Messenian decree the *chrysophoria*, which bestowed the right to wear a gold ring on Aristokles, is tantamount to the *ius anuli aurei* and hence confers equestrian rank on him.⁷² It must, however, be emphasized here that this postulate may only be relevant as far as the award of the gold ring by the Roman officials is concerned, which according to the decree preceded the conferral of the same honour by the Messenian *synedroi*.⁷³ The local council itself was not in a position to confer equestrian rank; the second award — or rather approval — of the gold ring in the honorific decree was apparently a response of the Messenian *synedrion* to keep up with this extraordinary honour by the Romans and assert its honour-granting authority.

Given the late-Republican dating of the inscription, the equation of the *chryso-phoria* with the *ius anuli aurei* would presuppose that the gold ring already signified equestrian status in the first century BC.⁷⁴ But herein the crux of the matter lies: it is

römische Reiteradel und seine Standesabzeichen, Baden-Baden 1952, 26–35; S. Demougin, *De l'esclavage à l'anneau d'or du chevalier*, in: C. Nicolet (ed.), *Des ordres à Rome*, Paris 1984, 217–241; S. Demougin, *L'ordre équestre sous les Julio-Claudiens*, Rome 1988, 789–794; N. Ergün, *Der Ring als Statussymbol*, KJ 32 (1999) 713–725; R. Duncan-Jones, *Who were the equites?*, in: C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XIII*, Brussels 2006, 215–218; B. Spalhoff, *Repräsentationsformen des römischen Ritterstandes*, Tübingen 2010, 19–27.

⁷² Thus Giovannini, *Circulation* (n. 55) 119–122. Occasionally, the term *chrysophoria* has indeed been equated with the Roman *ius anuli aurei* in modern scholarship: see H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1996, 2011 with reference to *IG V 1, 1432* (Messene) and *IG II² 4193* (Athens; see below); H.-G. Pflaum, *Les fastes de la province de Narbonnaise*, Paris 1978, 105; J.-M. Paillet, *Domitien, la «loi des Narbonnais» et le culte impérial dans les provinces sénatoriales d'Occident*, *Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise* 22 (1989) 184; J. Dalfen, *Gold. Ein Streifzug durch das griechische Wörterbuch*, in: S. Deger-Jalkotzy, N. Schindel (eds.), *Gold. Tagung anlässlich der Gründung des Zentrums Archäologie und Altertumswissenschaften an der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 19.–20. April 2007, Vienna 2009, 28.

⁷³ *IG V 1, 1432, ll. 11–12*. Aristokles does not seem to possess the *civitas Romana*, but this does not rule out the possibility of his promotion to equestrian rank: *en bloc* grants of Roman citizenship and equestrian rank were possible. See *IEph 3032*. Cf. S. Demougin, *L'ordre équestre en Asie Mineure. Histoire d'une Romanisation*, in: S. Demougin, H. Devijver, M.-T. Raepsaet-Charlier (eds.), *L'ordre équestre. Histoire d'une aristocratie (I^{er} siècle av. J.-C. – III^e siècle ap. J.-C.)*, Rome 1999, 585.

⁷⁴ Giovannini, *Circulation* (n. 55) 119–122 has maintained that the *ius anuli* was conferred on Greek provincials in imperial times only and therefore concluded that the Messenian inscription must be dated to the mid-first century AD. However, Giovannini's (circular) argumentation for this dating is based on wrong premises and has been convincingly refuted; see P. Marchetti, *Rev. of A. Giovannini, Rome et la circulation monétaire en Grèce au II^e siècle avant Jésus-Christ*, *Revue belge de numismatique* 125 (1979) 193–194; Migeotte, *Date* (n. 55) 58. Not only is the Hellenistic dating of the inscription indicated by other factors (Migeotte, *Date* [n. 55] 52–57); in imperial times it was the prerogative of the emperor to grant the *ius anuli*, not of the proconsul, let alone the local council.

not at all clear exactly when the grant of a gold ring began to connote promotion to equestrian rank *before* its legal formalization in the Tiberian principate. Pliny vaguely dates this convention to Augustan times,⁷⁵ but some scholars have suggested that the status-granting quality of the gold ring already developed in late-Republican times.⁷⁶ A central source often discussed in this context is an episode in Cicero's second speech against Verres.⁷⁷ After criticizing how unworthy subalterns (including scribes) have increasingly encroached on equestrian rank through their wealth, Cicero scolds Verres for giving a gold ring to his scribe at a public meeting — 'a gift which was an act of such extraordinary impudence that it seemed novel to all the Sicilians, and to me incredible.'⁷⁸ He explains that it had been an ancient Roman custom that generals and magistrates with *imperium* presented their secretaries with gold rings in a public assembly, but only after the defeat of an enemy or some other military success.⁷⁹ His indignation with Verres, then, is primarily targeted at the misappropriated award of the gold ring outside the military context to an unsuitable person by an unworthy Roman magistrate. At first glance, the juxtaposition of his outrage about equestrian upstarts in the passage immediately preceding the report about Verres' award of the gold ring to his scribe may insinuate that the gift of the ring also implied the scribe's elevation to equestrian status.⁸⁰ However, this inference is a splendid example of a skilfully devised ambiguity and deceptive manoeuvre which the great rhetor deliberately creates in his effort to expose Verres' depravity. Nowhere does Cicero explicitly equate equestrian rank and the gold ring.⁸¹ He merely suggests that the gold ring was commonly deemed a mark of distinction to honour prominent individuals, which could enhance their social recognition.⁸² The gold ring was certainly to develop into a distinct symbol of equestrian status at that time.⁸³ It *reflected* high status, but did not

⁷⁵ Plin. *HN* 33.30.

⁷⁶ See Alföldi, *Reiteradel* (n. 71) 27; C. Nicolet, *L'ordre équestre à l'époque républicaine (312–43 av. J.-C.)*, vol. 1, Paris 1974, 92–94. Cf. also Spalthoff, *Repräsentationsformen* (n. 71) 20.

⁷⁷ Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.184f.

⁷⁸ Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.185: *Quae tua donatio singulari impudentia nova Siculis omnibus, mihi vero etiam incredibilis videbatur.*

⁷⁹ Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.185: *Saepe enim nostri imperatores superatis hostibus, optime re publica gesta, scribas suos anulis aureis in contione donarunt.*

⁸⁰ See Alföldi, *Reiteradel* (n. 71) 26–35; Spalthoff, *Repräsentationsformen* (n. 71) 19–20.

⁸¹ See also Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.187. In this passage, Cicero becomes less equivocal about the award of the gold ring to the scribe: 'For that gold ring given by you does not prove he was a brave man, but only a rich one. As we should judge that same ring, if given by someone else, to have evidence of virtue, when given by you, we consider it only an accompaniment to money' (*neque enim iste anulus aureus abs te datus istum virum fortem, sed hominem locupletem esse declarat. Ita eundem anulum ab alio datum testem virtutis duceremus, abs te donatum comitem pecuniae iudicamus*). While it may have been Verres' *intention* to grant high status to his friends through the gold ring, it nevertheless did not entail formal membership in the equestrian order. Likewise in Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.29.

⁸² See also Cass. Dio 48.45.

⁸³ Cf. also the episode in Suet. *Caes.* 33: Suetonius explains that the soldiers misunderstood the meaning of Caesar's pointing to his ring, believing that he would grant them equestrian

formally constitute it yet, even if given by an *imperator*.⁸⁴ There were still different ‘user groups’ of gold rings in Republican times, including honorands like Aristokles who were not of equestrian or senatorial status.⁸⁵

Cicero’s remarks on Verres’ dealing with his scribe offer an interesting point of reference because of the striking similarities between the reported Roman custom of the award of gold rings by generals and the award of the *chrysophoria* for Aristokles in the Messenian decree. According to Cicero, it is Roman magistrates with *imperium* who grant the gold ring, just as the proconsul and praetor bestow it on Aristokles. They grant it specifically to their secretaries, just as Aristokles is a *grammateus* (albeit of the *polis*, not of the Roman governor). The award is made in a public assembly (*contio*), just as Aristokles receives the *chrysophoria* ‘in the presence of all citizens’. Elsewhere Cicero explains that the special ‘merit’ of Verres’ scribe was to levy a tax on public transactions,⁸⁶ just as Aristokles had introduced a special land tax. It is true that there is no indication of a military context in the Messenian decree, but the parallels suggest that the award of the gold ring to Aristokles ties in with the established Roman custom of honouring outstanding citizens with a gold ring, which is here applied to the provincial, civic context.

Besides, Aristokles rendered services to the Romans that may in particular have earned him — and legitimized — the exclusive privilege of the gold ring since he fell into yet another ‘user group’ of bearers of a ring. As mentioned above, before its development as a distinct status symbol, the gold ring used to be given by the Romans

status. However, Suetonius, who writes in retrospect, clearly states that the grant of equestrian status would have implied the right to wear the gold ring *and* the requirement of the minimum census of 400,000 HS.

⁸⁴ T. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, vol. 3, Leipzig ³1888, 517–518 already emphasized that in Republican times the grant of the gold ring, even if given by the *imperator*, was a gesture of honour, since equestrian dignity itself could not be granted by a general. Only with the development of the institution of extraordinary powers did the *anulus aureus* begin to gain a status-granting quality, which was formalized in the principate. Stein, *Ritterstand* (n. 71) 45 also acknowledged that a minimum census was a necessary additional prerequisite. J. Linderski, *Review of C. Nicolet, L’ordre équestre à l’époque républicaine (312–43 av. J.-C.) II*, CP 72 (1977) 58 points out that full admission to the equestrian order could only be granted by the censors, regardless of the grant of the ring by *imperatores*. Cf. also J. Bleicken, *Cicero und die Ritter*, Göttingen 1995, 50–51.

⁸⁵ See also Duncan-Jones, *Equites* (n. 71), 215–218 on the significance of the gold ring in the principate: the equation of ring and rank is not self-evident even then. In the epigraphic record, there are only a few further attestations of a gold ring. They all date to the imperial period and are mainly dedications: *IPE* II 5; *I.Hadrianoi* 1; *I.Pergamon* III 72. This finding substantiates the impression that the grant of equestrian status was not expressed by a reference to the gold ring. More typical and common was the mention of the award of the *equus publicus*: ἵππῳ δημοσίῳ (τεταμημένον). See e.g. *I.Prusias ad Hypium* 54; *IGR* III 172 = *ILS* 8829; *IGR* III 778; *SEG* 17, 584; *I.Troas* 41.

