

Nikos GIANNAKOPOULOS*

The Gerousia of Akmonia¹

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to evaluate the information on the institution of the Gerousia provided by three inscriptions from Akmonia, meticulously published by E. Varinlioğlu in REA (108) 2006. The decree for Demades (64 AD) was introduced by the proegoros of the body and this post testifies to the complex nature of the Gerousia's legal and financial affairs. Moreover, the award of the *asymbolos* status to a new member chosen exclusively by Demades (the freedman Karpos), is the first undisputed proof that the Gerousia imposed regular contributions to its own members. Although we cannot be sure whether this decree was passed by the Gerousia itself or by the Council and the Assembly in response to a Gerousia's initiative, the ratification of Demades' choice by vote illustrates a carefully articulated scheme which sought to integrate a prominent individual's supremacy into the exigencies of the collective impersonal principles governing the function of Greek civic bodies and associations. A contemporary decree dated to 68 AD informs us that Demades son of Dionysogenes erected a group of three statues standing on the city gate which represented the Polis, the Demos and the Gerousia. The absence of the Council in this scheme suggests that, when it came to the symbolical representation of Akmonia's political community, civic hierarchy was flexible enough to allow the Gerousia to occupy a more prominent place. The Gerousia's public significance in Akmonia is further highlighted by the body's involvement in the pandemon decree for the Roman officer L. Egnatius Quartus dated to 2nd or the 3rd century AD. The same man had been previously honoured solely by the Council and the People but, when it was decided to award him the highly esteemed titles of *ktistes* and *euergetes*, the participation of the Gerousia was judged indispensable.

Keywords: Akmonia; Gerousia; civic bodies; Demades; L. Egnatius Quartus.

Introduction

During the Imperial Period organized groups of elders called Gerousiai appeared in numerous Greek cities in Asia Minor, as well as in other parts of the Greek world. The prevailing view of late 19th- and early 20th-century scholars was that these groups – which should be distinguished from homonymous institutions with legislative, governmental and policy-making functions such as the Spartan Gerousia – were primarily social organizations bringing together respectable citizens of mature and advanced age within the framework of the gymnasium.² Possessing no real political power, the Gerousia nonetheless enjoyed a considerable prestige in the Greek cities of the Imperial Period.³ On the other hand, a minority of scholars, based mainly on evidence from Ephesus, argued that at least the Ephesian Gerou-

* Dr. Nikos Giannakopoulos, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki; Department for Ancient History; GR – 54124 Thessaloniki (giannakn@hist.auth.gr).

¹ An earlier draft of this paper was read at the II Greek – Turkish Epigraphy Symposium (Adrasan, 23–26 May 2012). I would like to express my gratitude to the organisers for their kind invitation and to the participants (especially A. Chaniotis and P. Nigdelis) for their useful comments. I would also like to thank Dr. P. Thonemann for his valuable suggestions. Of course, any fault or misinterpretation is entirely my responsibility.

² See for example Mommsen, *Geschichte* V 326 fn. 1. The prevailing view on the character of the Gerousia in the first decades of the 20th century is epitomized in Jones, *Greek City* 225–226.

³ See e.g. Ramsay, *Cities* 110–114 and 438–440 (based on evidence from Hierapolis and Apameia).

sia controlled certain aspects of the city's religious life.⁴ A landmark in the relevant bibliography was James Oliver's book *The Sacred Gerusia*, published in 1941.⁵ Oliver distinguished between two types of Gerousia: the first type, which he called the 'Sacred Gerousia', was primarily involved in the financing and the organization of religious ceremonies. Athens, Ephesus and a few other Anatolian cities hosted such Gerousiai. The second type, the 'social Gerousia', had a rather private character. Oliver's thesis was frequently criticized by numerous scholars who insisted on the exclusively private and social character of the Gerousia;⁶ however, it was only in 1988 that the Dutch historian Johannes Van Rossum compiled for the first time a full and systematic study of this institution. Analyzing the relevant prosopographical data, Van Rossum clarified the social background of the Gerousia's members and rightly dismissed Oliver's distinction, pointing out that any Gerousia could under certain circumstances be called *hiera*. In fact, Van Rossum saw the Gerousia as a highly esteemed organization which provided its members with well-defined privileges, but retained a rather passive role in civic life.⁷ In a PhD dissertation completed in 2004 and published in 2008, I have tried to demonstrate that the Gerousia had a considerable public significance; it performed various and diverse functions – ranging from the conferment of honors in collaboration with the Council and the Assembly to the propagation of the Imperial ideology – satisfying in this way vital social and political needs. Recognizing the value of the Gerousia, the Roman emperors showed great zeal in organizing or supporting Gerousiai in various Greek cities.⁸ It is precisely in the light of the Gerousia's public role that I intend to evaluate the information on the Gerousia of Akmonia, provided by three inscriptions meticulously published by Ender Varinlioğlu in 2006 and thus absent from previous scholarship on this topic.⁹

