

EDITORS' PREFACE

Ruling the Greek World is a result of two research projects developed during the past few years¹. The aim of the first of these (*Greeks in the Empire: the creation of a political category*) was to analyse the procedures, ideas and realities which allowed the people from the Greek East to become a part of the Roman Empire while both preserving and redeveloping their cultural identity. Research into Hadrian's work in this field stood out as the obvious sequel to the first project becoming the central theme of the second project: *Hadrian, images of an Empire*. The emperor's love of the Greek culture, or philhellenism, turned the balance which had up until then reigned between the western and Greek speaking provinces into array, with the latter gaining a newfound importance within the Roman Empire as a whole.

The first stage of this book came to a close with a scientific meeting, *Ruling through Greek eyes*, held in Seville in 2008. The title was meant to express our first hypothesis – that the Roman government accepted and endorsed a vision of their own power and empire which at least partially was born from Greek thought and political praxis. Although we continue to believe that this is a valid perspective, the works presented in the meeting, along with some new contributions included in this book, convinced us that research on Greek integration into the Roman Empire could only spring from an understanding of its diversity, both regional and political. It should also take into consideration the peculiarities that singled out the Greek culture within the Roman Empire. Culture, politics and religion thus stood out as obvious categories for understanding how Rome governed those vast eastern areas which they considered bound by Greek language and culture. It also became clear that focussing solely on the Greek cities of the provinces of Achaea and Asia was not enough. The reality of the Greek world had reached the Euphrates and other areas that had been deeply hellenised for centuries. Different socio-political structures from that of the cities were in force in these areas, especially in the temple states which were common in the Near East.

The ways in which the cities that were considered “Greek” were integrated in the Roman Empire were not inherently obvious. The maintenance of the Greek as the language of government, the recognition of the political status of the Greek *poleis*, the respect the Romans showed for Greek gods, and the acceptance of their values and educational systems were not a natural consequence of the prestige and vigour of Greek culture. Nor were they exclusively born out of the respect the Romans, perhaps suffering from an inferiority complex, showed for these values. Undoubtedly, the intrinsic sturdiness of Greek culture, religion and politics was key to this development. However the willingness of the Roman government and of Ro-

1 Both projects have been funded by the Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad del Gobierno de España (HAR2008–02760, HAR2011–2638).

man society as a whole – except for a number of dissenting voices – was also crucial in this process.

Throughout the centuries, while the internal conditions of both the Roman Empire and its Greek citizens evolved, various political and institutional ways of securing the integration of the Greek East into the Roman Empire were put into place. “Ruling the Greek world” was indeed a dynamic and complex process which left neither the oligarchs nor the intellectuals from the Greek East indifferent as mere receivers of a process born and designed in Rome.

In just half a century, the Greek cities went from a proclamation of freedom, which entailed the recognition of their political and cultural condition, to the razing of Corinth, completely destroying the city where that very freedom had been proclaimed. A century later, Corinth was reborn as a Roman colony whose institutions were no longer those of a Greek *polis* but a replica of Roman ones. Corinthians spoke Latin and their fields were redivided into plots according to Roman agrimensores. These three milestones – freedom, annihilation and Romanisation – should not only be understood as testimonials to the different stages in the evolution of Roman imperialism – which they obviously were –, but also as clear evidence that the Romans had many options to play with as regards their Greek subjects. Once Octavius had undeniably taken over, these milestones were not just memories of a more or less distant past. With Nero granting freedom and Vespasian abolishing it, to take just two examples, everything pointed to the fact that all options were still open to Rome.

Granting the Greeks a privileged position within the Roman Empire as a tribute to their civilization was as possible an option as that of “barbarization”, i.e. the substitution of Greek cultural identity by the Roman one. However, between the respect and conservation of political and cultural structures, and their total annihilation and substitution by new realities of undeniable Roman stamp, there existed a wide spectrum of political possibilities with strong cultural and religious undertones. In creating those new options, which Rome either opted for, refused or changed, the political and cultural activity of the Greeks themselves, and in particular the oligarchs who ruled the cities in the Mediterranean East, played an important role. This book attempts to analyse those new possibilities.

Cristina Rosillo-López's initial chapter “Greek self-presentation to the Roman Republican power” looks at what could be defined as the prehistory of Graeco-Roman political integration. After the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C., when the Greek political system was in the throes of disintegration, new ways of keeping a privileged relationship with Roman rule were explored. Ancestors' merits turned into the main arguments to be weighed up in Rome. Although they were not decisive during the Republic, they did contribute to pinpointing the arguments that would finally be successful during the Roman Empire.