⁸⁶ Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.171 and 2.3.175–176. Verres’ *scriba* Maevius came from Asia. See Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.187.

to their ambassadors.⁸⁷ As the second decree in honour of Aristokles states, he did act as an ambassador to the Romans and ‘achieved many important advantages to the benefit of the city at the hands of the governors, some here in the city, some as an envoy. Further, in entertaining governors and numerous other Romans too he devotes the expenditure of his own money to the advantage of the city.’⁸⁸ On analogy with the Roman practice of equipping their own ambassadors with gold rings, the *chryso-phoria* in the Messenian dossier may also be viewed as a form of recognition (by both the Roman authorities and the *polis*) of Aristokles’ role as an ambassador and mediator between the Roman power and his hometown.

Our contextual analysis of the *chryso-phoria* in the Messenian decree gives us some idea of the complex intercultural contact between Rome and Greece in the field of status symbolism and civic honours. Apparently, the Roman honorific tradition of granting a gold ring to worthy individuals or envoys was transferred here to the Greek context, which was rendered by the term *chryso-phoria* to assimilate the Roman honorific practice with an equivalent Greek honorific convention. As far as existing honours are concerned, the adoption of Roman *ornamenta* and their specific connotations into the ambit of Greek *timai* may at times have resulted in a re-interpretation or extension of their meaning.⁸⁹

The establishment of the principate brought about a complex redefinition of the language of prestige in the whole Mediterranean world. Symbolic communication by all kinds of media was to become a pivotal instrument of the power politics of the imperial monarchy. Yet, especially in the early principate the self-presentation of the *princeps* was a delicate balancing act. The Republican façade of the principate expected from the emperors a display of modesty and parity in their dealings with the senatorial aristocracy. Augustus in particular concealed his quasi-monarchical position behind the markedly modest guise of the *civilis princeps*, who refrained from any royal symbolism and pomp, while the ostentatious use of gold and purple by the

⁸⁷ Plin. *HN* 33.13.

⁸⁸ *IG* V 1, 1432, ll. 30–33: γεγενημενᾶν <τε> ἐπιταγᾶν περὶ πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων κατείργασται πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα τῶν ταῖ πόλει συμφερόντων διὰ τῶν ἀγούμενων, ἃ μὲν ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεος, ἃ δὲ καὶ πρεσβεύων· ὑποδεχόμενος δὲ καὶ ἀγούμενος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ῥωμαίων καὶ πλείονας τίθεται τὰς ἰδίας δαπάνας εἰς τὰ τὰς πόλεος συμφέροντα (transl. B. Levick). On the presence of Romans in Messene see S. Zoumbaki, *Die Niederlassung römischer Geschäftsleute in der Peloponnes*, *Tekmeria* 4 (1998/99) 117–122.

⁸⁹ On the relationship between Roman *ornamenta* and Greek *timai* (*bouleutikai*, *agonothetikai* etc.) see A. Heller, *La cité grecque d’époque impériale: vers une société d’ordres?*, *Annales HSS* (2009) 355–357. Heller does not believe that such *timai* were modelled on the Roman practice of *ornamenta* and merely equivalent Greek translations; instead, she emphasizes the pre-existing honorific traditions of the *polis*. On the impact of Roman status symbols in the Greek East see A. B. Kuhn, *Honouring Senators and Equestrians in the Graeco-Roman East*, in: A. Heller, O. M. van Nijf (eds.), *Civic Honours. The Politics of Honour in the Greek Cities of Roman Imperial Times (1st–3rd c. AD)*, Leiden (forthcoming).

mali principes like Caligula, Nero and Domitian was denounced by contemporary moralists as inappropriate and became a distinguishing mark of their 'tyranny'.⁹⁰ Nevertheless, a prerogative of the emperors to certain insignia to mark their exclusive status — the triumphal dress in particular — developed subtly and gradually behind the semblance of imperial *civilitas*. On the one hand, it was brought about by laws concerning luxury, which implicitly reserved precious metals to imperial display.⁹¹ On the other hand, much of the symbolism associated with imperial power was accorded to the emperors from the outside, by senators and plebs alike.⁹²

The eastern provinces played an important role in this process. The Hellenistic tradition of worshipping rulers with cultic honours bolstered the divine image of the Roman emperor and with it the glory and splendour that were due to gods. The willingness of the Greek cities to accept the god-like authority of the emperor had an impact on the honorific culture of the cities themselves in so far as new forms of honours, i.e. innovative ways of adulation, were eagerly invented for the new *princeps*.⁹³ In general, however, the imperial cult was largely modelled on the established honours of the Hellenistic ruler cult, which in turn followed the ritual traditions of the contemporary worship of the gods.⁹⁴ Given the divine symbolism associated in particular with the emperor, the cities will have become more hesitant in awarding outstanding honours to eminent citizens, especially with regard to such royal prerogatives as gold and purple, whose employment was even a sensitive issue for the emperors themselves.⁹⁵

⁹⁰ Suet. *Cal.* 52; Plin. *Paneg.* 52; Suet. *Ner.* 25; 30–31.

⁹¹ Cf., for instance, Tiberius' prohibition of gold vessels and silk wear (Cass. Dio. 57.15.1–2; Tac. *ann.* 2.33); Nero's prohibition of the use of amethystine and Tyrian purple clothes by women (Suet. *Ner.* 32.3). On sumptuary laws by the emperors see J. Edmondson, *Public Dress and Social Control in Late Republican and Early Imperial Rome*, in: J. Edmondson, A. Keith (eds.), *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture*, Toronto 2008, 21–46.

⁹² On this aspect see A. Alföldi, *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche*, Darmstadt 1970; A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Civilis Princeps. Between Citizen and King*, *JRS* 72 (1982) 32–48; M. Zimmermann, *Die Darstellung des kaiserlichen Ranges und seines Prestiges*, in: A. B. Kuhn (ed.), *Social Status and Prestige in the Graeco-Roman World*, Stuttgart (forthcoming).

⁹³ In 29 BC, the province of Asia announced that whoever would come up with the best suggestion of how to honour Augustus would receive a gold crown. The prize was given in 9 BC to Paullus Fabius Maximus for his idea to start the new calendar of the province with Augustus' birthday. See I.Priene 105.

⁹⁴ On this aspect see A. Chanotis, *Der Kaiserkult im Osten des Römischen Reiches im Kontext der zeitgenössischen Ritualpraxis*, in: H. Cancik, K. Hitzl (eds.), *Die Praxis der Herrscherverehrung in Rom und seinen Provinzen. Akten der Tagung in Blaubeuren vom 4. bis zum 6. April 2002*, Tübingen 2003, 3–28.

⁹⁵ Cf. also the case of Labeo of Cyme, who rejects the honorific title of *ktistes* because he deems it only appropriate for the gods and the god-like emperor. See *I.Kyme* 19 = *IGR* IV 1302. On the monopolization of cultic honours by the imperial *domus* see J. Strubbe, *Cultic Honours for Benefactors in the Cities of Asia Minor*, in: L. de Ligt, E. A. Hemelrijk, H. W. Singor (eds.), *Roman Rule and Civic Life. Local and Regional Perspectives*, Amsterdam 2004, 315–330.

The new circumstances in the imperial honorific landscape may account for the lack of any explicit evidence of the award of the *chrysophoria* in the Greek East in the early principate. It is not before the mid-first century AD that the *chrysophoria* reappears in several honorific inscriptions from Argos. In our introductory remarks, we have already mentioned Tib. Iulius Reglos, who was honoured with the *chrysophoria* as ‘the first and only one’.⁹⁶ Despite this (formulaic) statement about the uniqueness of the honour for Reglos, the *chrysophoria* was anything but exceptional in this *polis*: another prominent local notable, Claudius Diodotos,⁹⁷ is granted the *chrysophoria* along with the additional honour of wearing purple garments and the ‘honours of Perseus and Herakles’, which were presumably a local form of heroic honours with a ‘royal’ connotation since Herakles and Perseus were regarded as the ancestors of the Argive kings.⁹⁸ Of particular interest for our analysis is, of course, the information about the honouring body of these exclusive *timai* for Claudius Diodotos: it is the community of Italian businessmen (*negotiatores*) at Argos who bestow the honours on him ‘because of his benefactions towards the *epitropoi* (*procuratores*)’.⁹⁹ Here again, the active role of the Roman community in the conferral of both the *chrysophoria* and the purple garment (possibly even the Roman *toga praetexta*?) comes to the fore and corroborates our previous observations on the Roman influence on the honour.¹⁰⁰

Apart from his services towards the Roman *epitropoi*, Claudius Diodotos was much committed to the public weal of his hometown.¹⁰¹ He had held the civic offices of *agoranomos*, *grammateus*, *gymnasiarchos*, *hierophantes* (of the mysteries at Lerna) and is praised as ‘the first and only one’ who distributed oil to free citizens

⁹⁶ IG IV 586.

⁹⁷ IG IV 606. Given the *nomen gentile* of Claudius Diodotos, the *terminus post quem* of the inscription may be identified as the reign of Claudius. Thus Zoumbaki, *Niederlassung* (n. 88) 132.

⁹⁸ On these particular honours see M. Piérart, *Temps des empereurs, temps des héros*, in: A. Barzanò (ed.), *Modelli eroici dall'antichità alla cultura europea*, Rome 2003, 308–309; D. Ogden, *Perseus*, Oxford 2008, 100–105; S. Zoumbaki, *Auf den Spuren von prominenten Argivern der römischen Elite. Alte und neue epigraphische Zeugnisse für eine vornehme Familie von Argos*, in: E. Sverkos (ed.), *Β' Πανελλήνιο Συνέδριο Επιγραφικής*, Thessaloniki 2008, 124–125.

⁹⁹ IG IV 606, ll. 12–14: (...) Ῥωμ[αῖ]οι οἱ ἐν Ἄργει κατοικ[κ]οῦντ[ες τ]ὸν ἐπιτροπῶν εὐεργέταν (...).

