

# CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE AND UNREST IN AUGUSTAN ATHENS

IN THE WINTER OF 22/1 B.C., Cassius Dio records, Augustus crossed over from Sicily to Greece and visited Sparta and Athens:<sup>1</sup>

καὶ Λακεδαιμονίους μὲν τοῖς τε Κυθήροις καὶ τῇ συσσιτίᾳ ἐτίμησεν, ὅτι ἡ Λιουία, ὅτε ἐκ τῆς Ἰταλίας σὺν τε τῷ ἀνδρὶ καὶ σὺν τῷ υἱεὶ ἔφυγεν, ἐκεῖ διέτριψεν· Ἀθηναίων δὲ τὴν τε Αἴγινα καὶ τὴν Ἐρέτριαν (ἐκαρποῦντο γὰρ αὐτάς), ὥς τινὲς φασιν, ἀφείλετο, ὅτι τὸν Ἀντώνιον ἐσπούδασαν, καὶ προσέτι καὶ ἀπηγόρευσέ σφισι μηδένα πολίτην ἀργυρίου ποιεῖσθαι. καὶ αὐτοῖς ἐς ταῦτα ἔδοξε τὸ τῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἀγάλματι συμβᾶν ἀποσκήψαι· ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀκροπόλει πρὸς ἀνατολῶν ἰδρυμένον πρὸς τε τὰς δυσμὰς μετεστράφη καὶ αἷμα ἀπέπτυσεν.

Dio fails to inform us of the reason for Augustus' visit, but instead he focuses on the two stops the Emperor made during his journey. In Sparta Augustus bestowed honors and benefactions on the city by awarding the island of Kythera to Spartan control and by attending the city's public banquet hall. These honors were doubtless conferred on the Spartans because, as reported by Dio (XLVIII.15), they once provided refuge to Augustus' wife Livia who fled Italy with her then husband, T. Claudius Nero, and their son, the future emperor Tiberius, to avoid persecution.

Augustus' visit to Athens, on the contrary, was quite different. Augustus took away Aegina and Eretria from Athenian sovereignty, and he also forbade the Athenians to sell

<sup>1</sup> Cassius Dio, LIV.7.2–3: "He [Augustus] honoured the Lacedaemonians by giving them Cythera and attending their public mess, because Livia, when she fled from Italy with her husband and son, had spent some time there. But from the Athenians he took away Aegina and Eretria, from which they received tribute, because, as some say, they had espoused the cause of Antony; and he furthermore forbade them to make anyone a citizen for money. And it seemed to them that the thing which had happened to the statue of Athena was responsible for this misfortune; for this statue on the Acropolis, which was placed to face the east, had turned around to the west and spat blood" (Loeb ed., E. Cary, trans.).

This article is an expanded discussion of several historical points raised in my dissertation, *The Roman Agora at Athens* (Boston University, 1988). I am grateful to Tracy Cullen and my dissertation adviser Fred Kleiner for their excellent editorial comments and helpful criticisms. I also gratefully acknowledge Meyer Reinhold for his advice on historical problems, and the anonymous reviewer of this paper.

Works frequently cited are abbreviated as follows:

- Day, *Economic History* = J. Day, *An Economic History of Roman Athens under Roman Domination*, New York 1942  
 Ferguson, *Hell. Athens* = W. S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, London 1911  
 Geagan, "Roman Athens" = D. J. Geagan, "Roman Athens: Some Aspects of Life and Culture. I. 86 B.C.–A.D. 267," *ANRW* II.7.1, Berlin 1979, pp. 371–437  
 Graindor, *Auguste* = P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste*, Cairo 1927  
 Kroll, "Two Hoards" = J. H. Kroll, "Two Hoards of Athenian Bronze Coins," *Δελτ* 27, 1972, B' 1 (1976), pp. 86–120  
 Raubitschek, "Octavia" = A. E. Raubitschek, "Octavia's Deification at Athens," *TAPA* 77, 1946, pp. 146–150

rights of citizenship. Dio cites from his sources two possible reasons for Augustus' actions: one, as reprisals for Athenian espousal of the causes of Antony; and second, an angry response to a curious incident involving a statue of Athena on the Akropolis. Dio himself offers no judgment on which reason is more likely. His primary concern is simply to highlight the contrast in Augustus' actions vis-à-vis two Greek cities.

