

DEMOSTHENES OF OENOANDA AND MODELS OF EUERGETISM

By GUY M. ROGERS

I. INTRODUCTION

On 25 July A.D. 124 C. Iulius Demosthenes, the *prytanis* and secretary of the *boule* of the Oenoandians, made a promise to found a penteteric thymelic festival in Oenoanda to be called the Demostheneia.¹ As part of that formal promise, Demosthenes set out terms about how the festival would be financed, how the prize money was to be divided, and how the *agonothete*, or president of the festival, was to be elected. At the same time, in the announcement of 25 July, the arrangement and dates of the competitions to take place at the festival over slightly more than a three-week period in July were spelled out in detail:²

On the Augustus day of Artemeisios [1 July], a competition for trumpeters and heralds, in which the victors will be given a prize of fifty denarii; then, after the meetings of council and the assembly on the 5th, a competition for writers of encomia in prose, in which the victors will be given seventy five denarii; the 6th day to be left clear because of the market which takes place then; the 7th, a competition for poets, in which the victors (40) will be given seventy five denarii; the 8th and 9th, a competition for playing the shawm with a chorus (*chorauloi*), the first prize winner will be given 125 denarii and the second seventy five denarii; the 10th and 11th, a competition for comic poets, the first prize winner will be given 200 and the second 100 denarii; the 12th, a sacrifice for ancestral Apollo; the 13th and 14th, a competition for tragic poets, the first prize winner will be given 250 and the second 125 denarii; the 15th, the second sacrifice for ancestral Apollo; and the 16th and 17th, a competition for citharodes [singers accompanied with the cithara], who shall receive as first prize 300 denarii and as second prize 150 denarii; the 18th, an open competition for all, for which will be given a first prize of 150 denarii, a second prize of 100 denarii, and a third prize of fifty denarii; and twenty five denarii will also be given to the person who provides the scenery; the 19th, 20th and 21st, hired performances among which will be mime artists, acts and displays, for which prizes are not provided; and the other acts (45) which are for the benefit of the city are hired for these days, for which 600 denarii will be paid; the 22nd, gymnastic competitions for citizens, on which 150 denarii will be spent.³

Approximately one year later, on 5 July A.D. 125, as part of a preliminary proposal made by three members of the *boule*, referring to an undertaking made by Demosthenes in a second proclamation at an immediately preceding meeting of the *boule*, further detailed arrangements for the celebration of the festival were made. The founder promised to make ready and dedicate a golden crown carrying relief portraits of Hadrian and ancestral Apollo, which the *agonothete* was to wear at the beginning of the New Year, and at meetings of the *boule* and *ekklesia*, as well as shows. An altar, decorated with silver, which had an inscription of the dedicator, was also promised. Furthermore, the three members of the *boule* established the procedures by which the subsidiary officials of the festival were to be selected, and also specified the privileges of the *agonothete*, especially his exemption from liturgical duties. The tax-free status of all commercial transactions during the festival was ratified, subject to confirmation to be sought from the provincial governor. Arrangements were also made to put

¹ An earlier version of this paper was read to the Ancient History Seminar at the Institute of Classical Studies in London on 3 May 1990. I would like to thank the members of the Seminar and the Editorial Committee of *JRS* for their comments and criticisms of the paper. I alone am responsible for the ideas expressed in this paper, which I would like to dedicate to O.A.R.

In addition to the usual abbreviations, the following will be used:

Gauthier (1985): P. Gauthier, *Les Cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs (IV^e-I^{er} siècle avant J.-C.)* (1985).

IvE: H. Wankel, *Die Inschriften von Ephesos*, vol. 1a (1979).

Jones (1990): C. P. Jones, 'A new Lycian dossier establishing an artistic contest and festival in the reign of Hadrian', *JRA* 3 (1990), 484-8.

Mitchell (1990): S. Mitchell, 'Festivals, games, and civic life in Roman Asia Minor', *JRS* 80 (1990), 183-93.

Rogers (1991): G. Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos: Foundation Myths of a Roman City* (1991).

Wörrle (1988): M. Wörrle, *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien: Studien zu einer agonistischen Stiftung aus Oinoanda* (1988).

Veyne (1976): P. Veyne, *Le Pain et le cirque: sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique* (1976).

Veyne (1990): P. Veyne, *Bread and Circuses*, trans. B. Pearce (1990).

² The order and prizes of the competitions are set out in lines 38 to 46 of the foundation dossier as published by Wörrle (1988), 8.

³ Translation of lines 38-46 by Mitchell (1990), 184-5.

up a stone stele, on which the record of Demosthenes' promises, a letter of Hadrian endorsing the foundation, and the decrees of the *boule* and *ekklesia* concerning the festival were to be inscribed.