The decree for Demades

i. The only piece of information available until now for the presence of the Gerousia in mid-1st-century AD Akmonia was an honorific inscription erected by the elders for their benefactor Ioulia Severa, who served as high-priestess of the Imperial cult and *agonothetes* of the relevant games.¹⁰ Ioulia Severa is also known to have financed the erection of a building for the local *synagoge*¹¹ and her name appears in several Akmonian coins during Nero's principate.¹² She was obviously a prominent female figure involved in various aspects of the local civic life. In this respect, the fact that the Gerousia also received its share of her benefactions may be considered a telling indication of the importance attributed to this body by the local elite.

Among the new inscriptions on the Akmonian Gerousia published by Varinlioğlu there is an interesting decree dated to 64 AD which will serve as the starting-point for this paper.¹³ The decree gave to a certain

⁴ This was the view of Menadier, *Ephesii* 48–63. A detailed survey of conflicting scholar opinions on the character and the functions of the Gerousia is to be found in Oliver, *Sacred Gerusia* 9–13. See also Van Rossum, *Gerousia* 1–16.

⁵ Oliver, *Sacred Gerusia*.

⁶ See e.g. Jones 1944; Magie, *Roman Rule* 62–63, 653, 855; Macro 1980, 681.

⁷ Van Rossum, *Gerousia*.

⁸ Giannakopoulos, *Θεσμός της Γερουσίας*.

⁹ Varinlioğlu 2006.

¹⁰ MAMA VI 263. Cf. Giannakopoulos, *Θεσμός της Γερουσίας* 143–144 fn. 308.

¹¹ MAMA VI 264 (IJO II 168). The epigraphic evidence regarding the Jewish community in Akmonia is assembled in IJO II 345–379. Cf. Trebilco, *Jewish Communities* 58–84; Rajak, *Jewish Dialogue* 463–478; Thonemann 2010, 172 fn. 29.

¹² RPC I 3170–3177. On Ioulia Severa see now MAMA XI 5 (<http://mama.csad.ox.ac.uk/monuments/MAMA-XI-005.html>: building inscription in Apollonia dedicated by Ioulia Severa and her son Lucius Servenius Cornutus) with further bibliography; cf. PIR² I 701; Levick, *Roman Colonies* 106–107; Trebilco, *Jewish Communities* 58–60 and 83; Rajak, *Jewish Dialogue* 463–466 and 470–474; Thonemann 2010, 165 fn.10 and 178 fn. 65.

¹³ Varinlioğlu 2006, 368–371 no.5; cf. AE 2006, 1427; SEG 56 1489.

Demades permission to introduce an *asymbolos* member to the local Gerousia; Demades chose the freedman Karpos, probably one of his own former slaves,¹⁴ and his decision was subsequently approved by vote:

[.]Σ[- - -]ΚΕΚ//σθαι καὶ νῦν δεδόχθ[αι]
 ἐπιτραπήναι τῷ Δημάδῃ εἰσαγωγὴν ὀνόμα-
 4 τος ἄσυμβόλου, οὗ καὶ εἰσαγαγόντος Κάρ-
 πον ἀπελεύθερον, ἐψηφίσθαι μετέχειν α[ὕ]-
 τὸν τῆς γερουσίας <ἐ>π' ἴση πάντων· *vacat*
vacat λαχόντων δογματογράφων *vacat*
 Μάρκου Ἰουνίου Λούπου, Ἀρτέμων Ἀρτεμ[ο]-
 8 νος, Πάτρων Δημάδου τοῦ Ἀσκληπιάδου·
 ἐκυρώθη πρὸ δεκαπέντε καλανδῶν
 Ὀκτοβρείων Μάρκῳ Λικινίῳ Κράσσω Φρο[ύ]-
 γει, Γαίῳ Λαικανίῳ Βάσσῳ υἱῷ ὑπάτοις,
 12 ἔτους ρμη', μηνὸς Ὑπερβερεταίου ε'
 ἀπίοντος· ἐπενεχθεῖσ[ῶ]ν ψήφων διὰ Στράτωνος δημοσ[ίου]
 Σωσθένους Ἀσκληπιάδου προήγορος τῆς γερουσίας καὶ [γυ]-
 μνασίαρχος εἰσήγγειλα, Ἀρτεμίδωρος Ἀρτεμιδώρου προ-
 16 ἡγορος εἰσήγγειλα, Μάρκος Ἰούνιος Μάρκου Σαβατεῖνα Λοῦ-
 πος δογματογραφεὺς, Ἀρτέμων Ἀρτέμονος Πάτρων
 δογματογραφεὺς. *vacat*

