

PANACHAEANS AND PANHELLENES

IN THIS ARTICLE we seek to bring evidence on the Commonalty of the Achaeans in the province of Achaia and the Panhellenion up to date and to distinguish periods of aim and organization in the former. Representatives of the two koina have in common the appellation Panhellenes, though at different periods. The reader must be warned that in the writer's opinion (see *GrRomByzSt* 14, 1973, p. 389) Thessaly did not belong at any time to the province of Achaia after 27 B.C.

I. THE COMMONALTY OF THE ACHAEANS AS PROVINCIAL KOINON

In Greece in the 1st century after Christ the terms "all the Hellenes" (which could in the right context be shortened to "the Hellenes") and "the Panhellenes" and "the Achaeans and Panhellenes" were convenient ways of referring to a more recent union of the Achaean League of the Peloponnese with the pre-existing union of the several ethnic communities of Central Greece without listing all the ethnic communities more than once. The evidence lies in *IG VII*, 2711 and 2712, the Epaminondas documents from Acraephia, which the writer examined carefully in 1971.¹ The first document in the dossier of *IG VII*, 2711 begins, "[The general of the Achaeans], Boeotians, Locrians, Euboeans, [Phocians, so and so], son of Diodotus, of Argos, to the archons of the Acraephians, greetings." The strict formality of a heading provides the official name. The epistle reports the service performed by Epaminondas in keeping the Boeotian ethnos represented in this larger union: ὡς ἀποστῆναι [κινδυνεύ(ε)ιν τὴν Βοιωτίαν ἀπὸ τῶν Πανελλήνων, he says in lines 9-10. This is a covering letter for the second document, a decree with honors voted, he says, "by all the Hellenes." We do not have the prescript of the decree, but the formula of sanction reads in line 15 ἔδοξε τῇ συνόδῳ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, and the document ends with an order for the publication of "the decree of the Hellenes."

Just as even the general referred to "the Panhellenes," the phrase ἐν τοῖς Πανελλήσιν occurs in clear but abbreviated references in decrees of Boeotian corporations in *IG VII*, 2711, line 61 and *IG VII*, 2712, line 45. It is particularly striking that the Thebans say ἐν τῷ κοινῷ τῶν Παν[ελλή]νων τῷ ἀχθέντι ἐν Ἀργεῖ (2711, line 61), and the Acraephians themselves say ἐν τῷ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν καὶ Πανελλήνων συνεδρίῳ ἐν Ἀργεῖ.²

The most important document of the entire dossier is the third, namely the epistle of the new emperor Gaius, who with strict formality addresses the "Panhellenes" by their official, though cumbersome, title, "Commonalty of the Achaeans, Boeotians, Locrians, Phocians, Euboeans," thus with the Locrians again in third

¹ J. H. Oliver, "Epaminondas of Acraephia," *GrRomByzSt* 12, 1971, pp. 221-237.

² *IG VII*, 2712 (= *GrRomByzSt* 12, 1971, p. 237), lines 39-40.

place. But the list of ambassadors near the end of the imperial letter has the Locrians in last place; it reads as follows:

- Ἄ[ρ]χιπρεσβευτῆς μὲν
- 35 [. . . .] ΔΡΞ Λευκίου [----- Ἀχαι]ῶ[ν] δὲ θεόπομπος Ἄ
 [. . . .] δάμον, Ἀριστ[-----]ος Ἐπιδίκο[ν], Τιμόξε
 [νος Τ]ειμοξέν[ο]ν, Λ[-----]δαμος Τειμανδρ[ί]
 [δον], Μηνοφάνης [-----]δον ὁ Βοιωτῶν δὲ Ἐπα
 [μινώ]νδας Ἐπαμινώνδο[ν, ----- Ὀλυμ]πίων ὁ Ἡράκλειτος
 40 [Ὀλυμ]πίωνος ὁ Φωκέων [δὲ ----- Εὐβο]ίων δὲ Ἀριστόδικος
 [. . . .] φον ὁ Λοκρῶν δὲ [-----]ης Ἀναξιδότου.