Dio's report of Augustus' conduct toward the Athenians is indirectly supported by a passage from Plutarch who records that Augustus spent a winter on the island of Aigina rather than in Athens because of his anger toward the Athenians.<sup>2</sup>

Τοῦ δὲ Ἀθηναίων δήμον ἐξημαρτηκέναι τι δόξαντος, ἔγραψεν ἅπ' Αἰγίνης οἰεσθαι μὴ λανθάνειν αὐτοὺς ὀργιζόμενος, οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐν Αἰγίνῃ διαχειμάσαι. ἄλλο δὲ οὐδὲν οὔτε εἶπεν αὐτοὺς οὔτε ἐποίησε.

Plutarch's anecdote was assigned to the winter of 31/30 B.C. by Paul Graindor who believed the most appropriate time for Augustus to be angry at the Athenians was immediately following the Battle of Actium in 31.<sup>3</sup> Bowersock, however, points out that Augustus had no time in which to pass a winter on Aigina; instead the Emperor left Athens for Asia, returned to Italy, and departed once more for Asia that same winter.<sup>4</sup> Speed was essential in order to consolidate the gains won at Actium. The reason Graindor offers in dating the anecdote to 31 is also contrary to Augustus' initial conciliatory policy. Immediately following Actium Augustus sailed to Athens where, as Plutarch informs us, he became reconciled with all the Greek states, and he stayed in the city long enough to participate in the Eleusinian Mysteries.<sup>5</sup> It is significant that Augustus tarried in Athens in order to attend one of Athens' most important festivals before embarking on the whirlwind voyages mentioned above. Augustus' choice of Athens as the site to convene the Greek states in order to effect a reconciliation with them, instead of a more neutral place such as Delphi or Olympia, and his participation in Athenian festivals are clear indications of his high regard for Athens. It is therefore impossible for Augustus to have passed the winter on Aigina in 31/30 B.C. Dio's sources who claim that Augustus' anger is a result of Athenian support of Antony should also be discounted for the same reasons. There was no reason for Augustus to manifest anger at the Athenians ten years after the event.

Therefore, the incident on the Akropolis, as believed by the Athenians themselves according to Dio, appears to have been the cause for the economic sanctions Augustus imposed on the Athenians, and he emphasized his anger by spending at least part of the winter of 22/1 on the island of Aigina.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch, *Reg. et imp. apophth.*, 207 f: "When, as it appeared, the Athenian people had committed some offense, he wrote from Aigina that he supposed they could not be unaware that he was angry; otherwise he would not have spent the whole winter in Aigina. But he neither said nor did anything else to them" (Loeb ed., F. C. Babbitt, trans.).

<sup>3</sup> Graindor, *Auguste*, p. 17; cf. Day, *Economic History*, pp. 134–136.

<sup>4</sup> G. W. Bowersock, "Augustus on Aigina," *CQ*, n.s. 14, 1964 (pp. 120–121), p. 120; cf. *idem*, *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford 1965, p. 106 and R. Bernhardt, *Imperium und Eleutheria. Die römische Politik gegenüber den freien Städten des griechischen Ostens* (diss. Universität Hamburg), pp. 198–201.

<sup>5</sup> Plutarch, *Ant.*, 67.

<sup>6</sup> Dio's account (LIV.6.1) suggests that Augustus began the winter of 22/1 in Sicily and then crossed over to Greece late in 22 or early 21; see Bowersock, "Aigina" (footnote 4 above), p. 120.

Dio's description of the incident is short and without full explanation. Yet for Dio's readers, both ancient and modern, the meaning is perfectly clear: the incident, intended for Augustus' benefit, must have been meant as an insult to Rome and the Emperor. The scenario should be reconstructed as follows: a statue of Athena on the Akropolis (probably not that of Athena Polias), which had been set facing east, was discovered to have been deliberately turned to face the west in the direction of Rome, and blood had been splattered down the front and mouth of the statue to give the impression that Athena, the protectress and patron goddess of Athens, had spat blood at Rome.

Augustus' response to this act of vandalism was measured. Instead of violent reprisals, Augustus imposed sanctions on the Athenians. These sanctions went right to the heart of the Athenian economy which was slowly recovering from the damage of the incessant civil wars that had afflicted Greece, and particularly Athens, from 48 to 31 B.C. The removal of Eretria and Aigina from Athenian sovereignty must have greatly reduced essential revenues. Added to this burden was the prohibition against the sale of citizenship rights to wealthy foreigners, a common practice in Athens since the Hellenistic period.<sup>7</sup> Such sanctions imposed by Augustus must have severely burdened an already strained Athenian economy, and there may have been further sanctions not mentioned by Dio. It may be possible to associate these sanctions with the prohibition of minting bronze coinage that we know to have occurred sometime in the Augustan period.<sup>8</sup> We may also add the implication by Dio that the powers of the *ekklesia* were curtailed.<sup>9</sup> Finally, as emphasis of his anger at the Athenians Augustus spent that winter on Aigina, the very island he had just removed from Athenian sovereignty, instead of Athens where he evidently had intended to stay upon arriving.