ii. The first important piece of information obtained from this decree relates to the internal organization of the Akmonian Gerousia. The decree for Demades was introduced by two persons, Sosthenes son of Asklepiades, defined as *proegoros* and *gymnasiarchos* of the Gerousia, and Artemidoros son of Artemidoros, defined simply as *proegoros*. Although Artemidoros' position is not completely clear, there can be no doubt that Sosthenes acted in his capacity as an official of the Gerousia. It is well known that numerous Gerousiai all over Asia Minor possessed *gymnasiarchoi* as their head magistrates; the Akmonian Gerousia may now be safely added to the list.¹⁵ As elsewhere in the Greek world, the gymnasium was at the epicentre of the Akmonian elders' collective activities. But what deserves more attention is the presence of the office of *proegoros* in the internal organization of the Akmonian Gerousia. *Proegoroi* are generally viewed as legal representatives of a party before other parties or in various judicial processes, usually related to financial disputes.¹⁶ They are mainly attested as civic officials, but *proegoroi* of provincial *koina* are also known.¹⁷ However, as far as civic bodies and religious, professional or age associations are concerned, there have been until now only three relevant testimonies: an honorific inscription from Ankyra for the *phylarchos* Silvanos, also styled as father and *proegoros* of the first *Marouragene* civic tribe, the decree of the Dionysiac and Hadrianic artists honouring Gaios Ioulios Longianos of Aphrodisias as *proegoros* for life, and an honorific inscription erected by the Gerousia of Prusa ad

¹⁴ As Pleket observed in SEG 56 1489.

¹⁵ On the *gymnasiarchoi* of the Gerousia see Van Rossum, Gerousia 190–192; Giannakopoulos, Θεσμός της Γερουσίας 57–73.

¹⁶ On *proegoroi* see the important contribution by Robert, Hellenica IX 8–14. Cf. also Schaefer 1957.

¹⁷ See IPerge 294 and 321 (*proegoroi* of the Pamphylian *ethnos*) and IPrusias ad Hypium 47 (*proegoros* of the Bithynian *ethnos*).

Olympum for its own *prostates* and *proegoros*.¹⁸ The Akmonian Gerosia may be considered the fourth civic subdivision or association known to have possessed its own *proegoros*. The latter's key role in a decree allowing the enlistment of a new *asymbolos* member may be easily explained by the legal issues which such a decision presumably raised.¹⁹ More importantly, the very fact of the existence of such a post in the apparatus of the local Gerosia demonstrates that the nature of its legal and financial affairs, contacts and relations with other parties was significant and complex enough to require specialized officials. It is exactly within this framework that we should place an unfortunately undated inscription honouring the *logistes* of the Council and the Gerosia of Akmonia Symmachos son of Symmachos, styled as *rhetor* and *protos* in the city.²⁰ This inscription not only demonstrates the Gerosia's difficulties in managing its own resources but also indicates that the elders' financial and legal (see Symmachos' rhetoric excellence noted in the inscription) affairs were considered important enough to deserve attention of the kind paid to the Council. This is absolutely consistent with the information we have on other Anatolian Gerosiai which frequently seem to have been engaged in various economic activities, occasionally resulting in legal problems and disputes. It will perhaps suffice to highlight only one example: the *proegoros* of the Akmonian Gerosia may be compared with the *ekdikos* of the Ephesian Gerosia, which was heavily involved in lending activities (possibly investing in this way money bequeathed to the body) and at various times also benefited from the services of a *logistes*.²¹ Thus, the presence of the post of *proegoros*, if combined with the two other known posts, those of the *gymnasiarchos* and the *logistes*, testifies to the multiple and diverse aspects of the Gerosia's function and role in 1st-century AD Akmonia.