The importance of religion in how the Greeks presented themselves to the Romans is also brought into play by Elena Muñoz. Her work highlights the importance of the religious factor in how the Greeks defined their identity, which needed to be preserved and adapted for their integration into the Roman Empire. It was the civic oligarchies who demanded and encouraged keeping up the old religious traditions

of their cities in harmony with the emperors, Augustus and Hadrian in particular. In this light, Muñiz recovers significant passages from leading authors of the imperial Roman period such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Plutarch and Dio of Prusa. They all show how the Greek elite was convinced that traditional religion should be given a fundamental value, both as a tool for civic cohesion, and as a means for achieving special recognition from Rome. After all, as an inscription in Stratonicea puts it, the Greek gods “have acted in favour of the eternal dominance of the Romans, our Lords”.

The chapter “Hellas, Roman Province” starts off by reflecting on the previous arguments. It might also have been called “The battle for a name”, that of Hellas. Not one Roman province was ever called after that region which was identified with an entire civilization. Juan Manuel Cortés suggests that this incongruity lay in the fact that from the beginning Roman governmental structures – the provinces arising from military needs – had no necessity to recognise or adapt to previous realities. The only exceptions were firstly Asia and then Egypt, in so far as they were inherited kingdoms. From Augustus on, the Greeks from European Hellas set out to identify the province with those territories that aspired to being solely Greek. Under Caligula a confederation of Hellenic leagues was attempted with a view to Rome officially recognising them as the Hellenes. Even though the project was not entirely successful, in the 3rd century Cassius Dio had no trouble admitting that the name of that province was indeed Hellas.

Despite Greek efforts, Rome did not find a well-balanced Greek world. The kingdoms, the leagues and the cities were their way of organising their world. Although Rome gave priority to cities and made it a personal responsibility to create *poleis*, neither the kingdoms nor the leagues disappeared. Kingdoms survived on the limits of direct Roman control whereas leagues, after a period of proscription, resurfaced stronger than ever with the reign of Augustus as agents of the Imperial cult. However, Greek civilization did not stop at these political structures. Arminda Lozano's study is dedicated to the relationship between Rome and the temple states. Led by a strong sense of pragmatism, Rome was willing to accept or, more to the point, tolerate the traditions and customs of “the others” wherever it was to confront situations which were foreign to their own cultural and especially their religious world. Of course, this was all possible as long as their strategic and military interests were kept safe, as this was essential for controlling the territory. Nevertheless, as heirs to some extent of the Hellenistic kings' policies, it cannot be denied that the Roman government did make an effort to extend the urban model in those areas of Asia Minor. The development of secular structures of power and the consequent birth of new oligarchies conflicted with the old-established religious entities, which gave rise to different reactions depending on the area. On the other hand, the secularisation of the great powers of the Asian temples, or at least the suppression of their independence and political power, was a constant throughout the High Roman Empire.

Rome as the heir to the Hellenistic kingdoms is also the subject of Ted Kaizer's work dedicated to Dura-Europos. This old Macedonian colony became a privileged witness to the process of the Greek political structures, which had stood on the

boundaries of the Roman Empire, becoming part of the Empire. Despite Rome's desire to take on the Greek cultural legacy as their own and identify it with the very essence of its domination, it is clear that not all the cities founded by Alexander the Great's successors chose to be part of Roman dominance nor did they want to. This was brought to light by the plundering of the city during the retreat of the Roman troops, following Trajan's unsuccessful Parthian campaign in the year 117. On the other hand, the final and definitive incorporation of Dura into the Roman Empire was held up as a sign of flexibility on the part of the Empire to deal with a situation in which Hellenism did nothing more than touch the surface of a cultural and multi-ethnic reality.

Having focussed on the different Hellenistic political models and on Rome's attitude to each of the models, from the Greek territories of the Aegean to the border with the Euphrates river, the following two chapters put the spotlight on Hellas itself, albeit from a different perspective: the ways in which imperial power made itself present in Greece and Greece's reaction to Roman presence. In the first one, Elena Calandra analyses the evidences of the emperor's presence in Athens. One of the most noteworthy examples is obviously that of Hadrian whose images are specially copious in the city. Without doubt his interest in being present in the city, both physically and iconographically, is the result of the emperor's willingness to attribute a privileged position to the Greek world within the Empire. Fernando Lozano and Rocio Gordillo take a different look at the presence of the emperor in Greece by analysing the imperial cult. If when generalising about emperor worship the Greek East is to be considered culturally prone to looking on their emperors as gods and worshipping them in their lifetime as opposed to a rather restrained west, then the historiographical tradition of denying this type of worship in Delphi and the Amphictyony would seem rather strange. Lozano and Gordillo take a closer look at a series of inscriptions linked to the Delphic Amphictyony with a view to convincingly showing that in both the first and second centuries the league organised imperial cult. New priests were assigned to these rituals, strengthening the connection between the ancient Greek institution and the new Roman power.