¹⁰⁰ On Roman/Italian residents in the Greek East see J. Hatzfeld, *Les trafiquants italiens dans l'Orient hellénique*, Paris 1919; F. Càssola, *Romani e Italici in Oriente*, DArch 4–5 (1970–1971) 305–329; on Italians in Asia Minor see J.-L. Ferrary, *La création de la province d'Asie et la présence italienne en Asie Mineure*, in: C. Müller, C. Hasenohr (eds.), *Les Italiens dans le monde grec: II^e siècle av. J.-C. – I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C. Circulation, activités, intégration*, Paris 2002, 133–146; F. Kirbihler, *Die Italiker in Kleinasien, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Ephesos (133 v. Chr. – I. Jh. n. Chr.)*, in: M. Meyer (ed.), *Neue Zeiten — Neue Sitten. Zur Rezeption und Integration römischen und italischen Kulturguts in Kleinasien*, Vienna 2007, 19–36.

¹⁰¹ On Diodotos' biography see M. Mitsos, *Ἀργολικὴ προσωπογραφία*, Athens 1952, 105. On his family see A. Spawforth, *Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge 2012, 176–177.

and slaves. Above all, he presided, like his forebears, as *agonothetes* over the *Sebasteia* and *Nemeia*, where he sacrificed a hekatomb in honour of the Nemeian Zeus.¹⁰² The reference to his *agonothesia* provides a valuable clue since the lifetime honour of the *chrysophoria* appears to be linked with this specific office:¹⁰³ the community of Roman residents explicitly connect the bestowal of the honour with the tenure of the *agonothesia*.¹⁰⁴ Notably, the aforementioned Tib. Iulius Reglos had also served as *agonothetes* and, along with the *chrysophoria*, also held the ‘honours of Herakles and Perseus’ as well as the right to wear purple.¹⁰⁵ The *chrysophoria* with purple (presumably without the ‘honours of Herakles and Perseus’) is possibly also alluded to in a fragmentary inscription for yet another Argive *agonothetes*, Kleogenes.¹⁰⁶ On this basis, it has been assumed that there were clearly defined honours at Argos which were regularly conferred on the *agonothetai*.¹⁰⁷ Interestingly enough, an honorific inscription from Argos speaks summarily of *timai agonothetikai*.¹⁰⁸ It is not certain whether those *timai* a priori implied the *chrysophoria*, but this much can be said that at Argos the *chrysophoria* in combination with a purple dress was an honour that was conferred comparatively frequently on citizens who were predominantly *agonothetai*.

It must be noted here that with the presidency over the *Sebasteia* at Argos, which had been added to the Panhellenic festival of the *Nemeia*,¹⁰⁹ Claudius Diodotos played a central role in the organization of the imperial cult in the Peloponnese.¹¹⁰ In fact, as

¹⁰² A. Rizakis, S. Zoubaki, M. Kantiréa, *Roman Peloponnese I. Roman Personal Names in their Context*, Athens 2001, no. ARG 88 identify him with the Epidaurian notable Ti. Claudius Diodotos. See also M. Kantiréa, *Les dieux et les dieux Augustes. Le culte impérial en Grèce sous les Julio-claudiens et les Flaviens. Etudes épigraphiques et archéologiques*, Athens 2007, 171–172.

¹⁰³ On the *agonothesia* in imperial times see F. Quass, *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens. Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*, Stuttgart 1993, 303–316.

¹⁰⁴ *IG IV 606*, ll. 13–17.

¹⁰⁵ *IG IV 586*. The honouring body identify themselves as ‘we’ (the *demos* of Argos?).

¹⁰⁶ *IG IV 587*. Another statue base, whose fragmentary state unfortunately does not permit to identify the honorand and his offices, also features the same combination of honours. See W. Vollgraff, *Inscriptions d’Argos*, BCH 27 (1903) 260–261 no. 2.

¹⁰⁷ H. W. Pleket, *Three Epigraphic Notes*, Mnemosyne 10 (1957) 142.

¹⁰⁸ *SEG 13*, 244 with Pleket, *Notes* (n. 107).

¹⁰⁹ On the festival calendar see F. Camia, M. Kantiréa, *The Imperial Cult in the Peloponnese*, in: A. Rizakis, C. E. Lepenioti (eds.), *Roman Peloponnese III. Society, Economy and Culture under the Roman Empire. Continuity and Innovation*, Athens 2010, 387–388. See also A. Boethius, *Der argivische Kalender*, Uppsala 1922, 59–61.

¹¹⁰ Further *agonothetai* of the *Sebasteia kai Nemeia* at Argos: *IG IV 590* (T. Statilius Timocrates Memmianus, c. 138 AD); *IG IV 602* (Ti. Claudius Tertius Flavianus, 116/7 AD); Zoubaki, *Argos* (n. 98) (Ti. Iulius Claudianus). *Agonothetai* of the *Nemeia* and *Heraia*: *IG IV 589*; 597. On the imperial cult at Argos see Camia, Kantiréa, *Cult* (n. 109) 387–388; A. Spawforth, *Corinth, Argos, and the Imperial Cult. Pseudo-Julian, Letters 198*, *Hesperia* 63 (1994) 211–232; on the imperial cult and *koina* in Greece see K. Harter-Uibopuu, *Kaiserkult und Kaiserverehrung in den Koina des griechischen Mutterlandes*, in: H. Cancik, K. Hitzl

we can see from many documents, the specific attributes of such *agonothetai* commonly included a purple dress and a gold crown, particularly a portrait crown that was adorned with the likeness of the emperor. This special attire was also the characteristic dress of the imperial high priests.¹¹¹ According to the foundation of the *Demostheneia* at Oinoanda, the costume of the *agonothetes* consisted of a purple stola and a gold crown with portraits of Hadrian and Apollo.¹¹² At Prusias ad Hypium, the first *archon* presided over the *agones* in a purple dress and was adorned with a gold crown.¹¹³ In Severan times, M. Aurelius Daphnus, asiarch thrice and *agonothetes* several times at Ephesus, organized gladiatorial games and received the honour of wearing the gold crown and purple dress at the forefront of the procession.¹¹⁴ At Tomis, an unknown pontarch who presided over the ceremonies of the imperial cult was likewise adorned with golden crowns and purple robes.¹¹⁵ Against this background, one is tempted to identify the *chrysophoria* at Argos first of all with the wearing of a gold crown depicting an imperial portrait which was combined with the

(eds.), *Die Praxis der Herrscherverehrung in Rom und seinen Provinzen*, Tübingen 2003, 209–231; A. Hupfloher, *Kulte im kaiserzeitlichen Sparta. Eine Rekonstruktion anhand der Priesterämter*, Berlin 2000; F. Camia, *Imperial Priests in Second-Century Greece. A Socio-Political Analysis*, in: A. D. Rizakis, F. Camia (eds.), *Pathways to Power. Civic Elites in the Eastern Part of the Roman Empire*, Athens 2008, 25–43; Kantiréa, *Dieux* (n. 102). Diodotos is probably related to the ‘son of Diodotos’, *strategos* of the Achaean League in AD 37; see Spawforth, *Revolution* (n. 101) 177. Claudius Diodotos may also be related to the homonymous *neopoiis* at Ephesus; for the inscription see R. Merkelbach, *Ephesische Parerga* (8): *Ein Chrysophoros*, ZPE 25 (1977) 184.

¹¹¹ On the insignia of the imperial high priest and the *agonothetes* see A. Wilhelm, *Zu Inschriften aus Rhodos und Kos*, AM 51 (1926) 7–8; D. Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West*, vol. III, Leiden 2002, 477–480; Z. Taşlıklioğlu, P. Frisch, *New Inscriptions from the Troad*, ZPE 17 (1975) 106–109; P. Weiß, *Die Abkürzungen IB und IT auf den spät-kaiserzeitlichen Münzen von Tarsos und Anazarbos*, Chiron 9 (1979) 545–552; S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge 1985, 129; Wörrle, *Oinoanda* (n. 13) 192–193; J. Rumscheid, *Kranz und Krone. Zu Insignien, Siegespreisen und Ehrenzeichen der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Tübingen 2000; Chaniotis, *Kaiserkult* (n. 94) 7–9; Robert, *Perpetue* (n. 26) 258–261. See also the evidence in Wilhelm, *Messene* (n. 3) 38; *CIL* XII 6038 (= *ILS* 6964); *I.Ankara* 91–95 with commentary. Cf. Arr. *Epict. Diss* 1.19.26–29 and Dio Chrys. *Or.* 35.10 (criticism of the desire to wear the insignia of the imperial high priest). See also Cass. Dio 60.6.2 (Claudius presides over Greek *agones* at Neapolis, wearing a purple dress and a gold crown); Suet. *Dom.* 4 (Domitian wears a gold crown and purple costume as *agonothetes* of the *Capitolia*). Rumscheid held that this particular gold crown was worn only by the *agonothetes* or by the high priest in his capacity as *agonothetes* (Rumscheid, *Kranz* [n. 111] 8–11 and 39). This has been refuted by Chaniotis, *Kaiserkult* (n. 94) 8 n. 15, on the basis of counter-examples. For attestations of the priestly right to wear purple garments (without a gold crown) see *I.Prusias ad Hypium* 11; *I.Nikaia* 60; *TAM* II 905 (Rhodiapolis); on these texts see F. Quass, *Ein fragwürdiger Senator aus Prusias ad Hypium (Bithynien)*, ZPE 50 (1983) 187–194.

¹¹² *SEG* 38, 1462.

¹¹³ *I.Prusias ad Hypium* 11 (= *IGR* III 1422).

¹¹⁴ *IEph* 3070 = *IGladiateurs* 200: (...) καὶ παρὰ τῶν Σεβαστῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ || πρώτῃ προόδῳ τὸν χρυσοῦν στέφανον | ἅμα τῇ πορφύρᾳ (...).

¹¹⁵ *IGR* I 636.

right to wear purple.¹¹⁶ Yet, given the semantic vagueness we are again faced with here, it is not clear whether the term *chrysophoria* correlates with the wearing of a gold crown.