The question that remains concerns the depth of this anti-Roman sentiment in Athens as manifested in the Akropolis incident. It is unlikely that Augustus' sanctions were imposed in response to a single, isolated event. Rather one can safely assume that there was considerable anti-Roman feeling among the general populace. We have been witness only to a single incident.

The roots of this unrest in Augustan Athens are deep and can be documented from the literary sources. The first signs of civil discontent with Rome's presence in Athens can be traced to the populist uprising of the early 1st century B.C. that ultimately led to the siege and capture of the city by Sulla in 87/86.<sup>10</sup> Sulla showed no desire to destroy the city, and he

<sup>7</sup> The practice of selling citizenship may be traced as far back as Lykourgos; see Ferguson, *Hell. Athens*, pp. 245–246, note 6 and p. 315; Day (*Economic History*, p. 127), however, mistakenly implies that the practice began only after Sulla.

<sup>8</sup> Hoard evidence suggests that the Athenians continued to coin after Actium, as was their right as an autonomous city, but the mint quickly closed, perhaps as a result of the Akropolis incident in 21 B.C.; see Kroll, "Two Hoards," p. 101; and *idem*, "The Eleusis Hoard of Athenian Imperial Coins," *Hesperia* 42, 1973 (pp. 312–333), pp. 323–327.

<sup>9</sup> Cassius Dio, *LI.2.1*. It is difficult to know whether these undated prohibitions were instituted before the Akropolis incident, thus adding fuel to anti-Roman sentiment, or were part of Augustus' sanctions.

<sup>10</sup> Stephen V. Tracy has recently suggested that deteriorating conditions between a small group of wealthy Athenians with connections to Delos and Rome and the general populace in the early 1st century B.C. provide the background for the populist uprising; see *IG IP 2336: Contributors of First Fruits for the Pythais*, Meisenheim 1982, pp. 155–182; also, see D. J. Geagan, rev. of Tracy, *JHS* 103, 1983, pp. 205–206. On the sack of

gave orders to his soldiers to destroy no building.<sup>11</sup> Yet to the citizens of Athens he gave no quarter. The description in Plutarch (*Sull.*, 12) of the bloodbath that followed the breach of Athens' walls by Sulla's soldiers is stark testimony of a brutal punishment. Pausanias (1.20.7) described Sulla's treatment of the Athenians as excessively savage and unworthy of a Roman. There is no reason to doubt that among the first victims were the leaders of the populist uprising and that their political presence was replaced by a new constitutional government composed of members from the pro-Roman aristocracy.<sup>12</sup> A government more aligned with Roman interests was probably responsible for the institution of a new festival, the *Sylleia*, in honor of Sulla during his return to the city in 84 B.C.<sup>13</sup> In spite of this honor, and his initiation into the Eleusinian Mysteries that same year,<sup>14</sup> Sulla robbed the city of some of its treasures. Our sources report that he confiscated gold and silver, probably from the Akropolis, and the contents of an entire library.<sup>15</sup> Sulla also removed several columns from the unfinished Olympieion and transported them to Rome to be used in various temples on the Capitoline.<sup>16</sup> Sulla's soldiers are reported to have removed the shields of past Athenian heroes from the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios as spoils of victory.<sup>17</sup> This marks the first known occasion that Romans despoiled the city by taking away the treasures and artifacts of Athens' rich historical and cultural past, a practice that most certainly did not endear the Romans to the Athenians.

It is difficult to judge the extent of the despoiling of Athens. Yet Roman officials who had authority over Athens certainly coveted ancient sculptures, paintings, and other precious antiquities. From the testimony of Cicero we hear of the infamous Verres who removed gold from the Parthenon,<sup>18</sup> and in 59–57 B.C. the proconsul of Macedonia, L. Calpurnius Piso, apparently robbed the city of many of its treasures.<sup>19</sup> It is evident in his invectives that Cicero was dismayed about the extent of this corruption by Roman officials; in letters to Atticus he proudly claims that his visit to Athens in 51 B.C., unlike those of previous Romans, was not a burden to the Athenians.<sup>20</sup>

---

Athens see Plutarch, *Sull.*, 12; Appian, *Mith.*, 30–39; Strabo, ix.c395–396; see Ferguson, *Hell. Athens*, pp. 446–452 and Day, *Economic History*, pp. 113–119.