The book closes with three chapters given over to analysing some of Greece's understanding of Roman rule and how it influenced the Roman rulers. Greg Woolf's study looks into where the Greek world stood with Rome in terms of Rome's civilization of the West during the reigns of Caesar and Augustus. Woolf is concerned with analysing the interest in ethnographic description which had at this stage become the means by which a general idea of the new conditions of world order arising from the Roman conquest of both east and west could be understood. Greek intellect played a major part in this cultural operation, which Woolf sees as being emblematically portrayed in the historiographical personality of Diodorus of Sicily. In his *Bibliotheca Historica*, not only are relevant theoretical formulations to be found but so too are some of their practical applications. In this light, his work became a historical milestone in Greece's demand to be part of the intellectual ruling within the Roman Empire. This ruling would prove to be fundamental in how Rome governed the different towns throughout the Empire.

Maurice Sartre continues to make a comparative analysis of the opinions of other Greek authors from the first century about Roman rule in Asia Minor and how it behaved towards inherited Hellenistic realities. With A. Lozano and T. Kaizer we were shown two specific examples, the temples of Caria and Dura-Europos. It is now time to look at the Greeks' point of view and in particular, Strabo and Plutarch's. Strabo takes Rome's eagerness to completely change Greece's administrative divisions of Asia Minor to task. Just as Cortés had studied for the province of Achaea, the creation of *conventus iuridici* in Asia brought about a new institutional framework which paid no heed to the traditional administrative organisation of the Hellenistic kingdoms. Marcus Antonius' greed and his plundering of artistic and non-artistic treasures from the East also came in for harsh criticism. Sartre clearly sees how, in the *Præceptae gerendae reipublicae*, Plutarch of Chaeronea speaks out against the behaviour of the Roman governors who turned into tools of corruption within political life. Plutarch was firmly convinced that Greek aristocrats were no less to blame for behaviour which, outwardly appearing to be of instant benefit in the internal struggles, threatened to destroy the city itself as a place where the Greeks could feel at home within the Roman Empire.

This progressive development of Greek intellectual power in favour of Rome, whether as an instrument to crush its universal power or to preserve and strengthen its political structures, finds its culmination in the work of Francesca Fontanella and her analysis of the image of the Roman Empire in Aelius Aristides. In his speech *To Rome*, the sophist very convincingly eulogises the reasons why the Greek world, or at least its ruling oligarchy, could only see a positive outcome to their permanence and loyal participation in the Roman Empire. The Roman rule under which they found themselves had the consensus and participation of these very civic elites, whose task it was, among other things, to praise the new ruling power among their fellow citizens. Nevertheless, the analysis of other speeches of his, and in particular the *Panathenaicus* and the other civic speeches, prompts us not to forget the limits of Aelius Aristides' admiration for Rome. Fontanella thus manages a perfect balance which means that the sophist is looked on as more than just a eulogist of Roman power.

The colloquium which is at the heart of this book was closed by Paolo Desideri's concluding remarks, which have served as an important inspiration for this brief introduction. Throughout the meeting, both organisers and participants had the pleasure of enjoying a climate of constructive dialogue which we hope is projected in these pages. Our desire is that reading these works will evoke the prevailing feeling during those days, i. e. that "ruling the Greek world" constitutes a subject of research in itself, in which the interaction between the ruling bodies of the Greek world, and the progressive development of the concept of Hellenism by both Greeks and Romans, should be at the core.

This introduction would not be complete without acknowledging once again the infinite patience of the participants and, in particular, their outstanding and active participation. Among the participants was Sabine Panzram, who gave us a marvellous insight into Western rule which served as a basis for comparison for the

conclusions drawn about the Greek East. Rocío Gordillo's collaboration in the organisation and revision of the manuscript was priceless.

GREEK SELF-PRESENTATION TO THE ROMAN REPUBLICAN POWER

Cristina Rosillo-López

At the beginning of the second century BC, when Rome turned her head to the East, Greek communities faced new situations. Empires, such as the Macedonian, fell, and new powers, such as Pergamum, arose, in a period, according to Eckstein, of “exceptionally cruel interstate anarchy”¹. After the unexpected collapse of one of the pillars of the former tripolar system, the Ptolemaic Empire, multipolar anarchy ensued². Rome appeared as a new player, whose advantages relied on her ability to assimilate outsiders and her excellence in alliance-management³. Greek communities, caught in this context, had to develop new strategies for success and survival, such as self-presentation before the conquering powers.

This text discusses the creation of Greek self-presentation before the Republican power during the second and first centuries BC. It is not an evolution easy to trace. The second century began with Rome as one of many powerful regions of the Mediterranean; a hundred years later, Greek communities slowly fell into the arms of Rome. However, in theory, they still retained their independence and self-government. Even though the date in which Greek cities entered into Roman dominion is a thorny question, during the second and first century BC, they were *de facto* under Roman rule, even if *de iure* they were independent⁴.