It was further ordered that, during the days of the festival, the following would process through the theatre and sacrifice, according to the way the *agonothete* gave written instructions for each communal sacrifice:

The *agonothete* himself, one bull; the civic priest of the emperors and the priestess of the emperors, one bull; the priest of Zeus, one bull; the three panegyriarchs, one bull; the secretary of the council and (70) the five prytaneis, two bulls; the two market supervisors of the city, one bull; the two gymnasiarchs, one bull; the four treasurers (*tamiai*), one bull; the two *paraphylakes* [rural police-officers], one bull; the *ephebarch*, one bull; the *paidonomos*, one bull; the supervisor of public buildings, one bull; of the villages, Thersenos with Armadu, Arissos, Merlakanda, Mega Oros, . . . lai, Kirbu, Euporoi, Oroata, . . . rake, Valo, and Yskapha, with their associated farmsteads (*monagriai*), two bulls; Orpenna Sielia with their associated farmsteads, one bull; Orgarsan . . . ake with Lakistaunda and Kakasboi Killu and their associated farmsteads, . . . bull(s); yrnea with its associated farmsteads, one bull; Elbessos with its associated farmsteads, one bull; Nigrassos with its associated (75) farmsteads, one bull; Vauta Marakanda with their associated farmsteads, one bull; Milgeipotamos Vedasa with their associated farmsteads, one bull; Prinolithos Kolabe . . . with their associated farmsteads, one bull; Kerdebota Palangeimanake with their associated farmsteads, one bull; Minaunda Pan..syera with their associated farmsteads, one bull; Ornessos, Aetu nossia, Korapsa with their associated farmsteads, one bull; . . . a Sapondoanda with their associated farmsteads, one bull; and no one has the authority to exact a tax for these sacrifices.⁴

According to the interpretation of this festival presented by M. Wörrle in his recent publication of the foundation of Demosthenes, the celebration of this penteteric festival, with its artistic competitions and processions of twenty-six officials, probably thirty-five villages, and at least twenty-eight bulls, encapsulated the civic identity of Oenoanda, and shows that the link between Greek tradition and the imperial cult at Oenoanda was taken for granted.

Demosthenes probably intended to give Oenoanda an opportunity for self-representation as a Greek polis with his musical *agon*, which he bestowed upon his 'sweetest fatherland'; the city was supposed to find her identity in reflection upon the Hellenic tradition, and the tradition was displayed in great variety before the eyes of the participants of the festival by means of his programme. But the tradition was not seen as in the past, but rather was brought to life in the community of the celebration. Regardless of their actual ethnic origins, there opened up for the Termessians of Oenoanda with the agonistic exchange an important access to the Greek cultural community of the surrounding cities, which so completely matched Hadrian's inclination that he could only welcome the initiative. 'Discontent with the present' cannot be found as a motive for the former procurator Demosthenes, and the festival appears to have linked Greek tradition and the imperial cult together in a tension-free and matter-of-fact relationship.⁵

In the next few pages I would like to suggest that these conclusions about what the foundation of Demosthenes represents may be somewhat misleading. These conclusions seem to result from Wörrle assuming a specific model of how and why euergetism worked during the imperial period in Asia Minor; but this model is open to question, particularly when applied to

⁴ Translation by Mitchell (1990), 185–6 of lines 68 to 80 of the dossier.

⁵ Wörrle (1988), 257–8: 'Demosthenes dürfte mit dem musischen *Agon*, den er seiner *γλυκυτάτη πατρίδι* schenkte, also die Absicht verfolgt haben, Oinoanda eine Gelegenheit zur Selbstdarstellung als griechische Polis zu geben; sie sollte ihre Identität in der Besinnung auf die hellenische Tradition finden, die den Festteilnehmern durch das Programm in bunter Fülle vor Augen trat, aber eben nicht als Vergangenheit besichtigt, sondern in der Gemeinsamkeit des Feierns vergegenwärtigt wurde. Ungeachtet ihrer tatsächlichen ethnischen Herkunft eröffnete sich den *Τερμησοεῖς* von Oinoanda mit dem agonistischen Austausch ein wichtiger Zugang zur griechischen Kulturgemeinschaft der umgebenden Städte,

was so sehr im Sinne Hadrians war, daß dieser die Initiative nur begrüßen konnte. "Discontent with the present" läßt sich als Motiv des ehemaligen Procurators Demosthenes nicht feststellen, und das Fest scheint griechische Tradition und Kaiserkult in spannungsloser Selbstverständlichkeit miteinander verbunden zu haben.'

The arguments presented in this paper about the specific issue of what the foundation has to tell us about the relationship between Greek tradition and the imperial cult at Oenoanda do not alter my judgement that Wörrle has provided ancient historians with the most thorough, learned, and accurate explication of any single inscription from the Roman empire, and an invaluable bibliographical resource for further research on the cities of Asia Minor during the imperial period.