Our cautious assumption seems to be substantiated when we consider a contemporary epigraphic dossier from Athens which also mentions the award of the *chrysophoria*: the honorific statue bases of the (possibly) first provincial high priest of Gallia Narbonensis, Q. Trebellius Rufus from Tolosa, who had settled in Athens sometime in the Flavian period.¹¹⁷ The dossier comprises the dedicatory inscription along with two letters, one from the *concilium* of Gallia Narbonensis, the other from the magistrates and the council of Tolosa. They both thank the Athenians for the honours which they have decreed on their compatriot Trebellius Rufus. As can be inferred from the inscriptions, Trebellius had pursued a distinguished career in the service of Rome and held civic and religious posts in his hometown Tolosa and at Rome, which was crowned by his promotion to the provincial priesthood of Gallia Narbonensis.¹¹⁸ After several unspecified equestrian posts, he then obviously declined admission to the senatorial order and withdrew to Athens, where he also pursued a splendid local career: he not only received Athenian citizenship but held several high offices including the eponymous archonship and the priesthoods of the Elder Drusus and of Eucleia and Eunomia. It is not surprising that outstanding honours were granted to a great notable of such standing. They include the χρυσοφορία διὰ βίου and the setting up of busts and statues of Trebellius in prominent places all over the city.

Trebellius' honours are also referred to in the fragmentary letter of the magistrates and the council of Tolosa. According to line 33, Trebellius was to be crowned, to be praised in the Athenian assembly and, finally, to be awarded the *chrysophoria*.¹¹⁹ Here again, the *chrysophoria* obviously implies an honour that is different from the award of a (gold) crown. Hans-Georg Pflaum and Jean-Marie Pailler have assumed that it refers to Trebellius' equestrian rank and hence signifies the *anulus aureus*, the

¹¹⁶ Blum, *Purpur* (n. 27) 100 notes that the evidence from imperial Argos is the first uncontested attestation of the use of purple robes as the official costume of cult officials.

¹¹⁷ *IG II²* 4193; J. H. Oliver, *Greek Inscriptions*, *Hesperia* 10 (1941) 72–77 no. 32; see also J. H. Oliver, *Greek Inscriptions*, *Hesperia* 11 (1942) 80; J. Robert, L. Robert, *Bulletin épigraphique*, *REG* 57 (1944) 202–203 no. 82 (= *AE* 1947, 69).

¹¹⁸ On the career of Trebellius Rufus see D. Fishwick, *Our First High Priest. A Gallic Knight at Athens*, *Epigraphica* 60 (1998) 83–112 (= *AE* 1998, 1267); Oliver, *Inscriptions* (n. 117) 72–77; Pflaum, *Fastes* (n. 72) 103–105; A. Aymard, *Du nouveau sur un Toulousain et sur Toulouse à l'époque romaine*, *Bull. soc. arch. du Midi de la France* 1 (1942–1945) 515–516; cf. also J. S. Traill, *PAA* 802125 and 802130. E. Kapetanopoulos, *The Reform of the Athenian Constitution under Hadrian*, *Horos* 10–12 (1992–1998) 233–237 dates Trebellius Rufus to AD 92/3. On the discussion of whether Trebellius Rufus was the first high priest of Gallia Narbonensis see Fishwick, *High Priest* (n. 118); contra M. Clauss, *Kaiser und Gott. Herrscherkult im römischen Reich*, Stuttgart, Leipzig 1999, 403. See also *AE* 2001, 1267.

¹¹⁹ Oliver, *Inscriptions* (n. 117) 72–77 no. 32, l. 33: (...) οἷους ἀναστ[έφ]οντες ἐπα[νίε]σαν καὶ χρυσ[οφορία ...]. Fishwick, *High Priest* (n. 118) 92 suggests ἐπήνεσαν for ἐπα[νίε]σαν. He also notes a similarity of the honours to those of C. Vibius Salutaris at Ephesus.

wearing of the equestrian gold ring.¹²⁰ While the possibility should not be dismissed that the *chrysophoria* for Trebellius Rufus implied the permission to wear a gold ring, it is most unlikely that it should specifically refer to the equestrian status symbol, which, as a marker of Roman status, certainly would not need a renewed bestowal on him by the Athenian bodies.¹²¹ The context of the dedication makes it clear that the *chrysophoria* was newly conferred on him as a special lifetime distinction for his civic commitment at Athens. Duncan Fishwick has suggested that Trebellius' *chrysophoria* should be associated with the outward appearance of a local priest: the award of the *chrysophoria* 'for life' indicates that it may have been connected to the lifetime tenure of the priesthood of Eucleia and Eunomia.¹²² In the dedicatory inscription this is listed directly before the mention of his lifetime *chrysophoria*. It therefore most likely signifies the wearing of gold ornaments (in addition to gold-embroidered robes?), which together with the crown and the entitlement to a privileged seat in the theatre of Dionysos made Trebellius 'the cynosure of all eyes at public festivals'.¹²³

The lifetime grant of the *chrysophoria* in connection with the specific priesthood of Eucleia and Eunomia might have had a particular reason: the priest of Eucleia and Eunomia obviously served a significant political function. He was at the same time the *kosmetes* of the *epheboi* and hence played an important role in overseeing the training programme of the ephebes, which was mainly focused on the organization of athletic competitions.¹²⁴ Consequently (and similar to Argos), Trebellius' *chrysophoria* may have been related to the specific occasion of the holding of contests (in this case for the ephebes). It is not certain whether the priesthood of Eucleia and Eunomia was also associated with the imperial cult.¹²⁵ However, Trebellius' additional tenure of the priesthood of the Elder Drusus indicates that he continued to be involved to a certain degree in the cult of the imperial *domus* in his adopted city. Such involvement would account for the distinction of a special ceremonial costume, which equipped the Roman *equus* and former *flamen* Trebellius with the appropriate *ornamenta* and helped to integrate his extraordinary position into the honorific infrastructure of Athens.

*

As regards further attestations of the *chrysophoria* in the imperial period, it is striking that they all originate from *poleis* in Asia Minor: from Ephesus, Magnesia,

¹²⁰ Pflaum, *Fastes* (n. 72) 105; Pailler, *Domitien* (n. 72) 184.

¹²¹ See above our discussion of the case of Aristokles at Messene. The context is, however, different.

¹²² Fishwick, *High Priest* (n. 118) 92f; Fishwick, *Cult* (n. 111) 181. On the cult see M. Jung, *Marathon und Plataiai. Zwei Perserschlachten als "lieux de mémoire" im antiken Griechenland*, Göttingen 2006, 59–61.

¹²³ Fishwick, *High Priest* (n. 118) 93.

¹²⁴ Arist. *Polit. Athen.* 42; *IG III* 738.

¹²⁵ Suggested by Pflaum, *Fastes* (n. 72) 105.

Aphrodisias, and Tralles.¹²⁶ But while at Argos and Athens the *chrysophoria* has featured as an exclusive honour which was awarded to individual citizens as a life-long privilege and was attached to a priesthood or the *agonothesia*, the honour of *chrysophorein* in the *poleis* of Asia Minor was of a somewhat different nature. Generally speaking, the *chrysophoria* here manifests itself in an ‘institutionalized’, collective form.

At Ephesus, there is an impressive record of c. 30 inscriptions that mention officeholders designated as *chrysophoroi*.¹²⁷ Several of these *chrysophoroi* appear in lists of cult officials or in votive inscriptions to Artemis.¹²⁸ Their cultic function is underlined by the fact that most of them have in addition held the office of a *neopoios* (‘temple-administrator’),¹²⁹ or they are characterized as officials in the service of the city’s main deity: χρυσοφόρος τῆς θεοῦ (= *Artemis*).¹³⁰ A certain (T. Flavius?) Lucius served as *neopoios* and *chrysophoros* in a hereditary capacity (ἐκ προγόνων),¹³¹ while another (anonymous) *neopoios*, or rather several generations of his family, apparently performed the *chrysophoria* for sixty years.¹³² Most importantly, several inscriptions reveal that, like the *neopoioi* and *kouretes*, the *chrysophoroi* formed a ‘sacred’ college or brotherhood (*synedrion*), which corroborates the impression of an institutional character of the *chrysophoria* at Ephesus.¹³³ The association had their own *grammateus* as well as an *agonothetes* who was obviously in charge of the organization of the games of the *chrysophoroi*.¹³⁴ Moreover, a *hymnodos nemetes*, a musical judge (in the contests?), was apparently attached to the college.¹³⁵

Undoubtedly, the Ephesian *chrysophoroi* formed a clearly demarcated group in the city’s public life, and the question suggests itself why they were called ‘*chrysophoroi*’ and what their public role and social standing was. In this respect the dossier of documents of the famous inscription of C. Vibius Salutaris (AD 104) is most illuminating. It is the earliest mention of the group of *chrysophoroi* at Ephesus, since all the

¹²⁶ Due to its fragmentary nature, we do not consider *IG* II² 1081–1085+1116, which Oliver, *Inscriptions* (n. 117) 85–90 no. 37 reconstructed as an honorific decree for C. Fulvius Plautianus. Line 25 might refer to the award of the *chrysophoria*. See, however, the criticism of Oliver’s reconstructions by J. and L. Robert in *Bulletin* (n. 117) 82.

¹²⁷ On the *chrysophoroi* at Ephesus see C. Picard, *Ephèse et Claros. Recherches sur les sanctuaires et les cultes de l’Ionie du Nord*, Paris 1922, 242–246; G. M. Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesus. Foundation Myths of a Roman City*, London 1991, 56–57. Cf. also Harland, *Christ-Bearers* (n. 13) 490–492.

¹²⁸ *I*Eph 940; 940A; 943; 943A; 958; 959; 974; *SEG* 34, 1125.

¹²⁹ See e.g. *I*Eph 940; 940Ab; 958; 959; 972; *SEG* 34, 1125; *SEG* 38, 1182. On the office of the *neopoios* see O. Schulthess, s.v. *neopoios*, *RE* XVI (1935) 2433.

¹³⁰ *I*Eph 836; 1081A.

¹³¹ *I*Eph 958.

¹³² *I*Eph 959.

¹³³ *I*Eph 943; 4330; 991. In *I*Eph 991 the *synedrion* is called ‘sacred’ (τὸ ἱερὸν συνέδριον τῶν χρυσοφόρων). On the Ephesian associations see F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, Leipzig 1909, *passim*.

¹³⁴ *I*Eph 974; *JÖAI* 55, 4238. See also *I*Eph 627; 889.