<sup>11</sup> Appian, *Mith.*, 38. The most destruction apparently occurred at the Piraeus although the Agora excavations have revealed widespread damage that is now linked to Sulla's capture of the city; see John M. Camp, *The Athenian Agora*, London 1986, p. 181. Ironically, Sulla is reported to have said that one of the most fortunate events of his life was that he had saved Athens from destruction; see Plutarch, *Reg. et imp. apophth.*, 202 f.

<sup>12</sup> Appian, *Mith.*, 39; Strabo, ix.c398; cf. Ferguson, *Hell. Athens*, p. 455. For a study of Sulla's constitution, see D. J. Geagan, *Hesperia* Suppl. XII, *The Athenian Constitution after Sulla*, Princeton 1967; and E. Badian, "Rome, Athens and Mithradates," *American Journal of Ancient History* 1, 1976 (pp. 105–128), pp. 114–117.

<sup>13</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 1039, line 57.

<sup>14</sup> Plutarch, *Sull.*, 26.

<sup>15</sup> Gold and silver: Appian, *Mith.*, 39; library: Lucian, *Zeux.*, 3; Plutarch, *Sull.*, 26.

<sup>16</sup> Pliny, *HN* xxxvi.5.45.

<sup>17</sup> Pausanias, x.21.6.

<sup>18</sup> Cicero, *Verr.* II, i, 17.45.

<sup>19</sup> Cicero, *Pis.*, 40.96; Cicero refers to the city victimized by Piso as "laceratae Athenae".

<sup>20</sup> Cicero, *Att.* v.10.2, 11.5.

From around 50 to 31 B.C. the Athenians inevitably became involved in the violent political struggles that dominated the Roman world. On three occasions the Athenians found themselves on the losing side of civil war.

In 62 B.C. Pompey came to Athens immediately following the Mithradatic War and bestowed 50 talents on the city toward the restoration of its monuments.<sup>21</sup> At least part of this donation was used in the reconstruction of the Deigma in the Piraeus which had probably been destroyed a quarter of a century earlier when Sulla razed the port.<sup>22</sup> This was not the first time that Pompey had aided the city. In 67 B.C., just before embarking on his mission to rid the Mediterranean of pirates, Pompey briefly visited the city and was awarded special honors.<sup>23</sup> It is likely that Pompey's honors are to be linked with Athens' need for pirate-free waters for safe commerce. These two instances clearly underscore the debt Athens felt toward Pompey and help explain Athenian allegiance in the civil war between Pompey and Julius Caesar when Athens contributed three or more ships to Pompey's fleet.<sup>24</sup>

Caesar, on his part, did very little to court Athens' favor. Although in 51 B.C. Caesar donated 50 talents, a gift equal to that of Pompey, for the sole purpose of the construction of a new market building, his gift came too late to alter Athenian allegiance.<sup>25</sup>

In the civil war Attica again suffered greatly. Caesar's legate, Q. Fufius Calenus, easily captured the Piraeus and devastated all of Attica. Athens, however, held out until after the defeat of Pompey at Pharsalos in 48 B.C.<sup>26</sup> Immediately following the battle, an Athenian embassy came to Caesar as suppliants. According to Dio, "Caesar, cherishing no resentment, let them go unharmed. . . ."<sup>27</sup> Appian, moreover, records that Caesar rebuked the penitent Athenians by asking: "How often will the glory of your ancestors save you from self-destruction?"<sup>28</sup> In view of their later conduct, i.e., their joining the forces of Brutus and

<sup>21</sup> Plutarch, *Pomp.*, 42.5–6.

<sup>22</sup> *IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 1035, line 47; also, see Day, *Economic History*, pp. 149–151.

<sup>23</sup> Plutarch, *Pomp.*, 27.3. If these honors proffered to Pompey were divine as Plutarch implies, then they were almost certainly politely refused; see M. P. Charlesworth, "The Refusal of Divine Honors: An Augustan Formula," *BSR* 15, 1939, pp. 1–10.

<sup>24</sup> Lucan, III.181–183; Caesar, *BCiv* III.3.1. Athens may have also contributed land forces; see Appian, *BC* II.70 and 75. Caesar, however, in his list of the war's participants (*BCiv* III.4), does not mention any Athenian involvement on Pompey's side.

<sup>25</sup> Cicero, in a letter dated to 51 B.C. (*Att.* VI.1.25), mentions that Herodes of Marathon "extorted" 50 talents from Caesar. This money was undoubtedly meant for the construction of the Roman Agora, as the dedicatory inscription (*IG II<sup>2</sup>*, 3175) records that Caesar donated funds for its construction and that Herodes acted as ambassador to obtain the funds. For the early history of the Market, and the impetus behind its construction, see Hoff, "The Early History of the Roman Agora at Athens," in *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire. Tenth British Museum Classical Colloquium (BICS, Suppl. LV)*, S. Walker and A. Cameron, edd., forthcoming.