large foundations which created festivals (such as that of Demosthenes), or added to them (such as that of Vibius Salutaris at Ephesos a generation before).⁶ As we shall see, the specific model of euergetism which Wörrle implicitly follows makes assumptions about how such a festival foundation came into being, how the *euergesiai* or benefits of such a foundation were structured, and how that structure was intended to be interpreted symbolically. All of these assumptions can be challenged on the basis of the concrete evidence of the foundation inscription itself. If we start out from a more 'democratic' model of euergetism, a model in which the *boule* and the *demos* played important roles in the creation of such foundations, we may discover that Wörrle's picture of 'spannungslos' or tension-free Oenoanda needs to be re-framed. When we concentrate first upon the legislative and social steps by which the festival assumed its final form, we may see how, in the celebration of the Demostheneia, the link between Greek tradition and the imperial cult was not taken for granted; indeed, the role of the imperial cult in the festival emerged from a negotiation which took place over the better part of a year. The result of that negotiation was not the establishment of a tension-free link between Greek tradition and the imperial cult at Oenoanda, but rather the incorporation of the imperial cult and the villages surrounding Oenoanda into a procession which displayed the civic hierarchy of the *polis*. Thus it is precisely the relationship between the imperial cult, the villages of Oenoanda, and the civic hierarchy which the inscription exposes as problematic. This problematic relationship was acted out, and, in some sense resolved, at the processions of the festival, in front of the *demos* of the Termessians, as well as other spectators.

What is at stake here is not merely the explication of one large festival foundation, that now shows so uniquely how the resources of a city in Asia Minor and its surrounding villages and farmsteads could be marshalled for the celebration of a general festival. Behind the explication of this text lies the question of how we are to interpret such festivals: what these festivals (which probably increased in number and importance especially during the Severan period in Asia Minor⁷) can tell us about some of the preoccupations and thought-patterns of the inhabitants of the Greek cities of Asia Minor, and also, where such festivals fit into the overall landscape of city life during the Greek cultural renaissance known as the 'Second Sophistic'. If the celebration of such festivals gradually replaced public building as a major indicator of status for cities in Asia Minor during the Greek renaissance,⁸ then the study of how festivals such as the Demostheneia came into being and what those festivals signified becomes critical for understanding how power was articulated in the Greek cities.

At the same time, the foundation of Demosthenes (or Wörrle's interpretation of it) raises, in an acute form, the important question of our description and understanding of gift-giving on a large scale, a social phenomenon of the Greek cities of the late Classical and Hellenistic periods, the Roman Republic, and the Roman empire, which historians such as A. H. M. Jones, P. Veyne, and P. Gauthier, despite their major methodological differences, have nevertheless seen as crucial to our understanding of how Graeco-Roman city life worked.⁹ Thus, precisely because Wörrle has subjected this extraordinary foundation text to such a thorough and admirable exposition that his description of the origins of the foundation and his conclusions about the significance of the foundation may simply be taken for granted, and, at the same time, so much rests upon our understanding of such major foundations, it is perhaps worth considering the foundation of Demosthenes of Oenoanda in the light of a very different conception of euergetism.

II. THE NEGOTIATION OF THE FOUNDATION

From the first to the last page of his book, Wörrle assumes that the founder Demosthenes and the people related to him were essentially responsible for the terms and structure of the festival foundation: in his summation at the end of his book Wörrle asserts that it was Demosthenes who intended to give Oenoanda an opportunity for self-representation as a

⁶ For the text of the Salutaris foundation see *IvE* no. 27.

⁷ See Mitchell (1990), 190.

⁸ Mitchell (1990), 189.

⁹ See the comments of A. H. M. Jones, *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian* (1940), 247ff.; Veyne (1990), 1-3; Gauthier (1985), 1-6.

Greek *polis*, and that 'discontent with the present' could not be found as the motive of the former procurator.¹⁰ Circumstantial and direct evidence within the foundation itself suggests, however, that such an emphasis upon the motives and actions of Demosthenes gives a fundamentally misleading impression about how the foundation was actually formed, and therefore inevitably what the festival symbolized about the Greek past and the imperial cult in Oenoanda. As we shall discover, the *boule* and *demos* of the Termessians at Oenoanda not only must have discussed the terms of the foundation with the founder and his relations. But, from what we can tell about the legal sequence of actually creating the foundation, it was from those discussions (and others presumably with the inhabitants of villages and farmsteads around Oenoanda), which took place over the better part of a year, that those parts of the final festival in which imperial images, imperial officials, and village representatives played any role in the Demostheneia emanated. In other words, it was within the contexts of those wider discussions that roles for the imperial cult and villages with non-Greek names were found in the festival. If this was the case, Wörrle's hypothesis, that it was the former procurator who gave Oenoanda the opportunity to represent itself as a Greek *polis*, and that that representation showed the Greek past and the Roman present to have existed side by side in a tension-free relationship, needs to be re-formulated. The evidence of the foundation demonstrates that it was precisely the roles of imperial officials and the inhabitants of villages around Oenoanda that were negotiated, first from 25 July A.D. 124 to 5 July A.D. 125, and then displayed, during the processions of the festival itself.