iii. Another important issue raised by the decree for Demades and related to the Gerosia's internal organization and resources concerns the exact meaning of the term *asymbolos*. Varinlioğlu, in editing this inscription, remarked that Karpos would have participated in the Gerosia without bearing any financial burden and in a footnote further interpreted these financial obligations as entrance-fees.²² Pleket in *SEG* also equated the exemption from contributions denoted by the word *asymbolos* with dispensation not to pay entrance fees,²³ but Puech in *L'Année Epigraphique* simply wrote of exemption from contributions.²⁴ A brief review of epigraphic parallels may help to clarify this point. The word *asymbolos* is rather rarely attested in inscriptions; it appears only in texts dealing with religious associations and festivities. Thus, two inscriptions regarding the *Itonia* of Amorgos refer to benefactors inviting both citizens and foreigners to participate in this festival *asymboloi*, that is without having to pay the personal contribution normally required.²⁵ In fact, one of the privileges given to one of these benefactors, Kleophantos, was that he and his relatives would be exempt from any future *symbole* for the *Itonia*. It is in a similar sense that we should interpret the establishment of an *asymbolos* annual festival by the association of the Dionysiac artists in Cyprus: the fact that the festival was financed by the treasury of the association was a noteworthy exception from the usual method, which obviously involved indi-

¹⁸ On the inscription for Silvanos see IAnkyra 124 with bibliography. On the decree of the Dionysiac and Hadrarian artists see I Aphrodisias 12.27. Cf. Roueché, Performers 223–227 no. 88. On the honorific inscription of the Gerosia of Prusa ad Olympum see IPrusa ad Olympum 20.

¹⁹ Cf. Varinlioğlu 2006, 371.

²⁰ IGR IV 652.

²¹ On the *ekdikos* of the Ephesian Gerosia see IEphesos 26 and 892. On the legal problems that arose from the Ephesian Gerosia's lending activities see IEphesos 1486 and IEphesos 25 ll. 28–44. On the *logistes* of the Ephesian Gerosia see IEphesos 25 and IEphesos 618. Cf. Giannakopoulos, Θεσιμός της Γερονσίας 83–84, 87–88 and 103–114. On *ekdikoi* cf. also Dmitriev, City Government 213–216.

²² Varinlioğlu 2006, 370 fn. 38.

²³ SEG 56 1489 app. crit. ll. 2–5.

²⁴ AE 2006, 1427 p. 568.

²⁵ IG XII 7, 22 and 241; cf. IG XII Suppl. 330. See also Gauthier 1980, 206–207.

vidual contributions paid by the members.²⁶ Furthermore, it should be noted that *asymbolos* could also be an honour awarded by religious associations to their benefactors. In 153/2 B.C. the association of the Tyrian merchants at Delos awarded to Patron son of Dorotheos the right to attend all the assemblies of the body *asymbolos* and *aleitourgitos*. The term *asymbolos* here surely cannot be associated with the concept of entrance fees. Since the honorand was already a member of the *synodos*, the privilege had to do with exemption from the obligation to make regular payments entitling a member to attend the body's assemblies each time these were convened.²⁷ The *koinon* of the *eranistai* of Adonis at Rhodes is also attested to have honoured three benefactors as *asymboloi*.²⁸ One of them was the *archeranistes* Damatrios son of Damatrios, thus already a member of the *koinon*.²⁹ Clearly in this case too the term *asymbolos* denoted exemption not from entrance fees but from financial obligations imposed on the existing members of the *koinon*.³⁰

The practice of paying an entrance-fee for entering various voluntary associations is quite well documented.³¹ In the Imperial Period the Council in various Greek cities also followed the same policy, perhaps only with respect to supernumerary councillors.³² However, the word *symbole* and its derivatives are never used in such a context.³³ Thus, it is far more reasonable to accept that Demades' favourite earned the right of participating in the Gerousia of Akmonia without paying not an entrance-fee but the contributions normally required by all the members on various occasions. These contributions could be similar in purpose to the ones attested in the aforementioned inscriptions from Amorgos and Cyprus: sums of money charged to every member or participant specifically for the organization of

²⁶ Le Guen, Associations I 308–310 no. 66.