<sup>26</sup> Cassius Dio, XLII.14.1–2. In a letter to Cicero dated about 45 B.C., Servius Sulpicius relates the following account of the destruction wrought by Calenus (Cicero, *Fam.* v.4): "On my return from Asia, as I was sailing from Aigina to Megara, I began to survey the regions round about. Behind me was Aigina, before me Megara, on my right the Piraeus, on my left Corinth, towns at one time most flourishing, now lying prostrate and demolished before one's very eyes" (Loeb ed., E. Cary, trans.). There is very little doubt that Sulpicius' account is exaggerated as all these cities continued to be occupied to some degree; cf. J. R. Wiseman, "Corinth and Rome I: 228 B.C.–A.D. 267," *ANRW* II.7.1, Berlin 1979 (pp. 438–548), p. 493, note 198.

<sup>27</sup> Cassius Dio, XLII.14.2; Loeb ed., E. Cary, trans.

<sup>28</sup> Appian, *BC* II.88; Loeb ed., H. White, trans.

then Antonius, the Athenians were apparently not at all swayed by Caesar's admonition. Nevertheless, the Athenians felt obligated under the circumstances to erect statues in honor of Julius Caesar and to commemorate his pardon.<sup>29</sup>

Caesar's actions following his victory over Pompey were anything but conciliatory towards the Greek cities. Continuing his report of Caesar's activities after Pharsalos, Dio writes:

After accomplishing this [expedition against Pharnaces in 47] . . . he came to . . . Greece, whence he sailed for Italy, collecting along the way great sums of money from everybody, and upon every pretext, just as before. In the first place, he exacted all that any had previously promised to Pompey, and again, he asked for still more from other sources, bringing various accusations to justify his action. . . . All this he did, not out of malice, but because his expenditures were on a vast scale and because he was intending to lay out still more upon his legions, his triumph, and everything else that gratified his pride (Cassius Dio, XLII.49.1-4; Loeb ed., E. Cary, trans.).

Dio's account implies that Caesar, far from donating funds to subject cities, extorted money to pay off his army. There is no reason to believe that Athens was an exceptional case. The fact that the city received a pardon after Pharsalos on account of its ancient glory would not necessarily excuse the Athenians from imposed economic burdens.<sup>30</sup>

Another gift that Caesar was thought to have bestowed upon Athens was the restoration of the democratic constitution. Kolbe, followed by many later scholars, believed Caesar effected the restoration in 48 B.C. It has been shown in more recent years, however, that the constitutional change occurred at a much earlier date and was not associated with Julius Caesar at all.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>29</sup> For statue bases of Julius Caesar, see A. E. Raubitschek, "Epigraphical Notes on Julius Caesar," *JRS* 44, 1954 (pp. 65-75), pp. 65-66, F, and pp. 68-69, P. Both are dated by Raubitschek to shortly after Pharsalos. Raubitschek associates statue "P" (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 3222) with Caesar's gift of the Roman Market, but this association is doubtful. "P" has been recently re-edited and possibly may commemorate Caesar's dictatorship; see D. J. Geagan ("Imperial Visits to Athens: The Epigraphical Evidence," *Πρακτικά του Η' διεθνούς συνεδρίου ελληνικής και λατινικής επιγραφικής* [1982], Athens 1984 [pp. 69-78], p. 71) who also introduces another statue base of Caesar from the Agora excavations, inv. no. I 3042. An inscription from the Akropolis (*IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 3223) may refer to Caesar. A late Republican portrait head in the National Archaeological Museum at Athens without provenance (N.M. 437) has been identified as Julius Caesar; see A. Datsouli-Stavridis, *Ρωμαϊκά Πόρτραϊτα*, Athens 1985, pp. 27-28, pl. 14. These bases and portrait head may be associated with a senatorial decree ordered in 44 B.C. which directed all cities to erect statues of Caesar; see Cassius Dio, XLIV.4.4.

<sup>30</sup> This view is contrary to that of P. Graindor who, wrongly believing that Caesar donated the construction funds for the new Market after rather than before the civil wars (footnote 25 above), considered Julius Caesar conciliatory and generous; see *Un milliardaire antique: Herode Atticus et sa famille*, Cairo 1930, p. 7.