Before I reach the overt evidence for the roles the *boule* and *demos* played in the creation of the foundation, let me pick out a few moments in the process of actually creating the festival foundation, and pose a series of questions about that process designed to suggest that the *boule* and *demos* of the Termessians were at least consulted about the essentials of the foundation long before ratification took place. First of all, is it reasonable to assume that Demosthenes simply could have ordered the members of the *boule* to act as judges for his competitions (line 25), or could have decided that an *agonothete* was to be elected from the Council's numbers in the year before the celebration of the festival (lines 30–1), without the prior consent of the *boule*? Surely not. These measures, found in the proclamation of Demosthenes dated to 25 July A.D. 124, can only have been the result of negotiations between Demosthenes and the *boule*, as part of which Demosthenes, who was the secretary of the *boule* (line 7), must have revealed exactly what kinds of theatrical competitions he had in mind for the members of the *boule* to judge. Is it conceivable that the *boule* would have consented to judge competitions, the nature of which was a secret? The *boule*, I would conjecture, must have had some opportunity to give an opinion about the structure of the competitions, which constituted the core of the original proclamation (ἐπανγγέλλομαι πανήγυριν θυμελικήν).¹¹

The same argument holds true for the provisions relating to the *boule* which are enumerated in the preliminary proposal (προβουλε[ύ]σιμον),¹² from a year after the original proclamation. In fact the preliminary proposal itself was not made by Demosthenes at all, but by three members of the Council (Comon, Veranius, and Simonides) after Demosthenes had come forward before the *boule* and made a second proclamation (ἐπιγγείλατο),¹³ at an immediately preceding meeting of the *boule* (line 107). At this meeting Demosthenes declared

¹⁰ Wörrle (1988), 257–8; the model Wörrle and others have used to explain how such benefactions were created might be called the *philotimia* model. In this model, a benefactor, motivated by religious sentiment, regard for fellow citizens, and the desire for posthumous prestige, bequeaths a relatively limited range of objects, usually money or income-bearing land, to a city or some subdivision of it, in exchange for the increased status or posthumous glory which the city could confer. (For another recent example of the use of this model see D. Johnston, 'Munificence and *municipia*: bequests to towns in classical Roman law', *JRS* 75 (1985), 105–25.) This model is essentially utilitarian in its conception of social action, and, for our purposes, the key assumption of this model — encoded in historians' use of the Greek abstract noun *philotimia* to describe a whole variety of social acts — is that it was the benefactor who not only initiated the exchange, but determined the objects of the exchange, and their symbolic value. Scholars who have employed

this model usually have underemphasized or completely ignored the extent to which, as M. Mauss pointed out long ago (originally in 'Essai sur le don. Forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques', *Année* n.s. 1 (1925), 30–186; translated by I. Cunison as *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies* (1967)), in such exchanges the city, or groups of beneficiaries, could impose obligations and values upon benefactors both through demands for certain kinds of services and amenities, as well as the act of receiving them. In few of the cases where this kind of model has been employed to describe euergetism in the Graeco-Roman World (and this is probably still the dominant model), are there references to the *demoi*, or bodies of citizens, playing active roles in these gift-giving exchanges.

¹¹ Line 12 in Wörrle's text.

¹² Line 47 in Wörrle's text.

¹³ Line 51:

his intention to provide the *agonothete* with a ceremonial crown and an altar for the festival. These additions to the first proclamation, as well as what follows after line 56 in the preliminary proposal, all more than imply that the *boule* must have been consulted about the organization of the festival (arrangements for the *agonothete* to take a front seat at meetings of the *boule* (lines 58–9), to choose subsidiary officials for the management of the festival, including three *panegyriarchs* from the *boule* (lines 59–60), for the secretary of the *boule* to process through the theatre and sacrifice during the days of the festival (line 70), and for the *agonothete* to propose the most suitable of councillors as the next *agonothete* (lines 89–90)).

We are told specifically at lines 54–6 that the *boule* passed all of these measures by a decree (ἡ δὲ βουλή . . . ἐψηφίσατο τὰ ὑπογεγραμμένα). Once again, we should ask ourselves whether it is reasonable to assume that Demosthenes could simply have informed the *boule* that various civic officials and villages would be obligated to provide expensive bulls for sacrifice on festival days, or whether the substantial additions to the festival which the preliminary proposal represents, added on to the plan of the festival a year later, must have been subject to the kind of negotiations which Louis Robert argued long ago must have taken place in such cases.¹⁴

To this circumstantial evidence about the role the *boule* played in the legal process of creating the foundation should be added not only circumstantial evidence that the assembly must have been consulted about certain provisions of the foundation, but explicit testimony that the assembly ultimately decided whether any, or all, of the terms of the foundation should be accepted. What we should notice first in this regard is that the letter of the emperor Hadrian endorsing Demosthenes' foundation, dated to 24 August A.D. 124 — and thus necessarily referring to the first proclamation alone — is addressed, not to Demosthenes, but explicitly to the magistrates, the *boule*, and the *demos* of the Termessians.¹⁵ In other words, it was these three groups which were seen from the imperial point of view as legally responsible for accepting the terms of the foundation.