The embassy consisted of one chief ambassador and then ambassadors from each of the five constituent leagues.³ A. B. West⁴ identified the chief ambassador with L. Gellius L. f. Menander of Corinth, because Holleaux⁵ had made the letters MEN at the end of line 34 into the beginning of the name and the first visible letters of line 35, ΔΡΞ, into the end of the name Μέν[αν]δρ[ο]ς. There are, however, four missing letters at the beginning of line 35, not two as in the lacuna postulated by Holleaux and West, and there is no apparent reason for an indentation of line 35 and for a violation of syllabic division between lines 34 and 35. One cannot restore [Μέναν]δρ[ο]ς all at the beginning of line 35, because the line would then extend into the left margin without being the first line of a new document and without really being even the beginning of the list of ambassadors. These difficulties make it quite impossible to accept the identification, though Kahrstedt⁶ did. The stone-cutter may have miscopied iota omicron as rho in a name like [Ἀρμό]δ[ι]ος at the beginning of line 35. Leukios, a common name among Greek peregrini, does not indicate Roman citizenship. A title, perhaps ἀρχιερεὺς τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ, may have followed.

Kahrstedt, however, observes correctly that the list of ambassadors makes it possible to say that all the Greeks of the Peloponnese who belonged to the Achaean League belonged to it immediately; that is, without an intervening Arcadian or Messenian League.

³ One could make an interesting comparison with representation of the districts of Asia in another cult. See L. Robert, "Le culte de Caligula à Milet et la province d'Asie," *Hellenica* VII, Limoges 1949, pp. 206-238.

⁴ A. B. West, *Corinth*, VIII, ii, *Latin Inscriptions*, Cambridge, Mass. 1931, pp. 30-78.

⁵ M. Holleaux, "Inscription d'Acraephiae," *BCH* 12, 1888, pp. 305-315.

⁶ U. Kahrstedt, *SymbOslo* 28, 1950, pp. 70-75, but not J. Deninger, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit (Vestigia VI)*, Munich and Berlin 1965, p. 90, who followed Larsen. The writer would make other corrections in Kahrstedt's article. Kahrstedt, p. 73, failed to notice that *IG* II², 1094 (= III, 18) had been republished in *Hesperia* 10, 1941, pp. 361-363 with photograph, where the alleged reference to an Emperor Antoninus was completely eliminated. The inscription is Hadrianic. Secondly, Kahrstedt, p. 75, understood the word Ἀχαΐαν in line 12 of Nero's speech in *IG* VII, 2713 as indicating Central Greece alone as distinguished from the Peloponnese. Rather it subsumes both parts of the province. Thirdly, Kahrstedt tied the attestation of Corinth's membership in the Achaean League to West's (and Holleaux's) mistaken identification of the chief ambassador in *IG* VII, 2711, pp. 34-35.

The five constituent leagues did not send the same number of ambassadors each. There are eight from the Achaeans. In lines 38-40 the Boeotians have four, namely Epaminondas son of Epaminondas, then the lost so-and-so son of so-and-so, then [Olym]pion and Heraclitus sons of [Olym]pion. The Phocians have only one man. The Euboeans have only one man. The Locrians, however have two, of whom one name, but only one, is entirely lost in the lacuna.

The Dorians of Doris, who, as is clear from *IG* IV² 1, 80-81, belonged to this organization in the time of Tiberius, are not mentioned here. It does not follow that they no longer have any connection; they may have been absorbed, not by the Phocians (so Kahrstedt, p. 70), but by the Locrians. For the numbers suggest a parallel in Central Greece between Boeotians and the sum total of Locrians, Phocians, Euboeans and Dorians.

As we know from *IG* IV² 1, 80 and 81 at Epidaurus, the official order of the leagues used to be Achaeans, Boeotians, Phocians, Euboeans, Locrians, Dorians, and this probably reflected the ratio 8, 4, 1, 1, 1, 1. With the disappearance of the Dorians as a separate entity the official order became Achaeans, Boeotians, Locrians, Phocians, Euboeans, and this reflected the ratio 8, 4, 2, 1, 1. However, the traditional order with mention of the Phocians and Euboeans before that of the Locrians re-asserted itself in the order in which the ambassadors were listed at the end of the epistle of Caligula. That this was the traditional order of the local commonalties of Central Greece we know from *IG* II², 4114 of 34 or 33 B.C., which attests a pre-existing over-all commonalty of Boeotians, Euboeans, Phocians, Locrians and Dorians in that order even before the merger with the Commonalty of the Achaeans. The traditional order with [Phocians and] Euboeans ahead of Locrians appears again on the base for a statue of the emperor Claudius, found near Coronea but incorrectly restored in *IG* VII, 2878.