¹³⁵ *I*Eph 1604.

other recorded instances can be roughly dated to the second or third centuries AD.¹³⁶ Apart from the civic distributions of money, the Salutaris foundation established a procession in honour of Artemis, in which thirty-one gold and silver statues of the goddess, of members of the imperial house and of Greek and Roman institutions were to be carried from the Artemision to the theatre and back again.¹³⁷ According to the original decree by the assembly and the endowment itself (fragments A and B), those in charge of bringing the type-statues from the temple to the theatre were two *neopoioi*, a herald and the guards. However, the epigraphic dossier of the endowment contains further documents, including two decrees of the *boule* and a supplement, which provided for later additions and modifications of these regulations — a graphic illustration of the complex process of negotiations that surrounded large-scale benefactions. The central amendment of Salutaris' donation pertained to new regulations on the enlargement of the group of those carrying the statues. The first additional decree of the *boule* (fragment E) gives permission to 'the *chrysophoroi* for the goddess to bring into the assemblies and the contests the type-statues and the images dedicated by C. Vibius Salutaris from the *pronaos* of Artemis, with the *neopoioi* sharing in the care.'¹³⁸ It was the *chrysophoroi* who were now to figure prominently in the procession. But their participation in the procession was not the only alteration that was made in their favour. The second additional decree of the council (fragment F) endorses the request of the *chrysophoroi* to sit in the first row of the theatre, near the statue of Homonoia. This statue was an additional donation by Salutaris in the supplementary endowment (fragment G) and was again clearly related to the *chrysophoroi*. It was a silver image of *Sebaste Homonoia Chrysophoros*, which was explicitly dedicated to Artemis and the *chrysophoroi* and was to be placed above the block where the sacred victors were seated. Moreover, the *chrysophoroi* were now included in the money distributions.

The Salutaris inscription is a most instructive source with regard to the Ephesian *chrysophoroi* in so far as we can specify more closely their identity: the relevant passages speak of 'the gold-wearing priests and sacred victors' (οἱ χρυσοφοροῦντες τῇ θεῷ ἱερεῖς καὶ ἱερονεῖκαι). The expression is not unambiguous since it may imply that only the priests were *chrysophoroi*, which in turn moots the problem of how to define the relationship between the priestly *chrysophoroi* and the sacred victors

¹³⁶ Rogers, *Sacred Identity* (n. 127) 56 dates the earliest attestation of a *synodos* of the Ephesian *chrysophoroi* to the first century BC, but admits that the reference to the *chrysophoroi* is merely restored in a lacuna of the fragmentary inscription (*I Eph* 940).

¹³⁷ On the Salutaris dossier see above all Rogers, *Sacred Identity* (n. 127); see also G. M. Rogers, *The Mysteries of Artemis of Ephesos. Cult, Polis, and Change in the Graeco-Roman World*, New Haven, London 2012, 184–185 and 214.

¹³⁸ *I Eph* 27, frag. E, ll. 419–423: ὅπως ἐξῆ τῶν χρυσοφοροῦσιν τῇ θεῷ φέρειν εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας τὰ ἀπεικ[ον]ίσματα καὶ <τὰς> εἰκόνας τὰ καθιερωμέν[α ὑπὸ Γαίῳ]ν Οὐεβίου Σαλουταρίου ἐκ τοῦ προνάου τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος, συνεπιμελουμένων καὶ τῶν νεοποιῶν (...).

(*hieronikai*). They are usually mentioned together.¹³⁹ Guy M. Rogers has put forward an interpretation that may point into the right direction: he suggests that at the end of the first century AD Ephesian athletes who had won at sacred contests were awarded the *chrysophoria*, which had traditionally been reserved for priests, and the two previously independent groups came to form an influential association under the name of *chrysophoroi*.¹⁴⁰ Rogers, then, like other scholars, goes on the assumption that the *synedrion* of the *chrysophoroi* had already existed before Salutaris' donation. After the group had been completely passed over in the original decree, the *chrysophoroi* must have come forward before the council to claim a prominent role in the procession.¹⁴¹ Their success suggests that they must have obtained a position at Ephesus that could not be easily ignored. In the procession, they were given a central role appropriate to their standing — the escorting of the 31 type-statues.¹⁴² Yet, given their sudden rise to prominence in the procession one cannot rule out the possibility that the honour, or rather 'function', of a *chrysophoros* was actually for the first time *created* in the Salutaris foundation for a group of certain high-ranking priests (who had some connection to the Artemision) and the city's *hieronikai*. It is at least striking that no *chrysophoros* features in the Ephesian inscriptions before AD 104 and that the *chrysophoroi* were completely absent from the original decree of the foundation.

Since the inscription states that the *chrysophoroi* were to wear white garments, the *chrysophoria* cannot have implied the honour of wearing gold-embroidered costumes to mark a privileged status.¹⁴³ An indication of what 'wearing gold' in the Ephesian procession exactly implied is given in an inscription from 123/4 AD in honour of Hadrian, i.e. twenty years after the Salutaris foundation had been established. Here, the group of *chrysophoroi* are described as 'the priests and sacred victors who carry the gold ornaments of the great goddess Artemis' (οἱ τὸν [χρῦ]σειον κόσμον βασιτά[ζον]τες τῆς μεγάλης θεᾶς [Ἀρτέ]μιδος πρὸ πόλεως ἱερεῖς [καὶ] ἱερωνεῖκαι).¹⁴⁴ The *chrysophoria*, then, constituted a very concrete ritual duty: the *chrysophoroi* not only accompanied the thirty-one statues, but actually *carried* the sacred gold objects

¹³⁹ Except for one passage where, surprisingly, only the *hieronikai* are listed (*IEph* 27, l. 561), although, on analogy, one would have expected the 'gold-wearing priests' as well. This exception led E. L. Hicks, *Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum*, III, 2, Oxford 1890, 85 to the assumption that the *chrysophoroi* are identical with the *hieronikai*. However, such identification would not account for the otherwise repeated mention of the gold-wearing priests and sacred victors.

¹⁴⁰ Rogers, *Sacred Identity* (n. 127) 57. See also J. Robert, L. Robert, *Bulletin épigraphique*, REG 90 (1977) 420.

¹⁴¹ On this aspect see Picard, *Ephèse* (n. 127) 244–245; C. T. Kuhn, *Public Political Discourse in Roman Asia Minor*, Oxford, ch. 4 (forthcoming).

¹⁴² The procession is possibly referred to in Xen. Eph. 1.2.

¹⁴³ Thus assumed by A. Laumonier, *Les cultes indigènes en Carie*, Paris 1958, 484, who compared the Ephesian *chrysophoroi* to the *anthephoroi* (flower-bearers) at Aphrodisias.

¹⁴⁴ *IEph* 276, ll. 7–11. Cf. also the potential reference to cult statues of Hadrian's lover Antinous at Athens in Oliver, *Inscriptions* (n. 117) 77–78 no. 33 (= *SEG* 33, 140): εἰκόνας ἀναθεῖν[αι οὐκ ἔδωμεν χρυσο]φόρους ἀργυρᾶς. See the critical commentary in *SEG*.

and accessories of the goddess from the sacred treasury to adorn her cult statue with them. The Ephesian *chrysophoroi* were actually ‘gold-bearers’.¹⁴⁵ Their name was derived from an honorary function, which possibly also implied the financial sponsoring of the objects. The gold objects may have been specifically linked to the additional silver statue of *Sebaste Homonoia Chrysophoros*. It is certainly remarkable that the statue of *Sebaste Homonoia*, i.e. a personification of a key aspect of imperial ideology, bears the epithet *chrysophoros*. It once more underscores the ‘Roman’ background associated with the *chrysophoria*.¹⁴⁶ Likewise, the ‘Romanness’ of the *chrysophoroi* may be inferred from the fact that all the Ephesian *chrysophoroi* on record held Roman citizenship, and that in the theatre the *synedrion* of the *chrysophoroi* had its seats in one section with the *phyle Sebaste*.¹⁴⁷

Concerning the social standing of the *chrysophoroi* in Ephesian society, we have already mentioned that they were closely linked to another Ephesian group of cult functionaries, the *neopoioi*, with whom they shared the task of carrying the statues to the theatre in the Salutaris procession. A number of the *chrysophoroi* also served as *neopoioi*,¹⁴⁸ and the two separate *synedria* of the *neopoioi* and the *chrysophoroi* often jointly appear in the epigraphic record, in one instance along with the *synedrion* of the *kouretes*.¹⁴⁹ This suggests that the social background of the ‘gold-bearing priests and sacred victors’ was similar to that of the *neopoioi* and the *kouretes*, who hailed from families of the local elite.¹⁵⁰ In view of the fact that they are also represented among generous benefactors, the *chrysophoroi* obviously belonged to the upper social stratum.¹⁵¹ Some further indication of their social position may be derived from an instructive passage in the second book of Artemidorus’ *Dreambook* (*Oneirokritikon*). Elaborating on the symbolism of fire in dreams, he remarks that ‘to rich citizens who are designated to *chrysophorein* because of a magistracy or a priesthood, it (i.e. fire) will not do harm, but it predicts a brilliant career as high magistrates or priests. For

¹⁴⁵ They will, in addition, have been porters of the statues. Accordingly, a seat inscription speaks of the ‘gold-wearing icon-bearers’ (*IEph* 546: τόπος εἰκονοφόρων χρυσοφόρων). As Harland, *Christ-Bearers* (n. 13) 492 has succinctly put it, ‘these gold-bearers were, quite literally, god-bearers.’ It must be emphasized, however, that it is not the carrying of a gold cult statue, but the gold attachments to which the *chrysophoria* refers.

¹⁴⁶ G. Thériault, *Le culte d’Homonoia dans les cités grecques*, Lyon, Québec 1996, 153–155.

¹⁴⁷ *IEph* 2083c.

¹⁴⁸ See above n. 129.

¹⁴⁹ *IEph* 2083c; 951; possibly: *IEph* 943; 4330.

¹⁵⁰ On the Ephesian *neopoioi* and *kouretes* see G. H. R. Horsley, *Giving Thanks to Artemis*, in: G. H. R. Horsley (ed.), *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity. A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1979*, North Ryde 1987, 127–129; Rogers, *Artemis* (n. 137) ch. 1; J. R. Harrison, *A ‘Worthy’ neopoiios Thanks Artemis*, in: S. R. Llewelyn, J. R. Harrison, E. J. Bridge (eds.), *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity. A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published between 1988 and 1992*, Grand Rapids 2012, 48–54.