Next, circumstantial evidence suggests that the assembly of the Termessians at Oenoanda was presented with some of the details of the preliminary proposal before the decree which actually ratified the foundation was passed. First, it was stipulated that the *agonothete* should take a front seat at meetings of the *boule* and the assembly and at shows.¹⁶ More importantly, the ambassadors to be sent to the governor Flavius Aper concerning the tax-free status of the festival, and the *agonothete*'s exemption from official duties, were to be chosen in the assembly.¹⁷ Is it possible to believe that these measures were adopted later without any form of discussion within the assembly? Surely the second example at least confirms that it was the assembly of the Termessians at Oenoanda which was ultimately the sovereign body in the *polis*. This conclusion is supported not only by the prescript of Hadrian's letter to which I have already referred, but decisively by what followed the provision relating to the ambassadors to be sent to the governor, namely, the explicit statement that a proposal concerning all of the matters which had been decreed should be put to the assembly, *so that it might be confirmed by it*.¹⁸ A more explicit statement about who had the ultimate legal say about the acceptance of the foundation at Oenoanda could hardly be imagined: it was the assembly which might, or might not, confirm the proposal.

Thus far, I hope I have shown that there is both circumstantial and explicit evidence to suggest that the *boule* and assembly of the Termessians at Oenoanda played active roles in the legal process which ultimately resulted in the festival which was named the Demostheneia. Although I believe that there is even more circumstantial evidence of this nature in the inscription, which indicates that the terms of the foundation were the result of discussion in the city, I would like to shift my argument at this point to consideration of evidence about the organization of the festival. Here again it is possible to raise major doubts about some of Wörle's conclusions, particularly his idea that Demosthenes wrote the festival script on his

¹⁴ L. Robert, *Hellenica* 1 (1940), 50–1.

¹⁵ Lines 3–4, . . . Τερμησέων τοῖς ἀρχου]σιν καὶ τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ χαίρειν.

¹⁶ Lines 58–9, . . . ἐν δὲ ταῖς βουλαῖς καὶ ἐκκλησίαις καὶ | θεωρίας προεδρεύειν.

¹⁷ Line 100, . . . αἰρεθῆναι πρέσβεις πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

¹⁸ Lines 100–1, . . . προσανεχθῆνα[ι] | τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ περὶ πάντων τῶν ἐψηφισμένων, ὅπως καὶ ὅπ' αὐτῆς κυρωθῆ.

own, but also that in the script the imperial cult and Greek tradition existed in a 'spannungslose Selbstverständlichkeit' or tension-free and matter-of-fact relationship.

III. GREEK TRADITION AND THE IMPERIAL CULT IN THE DEMOSTHENEIA

At no point does Wörrle account plausibly for the time gap between the first proclamation of Demosthenes made on 25 July A.D. 124, and the preliminary proposal dated to 5 July A.D. 125, or especially the quite major differences between the festival outlined in the first proclamation, and then the preliminary proposal. For our purposes, ignoring certain technical arrangements having to do with the management and publicizing of the festival,¹⁹ the most important differences relate to the role of the imperial cult, and the villages and farmsteads in the territory of Oenoanda in the festival.

Put quite simply, other than the fact that the festival of the first proclamation was meant to begin on the Augustus day of Artemeisios, and part of the fine for transgressing the provisions of the foundation was to be paid into the treasury of the emperor, provisions which hardly affected the actual performance of the festival, there is no evidence for any role whatsoever for the imperial cult or imperial officials in the original plan of the festival, as it would have been performed by the city.²⁰ In fact, as Wörrle himself demonstrates, the choices made about the timing, the logistics, the prizes, and the competitions at the original Demostheneia were all based upon Hellenistic precedents.²¹ As Jones subsequently pointed out, the prizes in particular reflected 'a hierarchy of taste' also found at Aphrodisias, and Boeotia in the first century B.C.²² In other words, apart from the timing of when the festival began, and the designation of to whom fines should be paid for violating its terms, Demosthenes' original festival *could* have been conceived and carried out decades if not hundreds of years earlier in the same city. What was created legally in July of A.D. 124 was, in form, a Hellenistic festival, at which, on the twelfth and fifteenth days of the competitions, sacrifices for Apollo Patroos, but *not* the Roman emperor, were ordered.²³ To assume that similar sacrifices to or for the emperor were intended, but not thought to be appropriate to set out in the inscription, is scarcely credible.

Nor can a prominent role for the thirty-five villages and farmsteads of Oenoanda be found in the first proclamation: only at the end of the section setting out the sums of the prizes for the competitions is there a clause providing that 300 denarii and anything left over from the prizes should be divided among the citizens who were not among the recipients of free corn, the freedmen, and the *paroikoi* or country-dwellers.²⁴ Whoever the *paroikoi* were, it can hardly be claimed that this provision projected them into the middle of the celebration of the Demostheneia.

A year later, on 5 July A.D. 125, Demosthenes declared his intention to make ready and dedicate to the *polis* a golden crown carrying relief portraits of Hadrian and Apollo,²⁵ to be worn by the *agonothete* at the beginning of the New Year. He also organized a procession of officials, which included the civic priest of the emperors and the civic priestess of the emperors, and representatives of perhaps thirty-five villages, many with non-Greek names.²⁶ These officials and the representatives of the villages and farmsteads were ordered to process through the theatre and to sacrifice.²⁷ These new provisions do not represent simple amplifications or extensions of provisions which can be found in the first proclamation. The incorporation of the emperor, the imperial image, and the villages and farmsteads of Oenoanda into the celebration of the festival resulted in a substantively different festival.