²⁷ IDelos 1519. Cf. Poland, Geschichte 437 and 494.

²⁸ IRhod. Peraia 12 (edited by W. Blümel, who associates it with the Delian inscription for Patron) is an honorary inscription for Telestas who was also awarded with *ateleia* and a crown. It was first published by Durrbach and Radet (1886, 259–261 no. 6), who had noted the parallel offered by the honours voted to Kleophantos in Amorgos and had remarked that the term *asymbolos* denoted exemption not from regular contributions but from the sums of money required by the *koinon* for the organization of common festivities; see also Bresson, Recueil 174–175 no. 202. Another honorary inscription erected by the *Adoniastai* of Rhodes records the award of the same honours to two more benefactors, Sosikles and Damatrios (Pugliese Carratelli 1939/40, 147 no. 1).

²⁹ Pugliese Carratelli 1939/40, 147 no. 1 ll. 8–12. On *archeranistai* cf. Arnaoutoglou 1994.

³⁰ On the meaning of the term *asymbolos* see Pugliese Carratelli 1939/40, 194–195, who follows Poland, Geschichte 437 and 494. In the 2nd century BC an association of *therapeutai* at Thasos honoured a former priest as ἀλειτούργητον καὶ ἀνεϊσφορον πάσης εισφορᾶς (IAeg. Thrace 183 ll. 12–14). The term *eisphora* here also corresponds to repeatedly demanded contributions not to a one – off payment.

³¹ The following examples are indicative: IG II² 1339 ll. 15–17 (decree of *Heroistai*); SEG 31 122 ll. 38–40 (decree of *Herakliastai* of Paiania; cf. Arnaoutoglou, Thusias 99; Lupu, NGSL 187–188; Kloppenborg – Ascough, Greco-Roman Associations 235–240 no.5: the payments were made in kind); IG II² 1298 ll. 16–19 (decree of *thiasotai* of Artemis; cf. Arnaoutoglou, Thusias 98–99; Kloppenborg – Ascough, Greco-Roman Associations 113–114); IG II² 1368 ll. 37–39, 55, 61 (law of *Iobakchoi*; cf. Kloppenborg – Ascough, Greco-Roman Associations 241–257 no. 51 with further bibliography); IPergamon II 374 D ll. 13–22 (regulation of the *hymnodoi* of Augustus and Rome); Oliver, Sacred Gerousia 143 no. 33 (decree of a non-civic Sacred Gerousia of the *Soter* Asklepios in Hyettos; cf. Van Rossum, Gerousia 66–68). On the same practice in Roman *collegia* see Ross, Assembly 106.

³² For Ephesus see Oliver, Greek Constitutions, no. 82 (letter of Hadrian to the Ephesians regarding the sea captain Erastos). On entrance fees for entering the Council of Bithynian cities see Pliny, *Ep.*, X, 12; Dio Chrysostom XLVIII, 11. Cf. Sartre, Orient 140–141 and Dmitriev, City Government 133 and 154–157, with further evidence.

³³ See, for example, the decree of the *orgeones* of Athens IG II² 1361 ll. 17–21, where the verb συμβάλλω is used to denote contributions by existing members whereas the verb εισφέρω denotes entrance-fees. Cf. Arnaoutoglou, Thusias 98–99 and Kloppenborg – Ascough, Greco-Roman Associations 38–39. The word εισηλύσιον was also frequently used for the same purpose. See IG II² 1368 ll. 37–39 and 61 (law of *Iobakchoi*) and IPergamon II 374 D ll. 13–22 (regulation of the *hymnodoi* of Augustus and Rome). Cf. Poland, Geschichte 493. On the meaning of *symbole* see also Müri 1931 col. 1090.