¹⁵¹ Cf. *IEph* 951. See also Rogers, *Artemis* (n. 137) 119.

gold is similar to fire because of its colour.¹⁵² The meaning of *chrysophorein* remains vague here, but since Artemidorus originated from Ephesus, he may have had the Ephesian *chrysophoria* in mind. From his remark we may gather that it was members of the well-off elite who held the *chrysophoria*, and that it provided a career-promoting conduit to high-ranking positions. In this context, it is indeed striking that in the decree on the Salutaris foundation the Ephesian *chrysophoroi* figure in juxtaposition with the two principal civic bodies of the local aristocracy, the *boule* and the *gerousia*, where they are mentioned after the two institutions.¹⁵³ Likewise, the aforementioned *hymnodos nemetes* was associated not only with the *chrysophoroi* but also with the *boule* and the *gerousia*,¹⁵⁴ and several *chrysophoroi* were members of the *gerousia*.¹⁵⁵ In sum, the *chrysophoroi* at Ephesus obviously represented an influential, socially ambitious elite group of priests and sacred victors who, united in a cult association and equipped with the privilege to bear the gold ornaments of the statue of Artemis, aimed to be viewed on the socio-political level as equal to the members of the *boule* and *gerousia*.¹⁵⁶

Similar characteristics of religious officials called *chrysophoroi* can be observed at Magnesia and Aphrodisias; in comparison with Ephesus, however, the extant evidence from these *poleis* is not so ample.¹⁵⁷ At Magnesia, *chrysophoroi* feature as sacred officials in the cult of Artemis Leukophryne.¹⁵⁸ Interestingly, there was also a board of *neopoioi* at Magnesia,¹⁵⁹ so it may reasonably be assumed that both groups cooperated with each other as they did in Ephesus.

The close correlation between *chrysophoroi* and *neopoioi* is most conspicuously confirmed by the evidence from Aphrodisias. Here, *neopoioi* of the goddess Aphrodite are in fact *chrysophoroi*, that is, they bear the title *chrysophoros*. The

¹⁵² Artem. 2.9: πλουσίον δὲ τοὺς μὲν χρυσοφορεῖν μέλλοντας διὰ τινα ἀρχὴν ἢ ἱερωσύνην οὐ βλέπτει, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπισημοτέρως ἄρξαι ἢ ἱερώσασθαι προαγορεύει· ἔοικε γὰρ πυρὶ τὸ χρυσίον κατὰ γε τὴν χροῖαν.

¹⁵³ *IEph* 27, frag. G, ll. 454–457.

¹⁵⁴ *IEph* 1604.

¹⁵⁵ *IEph* 907; *SEG* 34, 1125.

¹⁵⁶ Thus already Picard, *Ephèse* (n. 127) 244.

¹⁵⁷ Further evidence for (female) *chrysophoroi* is reported in a literary source. Athenaios (Athen. 13.609e–610a) relates that on the occasion of the festival in honour of Eleusinian Demeter at Basilis (Arkadia), the competitors of a women's beauty contest were called *chrysophoroi*. R. Stiglitz, *Die Großen Göttinnen Arkadiens. Der Kultname Megalai Theai und seine Grundlagen*, Vienna 1967, 58 assumes that the purpose of electing the most beautiful woman in this contest was to find an appropriate representative who would plead with the goddess for fertility and numerous progeny — a vital aspect for the survival of the community. Therefore, the select group of beautiful women who entered the competition were distinguished by the *chrysophoria* because they would play an important role in the ritual communication with Demeter Eleusinia. In view of the tight restrictions on wearing gold jewellery for women particularly in Peloponnesian towns, this quasi-priestly function could legitimize the exclusive privilege of wearing gold.

¹⁵⁸ *IMagnesia* 119; 170; 192.

¹⁵⁹ *CIG* 2917.

Aphrodisian *chrysophoroi neopoioi* formed a commission (*synedrion*), which is characterized as ‘most ancient’.¹⁶⁰ Similar to the ranking in Ephesus, they appear alongside the *boule* and the *gerousia* as beneficiaries of money distributions in foundations and are in the funerary context specified as the recipients of fines arising from the violation of tombs.¹⁶¹ It suggests itself that the responsibilities of the Aphrodisian *chrysophoroi neopoioi* resembled those of the Ephesian *chrysophoroi* and were inextricably linked to the local sanctuary of Aphrodite.¹⁶² The fact that several Aphrodisian *neopoioi* are attested in the inscriptions without the epithet *chrysophoros* cannot serve as a firm indication that the *gold-wearing neopoioi* constituted a subsection of the group of the *neopoioi*. They were most likely identical, and this is all the more likely when we consider that the Aphrodisian *neopoioi* are known to have played a significant role in the agonistic domain. They are attested as *agonothetai* of the *Aphrodeisaea-Philemonia*, where they were in charge of honouring the sacred victors.¹⁶³ The (*chrysophoroi*) *neopoioi* count among the most important local officials at Aphrodisias.¹⁶⁴ They are recorded as munificent benefactors and are praised as ‘generous’, ‘well-ordered’, ‘notable’, and ‘pious’ in their capacity as *neopoios* — common epithets for local elite members in Aphrodisias’ honorific epigraphy.¹⁶⁵ Most instructive is the statement in the honorific inscription for a certain Peritas Kallimedes that he ‘undertook offices and embassies and liturgies and was a pious and munificent *neopoios*’.¹⁶⁶ The office of *neopoios* is here singled out and distinguished from the performance of ‘public services’ such as magistracies,

¹⁶⁰ *I Aph2007* 1.161: (...) καὶ ἀρχ[αι]οτάτῳ συνεδρίῳ τῶν χρυσοφόρων νεοποιῶν.

¹⁶¹ *I Aph2007* 1.161; 11.23; 12.1016; 13.154; 11.403.

¹⁶² Thus also Brody, *Aphrodite* (n. 13) 104, who assumes that the gold-bearing *neopoioi* were guardians of some gold objects of the goddess.

¹⁶³ *I Aph2007* 1.177; 11.58; 11.60; 11.224; 12.35; 12.325; 13.152; 13.616; 15.330; 15.364. Cf. also C. Roueché, *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias in the Roman and Late Roman Periods*, London 1993, nos. 81–85. The organization of the contests by the *neopoioi* was led by a ‘chief-*neopoios*’ (*archineopoios/protoneopoios*), who could at times be replaced by his ‘vice-*neopoios*’. On these designations see *I Aph2007* 1.176; 5.10; 12.807; 12.1111; 12.417; 12.612; 15.322; 15.364.

¹⁶⁴ See A. Chaniotis, *Aphrodite’s Rivals. Devotion to Local and Other Gods at Aphrodisias*, CGG 21 (2011) [2010] 237. On the duties of the *neopoioi* cf. Brody, *Aphrodite* (n. 13) 104–105; G. Stevenson, *Power and Place. Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation*, Berlin, New York 2001, 57–58. They included, for example, the erection of honorific statues: *I Aph2007* 5.204i; 7.8; 12.914; 12.915. The tenure of the office of the *neopoios* was counted in cycles and could be held repeatedly; see *I Aph2007* 11.57; 13.616; 12.521. It was obviously performed by families over generations (cf. *I Aph2007* 13.616, where the vice-*neopoios* was the grandson of the chief-*neopoios*).

¹⁶⁵ *I Aph2007* 13.105a, ll. 10–12: νεοποιήσαντά τε μεγαλοπρεπῶς καὶ κοσμίως καὶ ἐπιφανῶς; *I Aph2007* 13.105c, ll. 15–17: νεοποιήσαντος εὐσεβῶς καὶ φιλοτείμως.

¹⁶⁶ *I Aph2007* 13.105c, ll. 11–17: Πρεΐτου τοῦ Διογένους τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου Καλλιμήδους ἀνδρὸς ἔν τε ἀρχαῖς καὶ πρεσβείαις καὶ λειτουργίαις γεγονότος καὶ νεοποιήσαντος εὐσεβῶς καὶ φιλοτείμως. See also *I Aph2007* 12.1011.

embassies and liturgies. The distinction reflects the high social significance of the (*chrysophoroi*) *neopoioi* at Aphrodisias.¹⁶⁷

*

In the passage from Artemidorus' *Dreambook* quoted above, the author distinguishes between the *chrysophoria* attached to a priestly office and the *chrysophoria* attached to a civic magistracy. It is true that in several cases a clear distinction between the 'secular' and 'religious' sphere is problematic since the two spheres at times overlap, but Artemidorus' distinction with regard to the *chrysophoria* is not unfounded. While all the *chrysophoroi* at Ephesus, Aphrodisias and Magnesia were evidently officials with cultic functions, the epigraphic evidence also yields examples of the *chrysophoria* which, *cum grano salis*, may be viewed as constituting a more 'secular' form. In Tralles in particular, the *chrysophoria* is presented in terms of a civic office. So, the impressive list of civic *archai* that the local benefactor Ti. Iulius Claudianus had held also includes the function of *chrysophorein*, which is recorded in a direct line with such high magistracies as *grammateus tou demou*, *eirenarches*, *agoranomos*, *paraphylax*, *dekaprotos*, and many more.¹⁶⁸ Another citizen from Tralles, P. Claudius Menetianos Kentaurianos, who held a similar series of prestigious offices, was *chrysophoros strategos* (a high *archon* at Tralles).¹⁶⁹ According to *I.Tralles* 90, the *chrysophoros* M. Aurelius Letoidos Iulianus was in charge of supervising the erection of an honorific statue together with another civic official, the *grammateus* M. Aurelius Trophimo. The rather civic character of the *chrysophoria* at Tralles comes most strikingly to the fore in an honorific inscription for a certain Berenicianus.¹⁷⁰ His *chrysophoria* is not only mentioned as one of the many public offices which he had held (including the offices of *stephanephoros*, *grammateus*, *agoranomos*, *eirenarches* and *boularchos*), but the text expressly emphasizes that he performed the *chrysophoria* 'for the *patris*' (*χρυσοφορήσαντα τῆι πατρίδι*) rather than in honour of a deity (as in Ephesus, Magnesia and Aphrodisias). Here, the civic dimension is the prime feature of the *chrysophoria*.