The question is: do we believe that it took one year to make arrangements for the

¹⁹ These technical arrangements, which I do see as an amplification of provisions made in the first proclamation, included detailed provisions for the *agonothete* to choose subordinate officials of the festival (*panegyriarchs*, *sebastophoroi*, *mastigophoroi*, *agelarchs*), the privileges of the *agonothete* (especially his exemption from liturgies), and the tax-free status of the festival, confirmation for which was to be sought from the Roman governor, as well as provision for inscribing and publicizing the documents.

²⁰ It is true that in the original plan of the festival on the fifth day, a competition for writers of *encomia* in prose was

set up (lines 39–40). The inscription, however, does not say that these *encomia* were for the emperor.

²¹ Wörrle (1988), 234–6.

²² Jones (1990), 486.

²³ Lines 42–3.

²⁴ Line 27.

²⁵ Lines 52–3.

²⁶ Non-Greek names of villages and farmsteads of course do not necessarily imply that non-Greeks lived in these villages.

²⁷ Line 68 f.

agonothete to choose the subsidiary officials of the festival, to decide upon the *agonothete*'s exemption from liturgies, and the tax-free status of the festival, or is it more likely that it took a year to discuss and set up the substantive differences in the celebration of the festival which the roles found for the imperial priest and priestess and the villages and farmsteads represent? No doubt the technical arrangements were discussed over that year, but it is difficult to believe that these provisions occupied the majority of the time spent, and, in any case, these provisions made no difference to the actual performance of the festival. The conclusion must be that it was largely the roles of the emperor, the imperial cult, and the surrounding villages in the festival which were negotiated from 25 July A.D. 124 to 5 July A.D. 125. What emerged from the negotiation between the benefactor and the *polis* over the course of that year was precisely what was not simply dictated by Demosthenes from the beginning: namely, the incorporation of the imperial cult and the villages surrounding Oenoanda into that part of the festival (the procession) in which the hierarchy of the *polis* was paraded.

If there was no question about the role of the imperial cult at Oenoanda and no question especially about the role of villages and farmsteads in the festival, why did the golden crown bearing an image of Hadrian and Apollo, and the civic priest and priestess, and the villages only become part of the celebration of the festival in July of A.D. 125, nearly a year after Demosthenes declared his intention to found a theatrical festival? And why did the imperial cult in particular appear only within the context of an exhibition of the contemporary civic hierarchy of the *polis*? By these questions I am not suggesting that the imperial cult at Oenoanda and Greek tradition, or the *demos* of the Termessians and the villages existed in a 'state of tension'; as Simon Price has shown, the imperial cult in Asia Minor was created and sustained precisely as a way of negotiating between local traditions and the facts of imperial power.²⁸ Rather, I am arguing that the roles played by the imperial cult and the villages at the festival were subject to a process of negotiation, as part of which the parties concerned were consulted. Demosthenes may have initiated that process, but he did not completely control the process, nor did he determine its outcome. The result of the negotiation at Oenoanda was a public display of the incorporation of the imperial cult and local villages within the civic hierarchy of the *polis* during the procession; it does not follow, however, that the Oenoandans felt no tension between their past and their present.

Since, however, the imperial cult only really appears as part of the celebration of the festival in the second proclamation, it can only be from the expansion of the festival which resulted in the preliminary proposal that Wörrle gets his idea that the foundation shows that the Greek past and the imperial cult lived together in a tension-free relationship at Oenoanda. Behind this idea seems to lie an assumption, which Paul Veyne argued was the key to understanding the persistence of gift-giving in the classical world,²⁹ that the success of an act of euergetism depended upon its benefits and obligations being equally distributed, both concretely and symbolically. Unfortunately, even within the area of the later additions to the festival (roles found for the imperial cult and the villages), there is no evidence that the benefits or obligations were collective (to use Veyne's word) or undifferentiated. In fact, we are told that, during the days of the festival, twenty-six persons were instructed to process through the theatre and sacrifice together.³⁰ Just as was the case with the structure of the competitions from the first proclamation, Wörrle admits that such lists of *συνθυσίαι* at festivals can be paralleled at Magnesia and elsewhere from the Hellenistic period;³¹ it seems likely that the organization of the joint sacrifice was based upon Hellenistic precedents at Oenoanda as well.

In this list of twenty-one officials of the *polis* of Oenoanda (excluding the *agonothete* and the three *panegyriarchs* elected and chosen specifically to supervise the celebration of the festival), near, but not at the very top, the civic priest of the emperors, and the priestess of the

²⁸ S. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (1984), 1 f.

²⁹ Veyne (1990), 12. According to Veyne, the *euergetes* provided collective benefits to all who both wanted and expected them, without discrimination. The betterment the *euergetes* brought was the same for everyone, whoever it was that was making the sacrifice to provide the benefits

for the cities. The key assumption about the success of the institution is that the *euergesiai*, or collective benefits, were undifferentiated within the cities, and therefore did not give rise to potential divisions among the *demoi*, or citizen assemblies.

³⁰ Line 68 f.