The order in lists of koina need not be interpreted as representing fluctuations in membership. Certainly the Dorians of Central Greece have disappeared, presumably absorbed into another local commonalty, but the over-all commonalty of Central Greece has remained. The Peloponnesians preferred to list the constituent local commonalties in order of weight (votes or ambassadors). The emperor replied by using the version of the title used in the decree or letter of transmission. The Greeks of Central Greece, however, preferred the historical order.

The over-all union of the commonalties of Central Greece was not an ancient inheritance but a defense reaction of weak neighboring states with the Aetolians, Achaeans, Thessalians in mind. In a unified province it served no great purpose and may have disappeared in A.D. 69, but the local commonalties, being ancient federal states, continued to exist. The over-all union, however, perhaps facilitated the merger with the Commonalty of the Achaeans into something like a provincial koinon. The date of the merger is not recorded and must be inferred.

To judge from *IG* IV² 1, 80-81 (the latter in the improved version of W. Peek, *Abn. Leipzig* <60, 2>, 1969, no. 34), the merger may have been worked out by T.

Statilius Timocrates, who on the recovery of their freedom became secretary of the new organization, καὶ τὰ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἔτι πλανώμενα κατεστήσατο β[έ]βαια. The freedom was the freedom to function as a union, not the short-lived freedom granted by Nero. It was also the freedom from foreign control (= senatorial rule), the freedom guaranteed by their patron, the emperor. A few years later Statilius Timocrates lost his son Lamprias, and he is consoled at Epidaurus by decrees of the Athenians and Lacedaemonians in *IG* IV² 1, 82-84 and 85-86 respectively. The Athenian decrees are dated to the Athenian archonship of Secundus, which can be placed with confidence well before A.D. 67.⁷ Quite apart from this, Epaminondas of Acraephia, who in *IG* VII, 2713 celebrated the grant of freedom and autonomy⁸ by Nero, commented that to this great gift Nero had added immunity from taxation, a benefaction which none of the previous emperors had granted in its entirety. He thus implied that Tiberius and Gaius, who had come only part way, had already granted much freedom when they liberated the province from senatorial government.

In brief, the glorious career of Timocrates fell in the time of Tiberius and Caligula. The union between the Achaeans on the one side and the Boeotians, Locrians, Phocians and Euboeans on the other clearly antedated the accession of Caligula, because he confirms their union. Because of Timocrates the union could hardly have gone back as far as the reign of Augustus. The formula of sanction in *IG* IV² 1, 81 was ἔδοξε τῷ Παναχαϊκῷ συνεδρίῳ. Larsen⁹ with his usual caution notes that the enlarged league "is first heard of towards the end of the reign of Tiberius," while West, *Corinth* VIII, ii, p. 30 and Kahrstedt, p. 71, dated the merger to the same time. West attributed the revival and merger to the activity of the popular legate, P. Memmius Regulus, toward the end of the reign of Tiberius.

A unified province of Achaia was somewhat unnatural. Not only had the Achaean League earlier been separate from Central Greece, but in A.D. 6, when the proconsul died, he was, according to Cassius Dio, LV.27. 6, succeeded by one acting governor for the Peloponnese and one acting governor for Central Greece. Achaia under its annually changing proconsul continued the old maladministration of the Roman Republic. The discontent which the Greeks felt with senatorial government led them to co-operate and look upon the emperor as their savior and liberator. Tacitus, *Ann.* I.76: *Achaiam ac Macedoniam onera deprecantis levare in praesens proconsulari imperio tradique Caesari placuit.* A.D. 15, when this occurred, actually brought a great deal of freedom and constitutes a *terminus post quem* for the merger. The other imperial legate remained far away, but P. Memmius Regulus (A.D. 35-44) took a great interest in Athens and Achaia. It is natural to think of him first as the governor who encouraged the merger. One argument (Kahrstedt's) must, however, be eliminated. In *IG* VII, 2711 the present participle in Caligula's statement ἐὼ ὑμᾶς συνισταμένους was a mistake; the true reading of line 29 is συνεσταμένους.