The question, of course, arises as to what the 'magisterial' *chrysophoria* implied here — whether it was an honorary office in its own right, or an honorific title or the privilege of gold *ornamenta* added to another magistracy. As indicated by the expression *chrysophoros strategos* (*I.Tralles* 134), it could be joined with another office, but it was also held separately (*I.Tralles* 73 and 145). It may well be that the

¹⁶⁷ For the social background of *neopoioi* see e.g. *I.Aph2007* 12.1111 (Ulpius Carminius Claudianus, *neopoios*; from the leading Aphrodisian family of the Carminii); 14.18 (Tib. Cl. Aur. Zelos, *neopoios*: rhetor and sophist); cf. also *I.Aph2007* 12.912 (Marcus Aurelius Gaitulikos, *protoneopoios*; freedman and *procurator Augusti*).

¹⁶⁸ *I.Tralles* 145. On Claudianus' offices see T. T. Terpstra, *Trading Communities in the Roman World. A Micro-Economic and Institutional Perspective*, New York 2013, 198–200.

¹⁶⁹ *I.Tralles* 134.

¹⁷⁰ *I.Tralles* 73.

‘magisterial’ *chrysophoria* was not necessarily a much-coveted office but one of the burdensome liturgies. In another remarkable passage in his *Dreambook*, Artemidorus speaks about *archai* that ‘compel’ (ἀναγκάζει) the officeholder to wear gold or purple.¹⁷¹ On the basis of the few extant sources, it is, of course, difficult to specify the responsibilities, if any but symbolic and representative, that the civic *chrysophoria* entailed. It is interesting to note that two of the *chrysophoroi* were victors of the local (iso)Pythian games and alytarchs of the *Olympeia* respectively, so the context of sacred games, in some way, may again prove relevant for the tenure of the *chrysophoria*.¹⁷²

William Ramsay provided an important observation that can help to understand the equivocal character of the *chrysophoria*: he has suggested that the *chrysophoria* at Tralles may have been comparable with the eponymous office of the *stephanephoros*.¹⁷³ The duties of the eponymous *stephanephoros*, whose name is derived from his bearing the crown of the city’s main deity, are not precisely known, but it appears mainly to have involved financial obligations.¹⁷⁴ The *stephanephoros* could also be attached to a priesthood or a magistracy and hence was, in a sense, located between *polis* and *hieron*. Ramsay associated the *stephanephoros* with the *chrysophoria* and assumed that the *stephanephoros* may have represented ‘the chief of the college of *chrysophoroi*’.¹⁷⁵ There is no direct evidence for the existence of a board of *chrysophoroi* at Tralles which was headed by a *stephanephoros*, but it is indeed remarkable that all the Trallians who held the *chrysophoria* also served as *stephanephoroi*.¹⁷⁶ Some interrelationship between the *chrysophoria* and the *stephanephoros* can therefore be postulated.

¹⁷¹ Artem. 2.30: οἶα δ’ ἂν ἀρχὴ πορφύραν ἢ χρυσὸν τὸν ἄρχοντα ἀναγκάζει φορεῖν, ὄλεθρον τοῖς νοσοῦσι σημαίνει καὶ τὰ κρυπτὰ ἐλέγχει. In 2.9, Artemidorus similarly alludes to the aspect of obligation.

¹⁷² *I.Tralles* 73; 134. It is notable that Artemidorus’ statement on the *chrysophoria* attached to offices (see n. 152) follows his discussion of the Olympic Games. Furthermore, the related privilege of the *porphyra*, the right to wear purple, was also enjoyed by the *hieronikai* at Tralles. A copy of a letter by Marcus Antonius to the *koinon* of Asia which grants the *porphyra* to the ecumenical guild of *hieronikai* and *stephanitai* in sacred games was found at Tralles, where the guild apparently had a local branch. See *I.Tralles* 105; cf. J. Keil, *Die Synodos der ökumenischen Hieroniken und Stephaniten*, JÖAI 15 (1911) 127 fr. A. See below n. 185.

¹⁷³ Cf. W. M. Ramsay, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. Being an Essay of the Local History of Phrygia from the Earliest Times to the Turkish Conquest. Vol. 1,2: West and West-Central Phrygia*, Oxford 1897, 360.

¹⁷⁴ On the *stephanephoros* see H. E. Stier, s.v. *stephanephoros*, RE III A.2 (1929) 2343–2347; J. Vanseveren, *Inscriptions d’Amorgos et de Chios*, RPh 11 (1937) 313–347; B. Dignas, *Porter la couronne d’un dieu. Titre civique, charge religieuse, pouvoir ou fardeau?*, Kernos 20 (2007) 173–187.

¹⁷⁵ Ramsay, *Cities* (n. 173) 360.

¹⁷⁶ Moreover, in other Greek *poleis* the *stephanephoros* was often assisted by a board of *strategoí*. Interestingly, the *strategoí* at Tralles is also attested as *chrysophoros*. See *I.Tralles* 134. Cf. B. H. McLean, *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, Ann Arbor 2002, 312–313.

Two further documents from outside Tralles reveal that in other cities the *chrysophoria* could indeed have some similarity with the *stephanephoria*, as regards eponymity and repeated tenure. In an inscription from Hadrianoi, the *chrysophoria* is attested as an eponymous post: it is dated ‘during the *chrysophoria* of the (anonymous) bithyniarch’.¹⁷⁷ In Arykanda (Lycia), a certain Hermaios performed the *chrysophoria* even thrice: *κεχρυσοφορηκότος τρι[ς]*.¹⁷⁸ The context of the mention of Hermaios’ three *chrysophoriai* suggests that it was an office that ranked on the same level as his magistracies and priesthoods (he had been *prytanis*, *hiereus*, *gymnasiarchos* and *hypogymnasiarchos* and had performed ‘all other *archai*’).¹⁷⁹ As in Tralles, the *chrysophoria* may have been attached to other high civic offices, or was performed in its own right.¹⁸⁰

It has been the major concern of the present analysis to point out the different manifestations and meanings that must be associated with the *chrysophoria* in different social and cultural contexts. It has become clear that — in contrast to the traditional *communis opinio* — the term *chrysophorein* cannot be associated with one specific, normative meaning. The semantic problem arises from the fact that in many sources it is used as an abstract generic term for a privilege whose exact implementation — e.g. the question as to which gold insignia were worn — seems to have been determined locally within a given context. For contemporaries it must have been familiar and unambiguous enough; so there was no need for any further specification and explanation. What, then, we can observe in the epigraphic evidence referring to the *chrysophoria* is the formation of local idiosyncrasies in the concept under specific historical conditions.

In Hellenistic times the *chrysophoria* refers to the wearing of gold adornment in honour of a god (except for the case of Aristokles). It was associated with the outward appearance of a priest and may primarily pertain to gold ornaments, a gold ring, a gold crown or gold-embroidered priestly garments. Which of these distinguishing

¹⁷⁷ M.-F. Auzepy *et al.*, *Campagne de Prospection 2008 de la mission Marmara*, *Anatolia Antiqua* 17 (2009) 453–454 no. 1 (reign of Antoninus Pius): (...) χρυσοφοροῦντος Βιθυνιαρχο[ῦντος] (...).

¹⁷⁸ *I.Arykanda* 162 (= *SEG* 44, 1153).

¹⁷⁹ *I.Arykanda* 162 (= *SEG* 44, 1153). The inscription later states that Hermaios had been honoured by the cities of Lycia and the *ethnos* of the Lycians with gold crowns and (gilded) statues, and by the *gerousia* with gold crowns. The award of these gold crowns by the three institutions should not be viewed as tantamount to his three *chrysophoriai* (l. 4): the context suggests that his three performances of the *chrysophoria* were clearly distinct from the honour of wearing gold crowns.

¹⁸⁰ Thus S. Şahin, *Die Inschriften von Arykanda*, Bonn 1994, 132. S. Dmitriev, *Notes on Inscriptions from Asia Minor*, *EA* 26 (1996) 109 linked the *chrysophoria* to the subsequent mention of *epangeleia* by erroneously reading *κεχρυσοφορηκότος τρι[ς] κατ’ ἐπαν[γ]ελίας* instead of *καὶ ἐπαν[γ]ελίας* (...). The reading has been corrected by P. Herrmann, *Epigraphische Notizen 16–17*, *EA* 28 (1997) 148 n. 11.

features is exactly alluded to in the honorific inscription must occasionally remain an open question. In several cases a contextual analysis has proved expedient to clarify the semantic vagueness by exclusion (to suggest what presumably it is *not*) or on analogy, in the attempt to define it more precisely. At Messene and probably at Kos, for instance, *chrysophorein* will have specifically referred to the privilege of wearing a gold ring.

In several *poleis* the honour of ‘wearing gold’ ranked among the highest distinctions in the nomenclature of honorific titles, not least because it carried an aura of divine and monarchical power. It is of particular interest to note that it was awarded as an exclusive mark of distinction especially in those cities where sumptuary and sacred laws expressly forbade the use of gold luxury items. Several of the extant documents mentioning the *chrysophoria* originate from Peloponnesian *poleis* (or their colonies), i.e. from a region that is generally known to have prohibited the lavish use of gold jewellery in the private and the religious spheres. So, it is the Peloponnesian city of Messene that approves of the *chrysophoria* for its *grammateus*; Tyndaris, which is the only securely attested town among the seventeen Sicilian cities privileged with the *chrysophoria*, is a colony of Messenian Greeks;¹⁸¹ likewise, it will most probably have been the member cities of the Isthmian-Nemeian *koinon* of Dionysiac artists, above all the Peloponnesian cities of Thebes, Argos, and Corinth, which will have raised objections to the entitlement of the Athenian *technitai* to the *chrysophoria*.¹⁸² As a result, the honour of ‘wearing gold’ was given a particular mark in the Peloponnesian *poleis* by the general prohibition of their citizens on wearing gold jewellery.¹⁸³

As regards the imperial period, the epigraphic evidence originates mainly from Asia Minor, with Ephesus providing the largest number of attestations. At Argos and Athens, the *chrysophoria* features as an individual honour conferred on the honorand for life, and often along with the right to wear purple. But there are also new modes of its manifestation that reveal a significant extension and shift of meaning: in imperial times the notion of *chrysophorein* and *chrysophoros* also comprises an institutionalized form of ritual practice. It designates a collective group of cult functionaries organized in a *synedrion* to perform cultic duties (Ephesus, Aphrodisias, Magnesia). As to the ambiguous meaning of *chrysophorein* in terms of ‘wearing’ or ‘bearing’ gold, the name of the Ephesian *chrysophoroi* actually corresponds with their function as ‘gold-bearers’. According to the Salutaris foundation it was their official duty to carry the deity’s gold ornaments in a procession through the city. Most significant, however, is another development that comes to bear in some places in the second century AD. Whereas all the epigraphic testimony concerning the *chrysophoria* was essentially cult-related — it was a distinction awarded to perform cultic duties in

¹⁸¹ Cic. *Verr.* 5.124.