³¹ Wörrle (1988), 100.

emperors, appear.³² Every other individual in the list, up to the fascinating enumeration of villages and farmsteads (*monagriai*), is designated by a local, institutional affiliation. It is as representatives of these civic institutions that the individuals take part in the processions and sacrifices. As far as I have been able to discover, the ten institutions of the other twenty-one officials represented (priest of Zeus, secretary of the *boule*, five *prytaneis*, two *agoranomoi*, two *gymnasiarchs*, four *tamiai*, two *paraphylakes*, one *ephebarchos*, one *paidonomos*, one *epimeletes*), where we have any information about their institutions, were probably Hellenistic, or late Hellenistic in their origins.³³ It is difficult to believe, in any case, that Oenoanda, which seems to have been typical of dozens of other cities of comparable size in Asia Minor,³⁴ functioned as a *polis* from the time that it was made a part of Lycia in 82 B.C. by the Romans, without a *boule*, an *ekklēsia*, at least one *gymnasium*, and an *ephebeia*. On the present state of the evidence, it is only an inference based upon their later existence, but it seems reasonable to suppose that the majority of institutions included in Demosthenes' list of *sunthusiai* existed at Oenoanda before the imperial cult took hold, an event which occurred sometime during the reign of the emperor Augustus.³⁵

If the structure of the joint sacrifice was grounded in Hellenistic precedents, and if at least some of the city officials who took part in the sacrifice represented institutions which originated during the Hellenistic era, in what sense can we say that the participation of *two* imperial officials in the processions and sacrifices, out of a long list of overtly Greek civic officials and village representatives, shows that a tension-free relationship between the Greek past and the imperial cult existed at Oenoanda, particularly when we know only that the imperial cult in the city began during the reign of Augustus. We know virtually nothing about the form its celebrations took during this period, and virtually nothing about the relationship between that cult and the others in the city (outside of the foundation). All of these factors should ideally be set against a dynamic social background in order for such a conclusion about the Ternessians' attitudes to the past or present to have any credibility whatsoever.

I might add that the absence of independent information about an institution as important as the imperial cult at Oenoanda exposes the primary danger of analyzing foundations such as Demosthenes' in purely institutional terms. This seems to me to be the primary problem with P. Gauthier's study of the Greek cities and their benefactors,³⁶ which analyzed the social phenomenon of euergetism almost purely from an institutional point of view. In his study, Gauthier seemed to lose track of the critical interpretative question of what possibly could have motivated benefactors, whether they were citizens or foreigners. Their benefactions were seen as part of a competition for institutionally rewarded titles and privileges, as if the system of public giving — which Gauthier conceptualized revealingly as a kind of civil service — existed outside of complicated sets of social customs and beliefs which gave those titles and privileges any tangible or symbolic value. As others have noticed before me,³⁷ with very little supporting evidence Gauthier asserted in his conclusion that major changes in the institution took place in the transitional period between the fall of the Greek monarchies, and the entry of Rome into the Greek east. Euergetism gradually lost its indigenous character as a kind of civil service, and became a kind of system of government. Thus, Gauthier attempted to give back to

³² Wörrle (1988), 103 sees the position of the civic priest of the emperors and the priestess in the hierarchy of offices as an indication of their importance and high rank in the city, which he believes is confirmed throughout the Demosthenes-dossier (p. 105). The problem with this view is that the civic priest and the priestess simply cannot be found in the original proclamation of 25 July A.D. 124. They only appear in those parts of the dossier dated to 5 July A.D. 125, or after. Nor can I agree with the assertion (p. 104) that there was no meeting of the *boule*, no assembly, no *agon* thinkable at Oenoanda without sacrifice to the emperor. Surely this is precisely what the first proclamation presents us with evidence for: an *agon* with no sacrifices to or for an emperor involving any priest or priestess of any emperor at all.

³³ Unfortunately there are few Hellenistic inscriptions which would help us to date the origins of the civic

institutions of Oenoanda. We do know, however, that the cult of Zeus was well-established in the city at least by the early second century B.C., according to the numismatic evidence, as Wörrle himself points out (p. 107). As for the other offices and institutions included in the list of sacrificers, Wörrle adduces parallels for them in other Lykian cities, often dating to the Hellenistic period, but it must be admitted that our information for these bodies at Oenoanda specifically comes from inscriptions of the second and third centuries A.D. (that is, after the date of the Demosthenes' foundation).

³⁴ See the remarks of J. Coulton, *PCPS* 29 (1983), 17.

³⁵ For the first reference to a temple and priest of Caesar during the Augustan era, see *IGRR* III (1906), no. 482.

³⁶ Gauthier (1985).