<sup>31</sup> W. Kolbe, *Die attischen Archonten*, Berlin 1908, p. 149. W. S. Ferguson ("Researches in Athenian and Delian Documents. III," *Klio* 9, 1909 [pp. 304-340], p. 340), however, expressed reservations on Kolbe's hypothesis. Scholars who follow Kolbe include Kirchner, commentary to *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 1043; Graindor, *Auguste*, p. 95; Day, *Economic History*, p. 130; and J. Notopoulos, "Studies in the Chronology of Athens," *Hesperia* 18, 1949 (pp. 1-57), p. 5. S. Accame (*Il Domino romano in Grecia dalla guerra acaica ad Augusto*, Rome 1946, pp. 174-175) places the democratic reforms under Brutus and is followed by Raubitschek (footnote 29 above), p. 66, note 5. Geagan has shown that the anti-Sullan reaction of 70 B.C. at Rome was echoed at Athens, effecting a restoration of the democratic constitution at that time; see D. J. Geagan, "Greek Inscriptions,"

Therefore, with the exception of the initial donation of funds for the Roman Market in 51 B.C., which were probably later confiscated by Caesar or exhausted during the war, there is little evidence that the Athenians derived benefit from the dictatorship of Caesar. On the contrary, besides devastating Attica and perhaps forcing levies on the city, Caesar was *dictator*, an office that was repugnant to the democratic traditions of the Athenians. In fact, the name of Caesar was held in such little esteem in Athens that upon his assassination in 44 B.C. the Athenians erected bronze statues of Brutus and Cassius next to the famous Tyrannicide group of Harmodios and Aristogeiton in the Classical Agora, which, after the Akropolis, was the most distinguished place in Athens for the erection of honorary statues.<sup>32</sup> The memory of Caesar was apparently vilified by the Athenians.

After Philippi, the Athenians were subject to Antonius' *imperium* and received as benefactions the islands of Aigina, Keos, Peparethos, Ikos, and Skiathos.<sup>33</sup> It has been suggested that Antonius reinstituted oligarchic rule in Athens, but this hypothesis is questionable.<sup>34</sup> While wintering in Athens in 39/8, Antonius decreed that he was to be addressed as the "New Dionysos", and that same year the city celebrated the Antonian Panatheneia.<sup>35</sup> The Athenians also arranged for his "marriage" to Athena, an honor which cost the city at least a million drachmas and perhaps more as a "dowry".<sup>36</sup> Although Antonius was still married to

*Hesperia* 40, 1971 (pp. 96–108), pp. 101–108, and Geagan, "Roman Athens," pp. 375–376 and pp. 416–417; also, see J. H. Oliver, "The Solonian Constitution and a Consul of A.D. 149," *GRBS* 13, 1972 (pp. 99–107), pp. 101–102.

<sup>32</sup> Cassius Dio, XLVII.20.4. A fragment of the inscribed base that supported the statue of Brutus was recovered in the Agora excavations of 1936 (I 3366); see A. E. Raubitschek, "The Brutus Statue in Athens," in *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di epigrafia greca e latina*, Rome 1959, pp. 15–21; also, see *idem*, "Brutus in Athens," *Phoenix* 11, 1957 (pp. 1–11), p. 5.

<sup>33</sup> Appian, *BC* v.7. On Antonius and Athens see A. N. Oikonomides, "Defeated Athens, the Land of Oropos, Caesar and Augustus. Notes on the History of the Years 49–27 B.C.," *The Ancient World* 2, 1979 (pp. 97–103), pp. 101–102 and M. J. Payne, "Aretas Eneken. Honors to Romans and Italians in Greece from 260 to 27 B.C.," diss. Michigan State University, 1984, pp. 320–323.

<sup>34</sup> Graindor (*Auguste*, p. 95) tentatively suggests a re-establishment of an aristocratic oligarchy because inscriptions appear about this time which record that the Council votes alone without collaboration of the popular assembly and that the hoplite general also plays a much larger role than in periods when a democratic regime is in power; cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 1043. Agreeing with Graindor are Day (*Economic History*, p. 133 and note 73) and Geagan ("Roman Athens," pp. 376–377). Graindor's assumption is apparently based on negative evidence, a highly suspect source. It is equally likely that such a reform might have been made earlier, perhaps under Brutus. One hopes that a more thorough study of inscriptions from this period will provide a solution.

<sup>35</sup> Cassius Dio, XLVIII.39.2; cf. L.5.3. Also, see Seneca, *Suas.* 1.6; Plutarch, *Ant.*, 33.4; *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 1043, lines 22 and 23; for an alternative restoration of the name of the festival see Raubitschek, "Octavia," p. 148. On Antonius and the "New Dionysos," see A. D. Nock, "Notes on Ruler-Cult I–IV," *JHS* 48, 1928 (pp. 21–43), pp. 30–38 (reprinted in *A. D. Nock. Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* I, Z. Stewart, ed., Cambridge, Mass. 1972, pp. 144–152); L. Cerfaux and J. Tondriaux, *Le culte des souverains dans la civilisation greco-romaine*, Tournai 1957, pp. 297–298.