⁷ For the date see also S. Follet, *Athènes au II^e et au III^e siècle*, Paris 1977, p. 303.

⁸ A stereotyped expression: one implied the other.

⁹ J. A. O. Larsen in Tenney Frank's *Economic Survey* . . . , IV, Baltimore 1938, p. 450.

II. THE ATTIC PANHELLENION

The Commonalty of the Achaeans, Boeotians, Locrians, Phocians, Euboeans could not pretend to be panhellenic in representing the whole Hellenic world of the three continents or even the Hellenic world of European Greece. Symbolically, spiritually and traditionally Athens and Sparta, which were not members, more truly represented Hellenism. In fact the Delphic Amphictyony had a better claim to the title "common synhedrion of all the Hellenes," and this actually was an aspiration early in the reign of Hadrian, when a Delphic inscription, *FdD* III, iv, no. 302, in column II, lines 1-6, mentioned the attempt to get the Senate to reapportion the votes in order that the excessive votes of the Thessalian League might be reassigned to Athens, Sparta and other cities, "so that the synhedrion might be a common synhedrion of all the Hellenes." The same inscription in column I, lines 15-17 attests that Nero had been responsible for the maldistribution of Amphictyonic votes. But even the Amphictyonic Council could not aspire to represent the true Hellenism of the whole Greek world of three continents.

The aspirations of the Domitianic-Trajanic-Hadrianic period in the old Greek world of the three continents eventuated in the establishment of the Attic Panhellenion with delegates from old Greek mother communities and old Greek colonies. These cities and ethnic communities (πόλεις καὶ ἔθνη), which included not only Athens and Sparta but the Achaean League and its partners, were said to participate in the Attic Panhellenion, and their delegates were officially known as Panhellenes. The material has been brought together and discussed in my book, *Marcus Aurelius (Hesperia, Suppl. XIII, Princeton 1970)*, chapters I and IV, and has been supplemented by J. and L. Robert and by S. Follet, *Athènes au II^e et au III^e siècle*, pp. 125-135 with some new evidence and with many judicious comments about the old. Of the new evidence the two most interesting documents are the following:

1. Thessalonica Honors Antoninus Puis at Request of the Panhelleion. Thessalonica. Statue base discovered near the Agora of the Roman Period. Ph. M. Ines Petsas, *Makedonika* 9, 1969, p. 143 f., no. 45 with photograph on plate 23; and J. and L. Robert. *BullÉp* 1970, no. 367.

Αὐτοκράτορα · Καίσα
 ρα · θεοῦ · Ἀδριανοῦ · υἱόν,
 θεοῦ · Τραιανοῦ · υἱωνόν,
 θεοῦ · Νέρονα · ἑγγονον · Τ · Αἴλι
 5 ον · Ἀδριανόν · Ἀντωνίνον [· Σε]
 βαστὸν · Εὐσεβῆ · κατὰ τὸ ψή[φισμα]
 τὸ δόξαν τοῖς Πανελλήσιν [δι]
 ἀπεμφθὲν ὑπ' αὐτῶν εἰς ἀπ[ά]
 σας τὰς μετεχούσας πόλεις κ[αὶ]
 10 ἔθνη τοῦ Πανελληνίου κυρ[ω]
 θὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος ^{vv}

πολιταρχούντων
 Γν · Δομιτίου · Θράσωνος τὸ β̄,
 Τ · Νουμισήνου · Μακρέινου τοῦ κα[ι]
 15 Πρεμιγένους
 Ἀλεξάνδρου Ἀπολλειναρίου

The inscription attests the term *psêphisma* for a decree of the Panhellenion, and it informs us that on the accession of Antoninus Pius the Panhellenes voted him honors and submitted a draft of the decree for his approval. Whether he trimmed the list or not is unrecorded, but he permitted the erection of a statue of himself in each city and ethnic center, whereupon notification was sent out to the member communities for their action. The Panhellenion thus made congratulatory embassies to Rome from member communities unnecessary.

2. The Areopagus Honors Vedia Io, daughter of a Panhellene from Argos. Athens. Statue base discovered in excavation of the Library of Hadrian. G. Dontas, *Δελτ* 23, 1968 (1969), *Χρονικά*, p. 19 with photograph; and J. and L. Robert, *BullÉp*, 1970, no. 245; S. Follet, *Athènes au II^e et au III^e siècle*, p. 133.