¹⁸² Aneziri, *Techniten* (n. 20) 136 and 307–314.

¹⁸³ Cf. also Alkman’s emphasis on the Spartan simplicity in clothing and his scorn for the gilded dress of the priests in Lydia. See Plut. *mor.* 599e.

honour of a deity — some inscriptions indicate that the honour refers to a (temporarily held) civic office in the service of the *patris* (Tralles, Arykanda). With reference to Artemidorus' differentiation between the *chrysophoria* attached to priesthoods and the use of the term applied to magistracies the latter may well be labelled 'magisterial' *chrysophoria*.

One striking feature that runs through the Hellenistic and Roman evidence is the close relation of the *chrysophoria* to the agonistic context. At Argos it was linked with the holding of the *agonothesia*. At Aphrodisias, members of the *chrysophoroi neopoioi* frequently served as contest-presidents of the *Aphrodeisiea-Philemoniea*. The *hieronikai* constituted one sub-group of the Ephesian *chrysophoroi*. Some *chrysophoroi* at Tralles were *agonothetai* or *hieronikai*. As priest of Eucleia and Eunomia, Trebellius Rufus was in charge of the agonistic competitions of the ephebes at Athens. This close link with the agonistic setting is clearly apparent in imperial times, but it already emerges in the Hellenistic period with the *chrysophoria* of the priests of the Athenian *technitai*, i.e. performers in sacred games, and the priest of Zeus Alseios at Kos, who was to wear gold on the special occasion of the sacred *agones*.

The frequent connection with *agones* is not coincidental. It may provide a clue to the origin and background of 'wearing gold' as an exceptional privilege. There is good reason to believe that it was deeply rooted in the honorific framework of the sacred games, where the winners were highly honoured with prestigious prizes. The performance of the *chrysophoria* was most likely limited to this particular occasion and was primarily reserved as a prerogative for the contest-presidents and victorious athletes. All this reflects the enormous prestige that could be drawn from the involvement in the cities' festivals and games as central elements of the social and cultural life in the Greek East.¹⁸⁴

It is indeed noteworthy that the context of victory and the presidency of games, in which the *chrysophoria* is basically embedded, have much in common with the agonistic background of a central Roman honorific practice, the award of the

¹⁸⁴ See Robert, *Perpetue* (n. 26); S. Mitchell, *Festivals, Games, and Civic Life in Roman Asia Minor*, JRS 80 (1990) 183–193; O. M. van Nijf, *Athletics, Festivals and Greek Identity in the Roman East*, PCPS 45 (2000) 176–200. These observations accord with the provisions for the related privilege of wearing purple (*porphyra*), which was equally associated with sacred competitions and sometimes appears in combination with the *chrysophoria* (cf. the evidence from Argos). Therefore, it was the *hellanodikai* (i.e. the presidents and umpires of the Olympic and Nemeian Games as well as the *Asklepieia* of Epidauros) who were allowed to wear purple robes. See *Etymol. Magn.*, s.v. *Hellanodikai*; Bekker, *Anecd.*, p. 249; see also Lucian, *Anach.* 3. In the triumphal period (in 41/32 BC), Marcus Antonius likewise granted the *porphyra* to the ecumenical guild of the *hieronikai* and *stephanitai* in sacred games: *SB I 4224 = P.Lond. I 137 (2) verso = RDGE 57*. Cf. R. K. Sherk, *Rome and the Greek East to the Death of Augustus*, Cambridge 1984, 105–106 no. 85 = A. C. Johnson, P. R. Coleman-Norton, F. C. Bourne, *Ancient Roman Statutes. A Translation with Introduction, Commentary, Glossary, and Index*, Austin 1961, 109 no. 125. See C. G. Brandis, *Ein Schreiben des Triumvirn Marcus Antonius an den Landtag Asiens*, *Hermes* 32 (1897) 509–522; on the dating see J. Ebert, *Zum Brief des Marcus Antonius an das κοινὸν Ἀσίας*, *AfP* 33 (1987) 37–42.

triumphal honours (*ornamenta triumphalia*) with gold and purple insignia. In Republican times, it was not only the victorious general on the occasion of a triumph, but also, most notably, the magistrates presiding over the games who were allowed to wear the triumphal insignia.¹⁸⁵ This Republican tradition was not fundamentally changed in the principate, although the celebration of triumphs was monopolized by the imperial family: the contest-presiding officials continued to be dressed in triumphal garb, and as a substitute for a triumph the victorious general (or loyal senator, as was the later practice) was still distinguished with the award of the *ornamenta triumphalia*, which were worn on the occasion of festivals and games.

The similarity with the *ornamenta triumphalia* again draws attention to the issue of a Roman involvement, which we have observed as another striking peculiarity of the ‘Greek’ *chrysophoria*. It has come to the fore when the honour was awarded by a decree of the Roman Senate to seventeen cities in Magna Graecia, or on the initiative of the Italian *negotiatores* at Argos and the proconsul and praetorian legate at Messene, or when it needed approval of the provincial government in the case of the Athenian Dionysiac *technitai*. So, as regards the conferral of this ‘Greek’ honour, the Romans occasionally had a hand in it, and the question has inevitably arisen whether this was facilitated by certain analogies and mutual influences in the honorific practices of Rome and the Greek East. However, although a certain Roman colouring underlying the Greek honorific concept can be observed, there is no indication that the *chrysophoria* can generally be viewed as an example of a cultural transfer. It was apparently only in the case of Aristokles at Messene that a Roman honorific tradition was adopted and rendered by the Greek term *chrysophoria*. The *chrysophoria*, then, was not directly modelled on Roman practices and was in many respects essentially different from the award of the *ornamenta triumphalia*¹⁸⁶ or the grant of the gold ring in the context of the *ius anuli aurei* to confer Roman equestrian status.¹⁸⁷ The analogies rather reflect some cultural consensus in Rome and the Greek East that prestigious symbolic signifiers such as gold jewellery and purple robes should be confined to festive occasions and cultic duties.

The *chrysophoria* completely vanishes from the epigraphic record in late antiquity. It was a period characterized by the lavish use and display of gold and purple as imperial insignia, which went hand in hand with restrictive regulations on their use and with their monopolization by the late antique emperors.¹⁸⁸ It was, moreover, a period marked by the rise of Christianity to the Empire’s state religion and the con-

¹⁸⁵ Alföldi, *Repräsentation* (n. 92) 143–144 and 152–153. See also Abaecherli-Boyce, *Ornamenta* (n. 62).

¹⁸⁶ An instance of a Greek translation of these *ornamenta triumphalia* has been seen in the *basilikai timai*, which are attested for the benefactor L. Iulius Agrippa at Syrian Apamea. See J. P. Rey-Coquais, *Inscriptions grecques d’Apamée*, AAS 23 (1973) 53–55.

¹⁸⁷ Quass, *Senator* (n. 111) has likewise shown that the award of the right to wear purple for M. Aur. Asclepiodotianus Asclepiades in *I.Prusias* 11 is not the Greek translation of the award of the *latus clavus*, but represents a separate civic honour.

¹⁸⁸ On the restrictive use see *Cod. Theod.* 10.21.1; 10.21.3; 11.9.1–2.

comitant decline of pagan cults. In contradiction to the doctrine of humility,¹⁸⁹ love of splendour became a significant feature in the ecclesiastical hierarchy — wearing gold as a symbolic reflection of the brightness of God’s love, the glory and magnificence of the One God.¹⁹⁰ It was, ultimately, a period in which the social and cultural conditions and reasons for the award of the extraordinary honour of the *chrysophoria* as practised in the previous centuries had obviously become irrelevant and obsolete: the civic honour of the *chrysophoria* had become a thing of the past.

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München
 Historisches Seminar
 Abt. Alte Geschichte
 Geschwister-Scholl-Platz 1
 80539 München, Deutschland
 annika.kuhn@uni-muenchen.de

Annika B. Kuhn

¹⁸⁹ From the viewpoint of Christian morality, Clement of Alexandria scornfully comments on men who embellish themselves like women: ‘For although not allowed to wear gold (*chrysophorein*), yet out of effeminate desire they enwreath their latches and fringes with leaves of gold; or, getting certain spherical figures of the same metal made, they fasten them to their ankles, and hang them from their necks.’ (Clem. Al. *Paid.* 3.3.17.4: Εἰ γὰρ καὶ μὴ χρυσοφορεῖν αὐτοῖς ἐφεῖται, ἀλλ’ οὖν γε διὰ τὴν θηλυδριώδη ἐπιθυμίαν ἱμάντας καὶ λώματα χρυσοῦ περιπτύξαντες πετάλοις ἢ τινα σφαιρικά τῆς αὐτῆς ὕλης ποιησάμενοι σχήματα σφυρῶν ἀπαρτῶνται καὶ τραχήλων ἀπαιωροῦσι.) Cf. also Clem. Al. *Paid.* 3.2.5.1.

¹⁹⁰ On this aspect see Janes, *Gold* (n. 33); D. Janes, *The Golden Clasp of the Late Roman State*, *Early Medieval Europe* 5 (1996) 127–153; D. Janes, *Brooches as Insignia and Loyalty to the Late Roman State*, in: N. Cambi, E. Marin (eds.), *Acta XIII Congressus Internationalis Archaeologicae Christianae*, Rome, Split 1998, 387–394.