<sup>36</sup> Seneca (*Suas.* 1.6) reports the amount given as 1000 talents (6 million drachmas); Dio (XLVIII.39.2), followed by Zonaras (x.23), lowers the amount to one million. J. A. O. Larsen ("Roman Greece," in *An Economic History of Ancient Rome* IV, T. Frank, ed., Baltimore 1938, p. 434), W. W. Tarn (*CAH* X, p. 53), and Day (*Economic History*, p. 133) suggest that the large dowry exacted from the Athenians is a fabrication spread by Antonius' enemies for propagandistic purposes. *Contra*, see Raubitschek, "Octavia," pp. 146–147 and Kroll, "Two Hoards," pp. 98–99.

Octavia, the problem of “bigamy” was overlooked because Octavia herself seems to have been identified with Athena Polias at about the same time.<sup>37</sup> Associated with Antonius’ presence in Athens is a new coin series which bears a Dionysos head on the obverse.<sup>38</sup> The fact that these coins (and later issues) had been debased in relation to the preceding New Style series implies, according to Kroll, that Antonius “left Athens a much poorer city than he found it.”<sup>39</sup> This appears to confirm the literary accounts of the exorbitant dowry.

As this evidence indicates, the relations between the Athenian citizenry and their Roman authorities before Augustus were apparently poor. The Romans were generally viewed at best as rapacious, untrustworthy, and disrespectful of Athenian culture and democratic traditions. The conciliatory gestures offered by Augustus following the battle of Actium did not quickly ameliorate the anger and distrust the Athenians felt toward the Romans. As the Akropolis incident clearly illustrates, the rancor felt at Roman presence in the city had continued unabated for ten years.

The economic sanctions imposed by Augustus in the aftermath of the Akropolis incident produced, at least on the surface, the desired effects. When Augustus next visited Athens in 19 B.C. on his return journey from the East following his successful Parthian “campaign”, there are no reports of anti-Roman demonstrations. Dio mentions that after passing the winter of 20/19 on Samos, Augustus came to Athens and participated for a second time in the Eleusinian Mysteries, which Dio states were held out of season on account of Augustus’ attendance.<sup>40</sup> Recently, Bernhardt has argued that it was the Athenians who persuaded Augustus to attend the celebrations in 19 in order to effect a reconciliation.<sup>41</sup>

Donatus also records Augustus’ visit to Athens in 19 B.C. while describing the Emperor’s encounter with Virgil in the city and the poet’s subsequent death during their journey together to Italy.<sup>42</sup> Neither Dio nor Donatus mention any incident of civil unrest or resentment on the part of Augustus toward the Athenians. Augustus’ participation once again in the Eleusinian Mysteries indicates that his anger had abated, and as Bernhardt

<sup>37</sup> An inscribed altar base from the Agora excavations (I 3071) refers to both Antonius and Octavia as *θεοὶ ἐνεργεταί*; see Raubitschek, “Octavia,” p. 149. On Antonius and Octavia in Athens, see Appian, *BC* v.76. Later, in 32 B.C., Antonius and Cleopatra were honored with bronze statues dedicated to them as divinities; see Cassius Dio, *L*.15.2. On the “bigamous” relationship, see Raubitschek, “Octavia,” p. 147.

<sup>38</sup> Kroll, “Two Hoards,” pp. 98–100.

<sup>39</sup> Kroll, “Two Hoards,” p. 99.

<sup>40</sup> Cassius Dio, *LIV*.9.7–10.

<sup>41</sup> R. Bernhardt, “Athen, Augustus und die eleusinische Mysterien,” *AM* 90, 1975 (pp. 233–237), pp. 233–237; Bernhardt’s hypothesis is questioned by Clinton who believes it unlikely that the Athenians proposed such a sacrilege of changing the date of the Mysteries of their own accord; only pressure from the emperor would cause them to do such a thing (e.g., Lucius Verus in the late 2nd century after Christ). On the other hand, given the seriousness of the problems between Athens and Augustus, the Athenians may well have gone to such lengths in order to effect a reconciliation with the Emperor.

I am grateful to Kevin Clinton for allowing me to read the section on Augustus in his still unpublished article, “The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman Initiates and Benefactors, Second Century BC to AD 267,” forthcoming in *ANRW*.