various collective events. But they could also be regular – annual or monthly – subscriptions owed by every member to the common treasury, as was the case with the contributions attested in the famous law of the *Iobakchoi*, in the decree of *Heroistai* from Athens, in the decree of the *Herakliastai* from Paiania and in several other cases.³⁴ Of course, since associations could impose both entrance-fees on new members and contributions on existing members,³⁵ it is reasonable to assume that, if the Gerousia of Akmonia also did so, Karpos was exempted from both. But the crucial point regarding the internal organization of the Gerousia lies elsewhere: whatever the exact nature of the financial obligations implied in the word *asymbolos* were, the decree for Demades reveals an aspect of the Gerousia's finances hitherto unattested. Several inscriptions from Athens, Ephesus, Kos, Iasus and Magnesia on the Maeander demonstrate that the Gerousia derived income from the exploitation of agricultural land and urban property, from lending out its own money and from allowances received by the city.³⁶ It has often been suggested that entrance fees were also levied but the only supporting evidence invoked until now was an inscription from Pergamum which refers to this practice but does not necessarily concern a Gerousia.³⁷ The decree for Demades emerges now as the first piece of evidence to demonstrate beyond any doubt that the Gerousia could draw on payments made by its own members – either as entrance fees or as contributions – to increase its income.

iv. As the above-mentioned inscriptions from Rhodes and Delos indicate, all those honoured as *asymboloi* were explicitly defined as benefactors of the honouring bodies. However, in the decree for Demades things were rather different. The new *asymbolos* member was not a benefactor awarded this status by means of a collective decision but an *a priori* unspecified person, chosen exclusively by Demades. The latter was obviously an important local figure, possibly a great benefactor, but this does not alter the fact that the *asymbolos* status was not conferred on him but transferred to one of his favourites. Due to the fragmentary state of the inscription we are in no position to know under what circumstances Demades assumed this right. It may well have been a way of honouring him for some unknown services he had provided to the Gerousia. In fact, if Demades was already a member, it would perhaps have been more appealing to him to be allowed to appoint a new member and to increase even more his influence. Another possibility, to which Puech alludes,³⁸ is that it was Demades himself who asked for this permission; if that was the case, we have again to assume a major service on his part to justify the positive answer he received. Last but not least, Varinlioglu thought that Demades was entrusted with the task of finding and enlisting a new *asymbolos* member;³⁹ if this is correct, then it is possible that the Gerousia was in need of new members and that the *asymbolos* status constituted a significant lure.

³⁴ IG II² 1368 ll. 46–47 and 155–160; IG II² 1339 ll. 10–16; SEG 31122 ll. 42–43, with the observations of Arnaoutoglou, *Thusias* 101. Cf. on this topic Foucart, *Associations*, 42–47; Poland, *Geschichte* 493; Migeotte 2013, 126; Boulay 2013, 267. On monthly contributions to Roman *collegia* see Kloppenborg 1996, 20; cf. Ross, *Assembly* 106–107 and Van Nijf, *Civic World* 50.

³⁵ See for example SEG 31 122 (decree of *Herakliastai*); cf. Poland, *Geschichte* 493–494 and Arnaoutoglou, *Thusias* 99–101.

³⁶ Giannakopoulos, *Θεσμός της Γερουσίας* 98–127.

³⁷ Hepding 1907, 293 no. 18 ll. 7–10. Cf. Jones, *Greek City* 226; Van Rossum, *Gerousia* 68–77 and 239–240. The view that the Gerousia drew money from entrance-fees and subscriptions had already been expressed by Ramsay, *Cities* 439. The well-known inscription from Ephesus regarding the financial organization of Asia records payments of 2 denarii to the Gerousiai of Chios and Kos (IEphesos. 13 II l. 8 and 16). These payments have been interpreted by Habicht (1975, 89), followed by Knibbe (1987, 91) and Merola (*Autonomia* 157), as entrance-fees, but one has to admit that the sum was too small. On the other hand, Gschnitzer, *Kleine Schriften* II 432–446, considered these payments to be taxes on legal transactions recorded in the Gerousia's archives. Since the general meaning of this inscription is not clear, it should not be taken as clear proof of entrance fees levied by the Gerousia.

³⁸ See her comments in *AE* 2006, 1427 p. 568.

³⁹ Varinlioglu 2006, 370.

However, all the suggestions mentioned above should be treated as nothing more than working hypotheses.