³⁷ Especially E. Gruen, *JHS* 107 (1987), 230.

the masses in the Roman empire precisely the chains of their 'dépolitisation' from which Veyne laboured so voluminously to free them.³⁸

In my view, analysis of major foundations in institutional terms (whether those foundations come from the Hellenistic or Roman worlds), which should be the first, not the last step in the process of interpretation, is difficult, or impossible, when we lack the evidence about the exact origins, structures, and functions of even the most basic civic institutions.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

My own hypothesis, then, based upon analogous foundations such as that of Salutaris at Ephesos in A.D. 104, which created a procession of thirty-one gold and silver type-statues and images carried from the temple of Artemis to the theatre and back to the temple on many occasions throughout the year, where we know that, after the original foundation was announced, certain civic groups such as the *chrysochoroi* and the *hieroneikai* actually came forward and petitioned to take part in Salutaris' procession,³⁹ is that during the period from 25 July A.D. 124 to 5 July A.D. 125, Demosthenes' festival was the subject of widespread discussion in Oenoanda and the villages and farmsteads surrounding the city. No doubt this discussion involved elite groups at Oenoanda. But I have also tried to point out both circumstantial and explicit evidence which suggests that the discussion was not limited to the aristocracy of the *polis*. To judge from what was substantively different about the second version of the festival, it was precisely the role of the imperial cult in the festival, how its representatives and images would fit in, and the role of the villages and farmsteads in the area surrounding Oenoanda (and we should remember that this was an area of mixed populations — at Kibyra alone Strabo reminds us that Pisidian, Solymnian, Greek, and Lydian were spoken⁴⁰) which were the main topics of conversation over that year, no doubt because such roles could *not* be based solely on those Hellenistic precedents which seem to have determined the shape of the rest of the festival.

Surely then, the Hellenistic past of the city, that is, its social, political, and theological structures, provided the essential system of reference within which the roles of imperial officials and images, and the villages around Oenoanda at the festival were negotiated, and endowed with any significance they might hold for the *demos* of the Termessians, which ultimately ratified the foundation. And surely it was precisely the creative tension — for want of a better word — between that Hellenistic system of reference, and any other newer elements, such as a Roman emperor who had become a god, but much more immediately villages with non-Greek names clustered around the city, which were incorporated into the system, that would have given the festival its dynamism, and potential success as an occasion on which exactly such issues about the boundaries of identity could be raised, dramatized, and, for that year at least, resolved. Whether it was exactly such ambiguities of identity which drove the Termessians, just as the Ephesians a generation before,⁴¹ to the recreation of that Hellenistic past, that the preliminary structure of the festival symbolized, is perhaps unknowable.

If we are to interpret foundations such as Demosthenes' in the light of models of euergitism — and these models become more useful when we have less information — I would suggest that these models first reflect the substantial internal and parallel evidence that elites did not just impose large foundations such as Demosthenes' or Salutaris' upon passive, apolitical masses from above. Wealthy benefactors may have initiated these exchanges, and no doubt consulted with their own friends, and other elite members in their cities about their benefactions. But their foundations were also subject to discussion, compromise, and ultimately ratification by the various *boulai* and *demoi*. Too often the interpretations of such foundations have ignored the vital contributions of the *boulai* and *demoi* to the creation of these self-representations.

³⁸ For the importance of Veyne's attempt to refute the Marxist idea of the 'dépolitisation' of the masses in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds, see the original review of Veyne (1976) by F. Millar in the *TLS* (24 March 1978), 356.

³⁹ *IvE* no. 27, 419–25.

⁴⁰ *Geography* XIII.4.17.

⁴¹ See Rogers (1991), Ch. 4.

Next, we need a more rigorous concept than collective benefits to account for the success and persistence of this varied social phenomenon — first of all, because no foundation of any type or scale I know of corresponds to this description in practice, or could do so logically. I have tried to show elsewhere, in the case of the much larger Salutaris foundation, that the benefits, particularly its cash distributions, which were timed to coincide with the celebration of the mysteries of Artemis, were anything but collective, anything but equal.⁴² In the case of the Salutaris foundation, I have argued that behind what has usually appeared to be a relatively egalitarian distribution of cash benefits, lay a structure of exchange which both privileged certain groups, particularly the ephebes of the city, over others, and also imposed special social obligations upon them.⁴³ If we abandon the impossible idea of collective benefits at the same time that we give due recognition to the role of the *boulai* and *demoi* in the formation of the benefactions, an analytical breakthrough is possible: it was the *boulai* and *demoi* who stood behind the *differential* benefits of foundations such as Salutaris' and Demosthenes', and it was their highly stratified views of the past and the present, including the emperor and the imperial cult, but also the relationship between *poleis* and villages, that the foundations reflected, and dramatized. When we put together the idea of differential benefits with the growing recognition that festivals (their types, sizes, and frequency) were replacing building as indicators of status both within and between Greek cities, we begin to see festivals as laboratories for exploring how provincials saw their collective roles within the Roman empire.

If we interpret Demosthenes' foundation from this new perspective, which argues essentially that festivals were negotiated, not imposed, then from listening to those negotiations we may overhear some voices which otherwise are silent, and may see that, whatever the foundation has to tell us about the past and present at Oenoanda, it reveals it from the point of view, not only of Demosthenes, but the *demoi* of Oenoanda itself. Whether it is more plausible to suppose that, for the *demoi* of the Termessians the past and the present existed in tension-free harmony, or whether, as elsewhere, the Termessians defined their present in relation to their past, new inscriptional evidence from Oenoanda may help us to decide.

Wolfson College, Oxford

⁴² See Rogers (1991), Chs 2 and 3.

⁴³ Rogers (1991), Ch. 5.