<sup>42</sup> Aelius Donatus, *Virgilio vita*, 35 (51).



argues, the initiative to change the date of the Mysteries came from the Athenians, demonstrating their strong desire for a reconciliation.<sup>43</sup> Indeed, I have argued elsewhere that it was during this visit that Augustus donated the funds necessary for the completion of the Roman Market as part of his gesture of reconciliation.<sup>44</sup>

Augustus' final recorded visit to Athens occurred in 12 B.C. when the Emperor was attending the Panathenaic festival. Dio reports that while Augustus was in Athens Agrippa fell ill; he died before Augustus was able to return to Italy.<sup>45</sup> No other mention is made by Dio concerning Augustus' activities in Athens other than his attendance at the Mysteries, but that fact alone indicates that the Emperor was still carrying out the policy initiated in 31 B.C. of fostering Athenian festivals. Neither do we hear of any anti-Roman demonstrations, but this silence should not be taken as indication that the anti-Roman factions had been neutralized. Indeed, economic sanctions and other prohibitions under Augustus, as well as overtures on the part of Augustus to promote good relations,<sup>46</sup> ultimately were ineffective in lessening public distrust and resentment. Later Roman authors assert that *ca.* A.D. 13 a revolt, or *stasis*, occurred and that the leaders were subsequently put to death.<sup>47</sup> The fact that an imperial legate was sent to Athens at about this time, apparently to deal with this crisis, indicates that this revolt was not taken lightly by Rome.<sup>48</sup> An echo of this revolt may be found in a speech of Piso in A.D. 18, in which he accuses the Athenians of

<sup>43</sup> It has been suggested that Marcus Agrippa may have acted as the catalyst for the reconciliation; see G. Bowersock, "Augustus and the East: The Problem of the Succession," in *Caesar Augustus. Seven Aspects*, F. Millar and E. Segal, ed., Oxford 1984, p. 173.

<sup>44</sup> Hoff (footnote 25 above), *passim*.

<sup>45</sup> Cassius Dio, LIV.28.3. This last visit of Augustus has consistently failed to attract the notice of scholars. Graindor, *Auguste*, pp. 13–36, lists three visits to Athens by Augustus: in 31, 21, and 19 B.C.; Geagan ("Roman Athens," p. 379) lists the same visits, including the probable sequence of events concerning Augustus' winter in Athens and Aigina in 21; also, see *idem*, "Imperial Visits" (footnote 29 above), pp. 69 and 73 and *idem*, "The Third Hoplite Generalship of Antiparos of Phylea," *AJP* 100, 1979 (pp. 59–68), p. 66. It is also possible that Augustus visited Athens in 29 when he traveled through Greece on his return journey from Pergamon; see Cassius Dio, LI.21.1. Thus the sequence of Augustus' visits should be 31, 29 (?), 21, 19, and 12 B.C.

<sup>46</sup> I.e., the construction of the new Market, patronage of Athenian festivals, reworking of the old Agora, reinvigorating old Attic cults, etc. For a useful summary of Augustus' patronage of Athens see Geagan, "Roman Athens," pp. 378–383. On the constructions and reworkings in the Agora, see H. A. Thompson and R. E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora*, XIV, *The Agora of Athens*, Princeton 1972, pp. 160–168, and more recently Camp (footnote 11 above), pp. 181–187.

<sup>47</sup> Eusebius, *Chron.* cxcvii.4; Orosius, VI.22.2; Paulus Diaconus, *Hist. Misc.* vii.861c (Migne). All are probably dependent upon Julius Africanus, who wrote in the early 3rd century after Christ. Graindor (*Auguste*, pp. 41–45) discusses this incident at length although he describes the affair as a minor domestic matter. Also, see *The Roman Empire: Augustus to Hadrian*, R. K. Sherck, ed., Cambridge 1988, pp. 39–40, no. 24. For problems concerning the date of the revolt, see R. Syme, "Problems about Janus," *AJP* 100, 1979 (pp. 188–212), pp. 199–204.

<sup>48</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup>, 3233; B. D. Meritt, "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 17, 1948 (pp. 1–53), pp. 41–42, no. 30; V. Ehrenberg and A. H. M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*, 2nd ed., Oxford 1976, no. 81a; also, see V. Ehrenberg, "Legatus Augusti et Tiberi," in *Studies Presented to David M. Robinson II*, G. E. Mylonas, ed., St. Louis 1953, pp. 943–944 and Bowersock, *Augustus* (footnote 4 above), pp. 107–108.

constantly acting as troublemakers.<sup>49</sup> From this point on the sources are silent concerning anti-Roman sentiment. The reason may simply be that the Athenians had finally accepted that Roman rule was a permanent fact of life.

MICHAEL C. HOFF

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN  
Department of Art and Art History  
Nelle Cochrane Woods Hall  
Lincoln, NE 68588

<sup>49</sup> Tacitus, *Ann.* II.55.