[Ἡ ἐξ] Ἀ[ρ]ήφ[υ] πάχ[ου]
 βουλῇ Βηδῖαν
 Εἰὼ Βηδίου Προ
 φάντου Ἀργεῖ
 5 ον Πανέλληνος
 ἀγωνοθετήσα[ν]
 τος Νεμεί[ω]ν
 θυγατέρα καὶ
 Κλαυδ[ίας Ἀ]ρτ[ε]
 10 μῶς αἰτήσα[μέ]
 νου τοῦ πα[τρὸς]
 ἀνέστησε[ν]

Through the kindness of Mr. Dontas the writer in 1971 was able to see the stone and to make a squeeze. The reading is difficult, but once the letters are read, only one restoration, that in line 11 where not more than three spaces can be allowed, raises doubt. A restoration Πα[νελ(ληνίου)] in an inscription with no other abbreviations would look rather desperate. It seems better to reckon with a ligature, i. e. the sigma or upsilon of a genitive ending inside the omicron like a sigma on the Athenian base shown in *Δελτ* 25, pl. 69. The restoration πά[ππου] is, however, impossible, because a grandfather of the lady honored has not been mentioned. Unless we have failed to visualize all the possibilities in line 11, only one restoration is possible, πα[τρὸς].

IG II², 4054, honoring a woman of Athens, ends καθ' ὑπομνηματισμὸν Ἀρε[οπα]-
 γειτῶν ὁ πατήρ ἀρετῆς ἔνεκε[ν]. It is normal for a father (or other relative) to

receive permission for a statue which he himself erects. But why did the Areopagus erect Vedia Io's and how did it happen that the non-Athenian father had the audacity to ask them to do so? Presumably the Areopagus had wished to honor the Panhellene, and he had asked that the statue, for which he himself was perhaps paying, should be a statue not of himself but of his daughter, who also deserved well. It is the father's service which receives mention; he was the agonothete, but since the festival was held at Argos, she may have distinguished herself with hospitality.

III. THE CONNECTION OF CORINTH

Julius Caesar caused a Roman colony to be founded, the *Laus Iulia Corinthiensis*, settled with freedmen. Later it served as capital of the Roman province of Achaia. A number of freeborn Greeks lived in and around this area, and they became more and more closely associated with all aspects of the city's life. In fact as time went on, the servile antecedents of the Roman colony became more of an embarrassment. In view of a cruel epigram of Crinagoras (*AP* IX.284) known to all, these antecedents were unlikely to be forgotten, and a tendency existed to connect the city through its Greek population with the glorious past of ancient Corinth. U. Kahrstedt¹⁰ thought that the leader of the embassy to Caligula was a well-known Corinthian and that Corinth therefore belonged again to the Commonalty of the Achaeans. The identification, rejected above in our list of ambassadors, was mistaken; there is still no evidence that Corinth in the Roman period ever belonged to the Commonalty of the Achaeans.

But Corinth did participate in the Attic Panhellenion. The Panhellene Maecius Faustinus¹¹ was a Corinthian, and I am no longer able to think of him as a possible representative of the Achaean League. He must have achieved his eligibility for membership in the Panhellenion rather by serving as a magistrate at Corinth, and Corinth must have been a constituent member of the Panhellenion. J. H. Kent, *Corinth*, VIII, iii, *The Inscriptions, 1926-1950*, Princeton 1966, pp. 18-19, pointed out that in the reign of Hadrian the official language at Corinth changed from Latin to Greek. This highly significant change could not have taken place without the consent of Hadrian. It reflects a decision to recognize Corinth officially as a continuation of the old Greek city and to admit it accordingly as such to the Panhellenion.

From then on, the settlers of the Roman colony were no more embarrassing than the forbears of citizens in other Greek cities, where many families were of freedman ancestry. The ancient Corinthian glory covered them all. When the emperor Julian wished to offer explanations to Greece, he wrote to what he considered the three leading cities, Athens, Sparta and Corinth.

JAMES H. OLIVER

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

¹⁰ See footnote 6 above.

¹¹ *Hesperia*, Suppl. XIII, no. 37. His praenomen is now known to be Aulus (*Hesperia* 39, 1970, pp. 79-93).