This work aims to trace the development of Greek self-presentation by analysing some issues: Hellenistic kings before the Senate, persuasive rhetoric of Greek communities, and, as a test of whether it worked, trace the existence of special legislation in favour of Greeks. The main hypothesis is that the presentation of Greeks before the Roman power changed in the second part of the second century BC, when Greek communities lost their political power, that is, their chance to bar-

- 1 A. M. Eckstein, *Mediterranean anarchy, interstate War and the rise of Rome* (Berkeley 2006), 3. This article is part of the project “Opinión pública y comunicación política en la República Romana (siglos II-I a de C.)” (2013-43496-P), financed by the Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, Spain.
- 2 Eckstein 2006, op. cit. (n. 1), 4. The former tripolar system of the third century BC was based on the Ptolemaic Empire, the Seleucid Empire and Antigonid Macedon (A. M. Eckstein, *Rome enters the Greek East. From anarchy to hierarchy in the Hellenistic Mediterranean, 230–170 BC* (Oxford 2008), 19–20).
- 3 Eckstein 2008, op. cit. (n. 2), 19–20.
- 4 Cf. R. Kallet–Marx, *Hegemony to empire: the development of the Roman Imperium in the East from 148 to 62 BC* (Berkeley 1995), 126 ff.; 190–92. Kallet–Marx (1995) 286–87; 340–41 states that this situation changed during Sulla’s dictatorship and, especially, during Pompey’s campaigns in the East. At that time, Romans recognized openly their *imperium* or *hegemonia* in this region.

gain in equal terms with Rome. At that moment, when Greek communities could no longer compete with Rome in equal terms, allusions to Greek past flourished as a mean to gain symbolic status.

Romans encountered monarchs for the first time at the beginning of the second century in the Hellenistic kingdoms. Did those kings have to face traditional Roman prejudice? The anti-kingship sentiment was felt in the East. Pouring into traditional Hellenistic liberation propaganda, Rome, a Republic, was liberating the cities from these omnipotent rulers⁵. King Antiochos wrote to Prusias that Rome intended to depose all royal dynasties in the Greek world⁶. Scipio Africanus and his brother Lucius felt compelled to deny those charges in a letter⁷. Rome had also refused conventional signs of friendship to some kings, pressing them for answers in a non-diplomatic way: the legate Popilius Laenas humiliated the Seleucid king Antiochos IV Epiphanes in 168 BC, drawing a circle into the sand and refusing to hear anything until the king gave him the answer he was expecting⁸. However, there was the possibility to use the term *rex* in a neutral or positive sense, in contrast with the negative *tyrannus*⁹. Hellenistic kings could count on Roman expectations on that side.

Several kings presenting themselves before the Senate practised different kinds of persuasive rhetoric, according to the image they wanted to deliver¹⁰. We shall see that this oratory relies on gestures, on words, but also on calculated silences. As euergetism¹¹, this rhetoric formed part of a new language between the Senate and the kings. According to Ma, language should be understood as a constituent of power as violence or conquest¹². The rhetorical dealings between kings and the Senate, without intermediaries, were moments where language was a powerful weapon. Kings had beforehand appeared before assemblies. For instance, king Philip V of Macedonia spoke at a meeting of the Achaean League in 200 BC, looking for an alliance against Nabis of Sparta. Speaking before an aristocratic body was not a novelty for them; but their presence was new for the Romans.

In 198–197, Amynder, king of the Athamanes, appeared before the Senate¹³. His reign was surrounded by the Aetolian league and Macedonia, but he was not a

5 A. Erskine, “Hellenistic monarchy and Roman political invective”, *Classical Quarterly* 41 (1991), 116–17.

6 Polybius 21.11.2; B. Forte, *Rome and the Romans as the Greek saw them* (Rome 1972), 41.

7 Polybius 21.11. Cf. E. Rawson, “Roman tradition and the Greek world”, in A. E. Astin and F. W. Walbank (eds.), *Cambridge Ancient History, second edition. Volume VIII. Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 BC* (Cambridge 1989), 440.

8 Livy 29.27.1–13; 3.4.3. cf. C. B. Champion, *Cultural politics in Polybius's Histories* (Berkeley 2004), 53.

9 E. Rawson, “Caesar’s heritage: Hellenistic kings and their Roman equals”, *Journal of Roman Studies* 66 (1975), 151.

10 T. Ball, *Transforming political discourse. Political theory and critical conceptual history* (Oxford 1988), 14 points out the question related to changes in discourse, which he identifies with conceptual changes (*ibid.*, p. 25).

11 J. Ma, *Antiochos III and the cities of Western Asia Minor* (Oxford 1999), 199, 237, *passim*.

12 Ma 1999, *op. cit.* (n. 11), 104.

13 Erskine 1991, *op. cit.* (n. 5), 116.