In any case, any attempt to evaluate Demades' role also has to take into account the fact that admitting new members to any Greek corporate body was a function normally performed collectively, in an officially defined and institutionally organized manner, perhaps after scrutinizing the candidate's credentials. A process of *dokimasia* (preliminary control) of new members is well attested in the regulations for various kinds of associations. A 4th-century BC decree of *orgeones*, a 1st-century BC law of an Athenian *eranos* and the famous law of *Iobakchoi* are three indicative examples.⁴⁰ Hadrian's letter to the Ephesians regarding the sea captain Erastos shows that passing a *dokimasia* was a necessary condition for entering the Ephesian Council too.⁴¹ In the aforementioned inscription from Pergamum, which possibly though not certainly concerned a Gerousia, even the sons of members of at least 5 years' standing were to pay an entrance-fee upon entering the body and to pass a *dokimasia*.⁴² The non-civic Sacred Gerousia of *Soter* Asklepios at Hyettos was a semi-hereditary association which elected its new members primarily from among the sons and relatives of the deceased ones but could also accept outsiders after a *dokimasia*.⁴³ Although there is no relevant information specifically on the Gerousia of Akmonia, comparative material from other Greek cities may be of some help. Obviously, the rules concerning the admission of new members in the Gerousia were initially set by the civic authorities, not the Gerousia itself. To take the best-known example, the Gerousia of Sidyma was founded by a decree of the Council and the Assembly and it was presumably these two bodies which selected its first members, 51 councillors and 50 *demotai*.⁴⁴ In Athens too the process of founding a Gerousia involved negotiations between the civic authorities and the Roman emperors, which also touched upon the subject of admission rules.⁴⁵ After this initial phase, the Gerousia alone may have decided who was going to be a new member, or the city may still have exercised some kind of preliminary or final control over the admission procedures.⁴⁶ The fact that in Pompeiopolis Klaudius Asklepiades was honoured by the city with citizenship and membership of the Gerousia supports the second suggestion, but whether he was a new member of an already functioning institution or an original member of a newly-founded Gerousia remains unknown.⁴⁷ In any case there can be no doubt that admittance to the various Greek Gerousiai of the Imperial Period was subject to well-defined procedures.

⁴⁰ IG II² 1361 ll. 23; IG II² 1369; IG II² 1368 ll. 36–37. Cf. on all this Foucart, *Associations* 10; Poland, *Geschichte* 276 and 499; Arnaoutoglou, *Thusias* 99; Kloppenborg – Ascough, *Greco-Roman Associations* 37; Boulay 2013, 267.

⁴¹ Oliver, *Greek Constitutions* no. 82 ll. 12–13. Cf. Dmitriev, *City Government* 157–158.

⁴² Hepding 1907, 293 no. 18 ll. 7–10. Cf. Poland, *Geschichte* 547; Jones, *Greek City* 226; Van Rossum, *Gerousia* 68–77 and 239–240. The term used to denote the entrance-fee was εισηλύσιον.

⁴³ Oliver, *Sacred Gerousia* 29–31 and 143–146 no. 33. Cf. Van Rossum, *Gerousia* 66–68.

⁴⁴ TAM II/1 175–176. For a detailed analysis of these inscriptions see Van Rossum, *Gerousia* 97–108 and Giannakopoulos, *Θεσμός της Γερουσίας* 30–36.

⁴⁵ See Oliver, *Greek Constitutions* no. 194; cf. Giannakopoulos, *Θεσμός της Γερουσίας* 44–54.

⁴⁶ Cf. Van Rossum, *Gerousia* 239–240.

⁴⁷ Marek, *Stadt* 147–148 no. 38. On the other hand, a decree of the Ephesian Gerousia awarding the title of *patrogeron* as a response to a great service (IEphesos 26 ll. 24–25; the same title is also attested in IEphesos. 972 and 1573), demonstrates that the Gerousia was in complete control of the appointments of new members, since no ratification of this decision was required. On *patrogeron* see Van Rossum, *Gerousia* 71–72 who, following L. Robert, *Documents* 87–89, associates this title with the title *patroboulos*, the latter denoting young sons of councillors who participated in the workings of the Council and assumed relevant duties (cf. also Nigdelis, *Πολίτευμα* 191–192 and Dmitriev, *City Government* 170 with further bibliography). As L. Robert has rightly pointed out, this title ultimately led to complete membership. The *patrogerontes* of the Ephesian Gerousia should also be considered as young sons of elders enjoying certain rights in the Gerousia and obviously obtaining full membership after meeting the proper age requirements. The latter were obviously very important and in a funerary epigram from Philomelion recording the career of

Hence, allowing Demades to introduce a new *asymbolos* member into the Akmonian Gerousia was to a certain extent a double deviation from the rules governing the function of Greek associations and corporate bodies. *Asymbolos* was a rare and high honour conferred upon benefactors, but Karpos was not one.⁴⁸ The admission of new members obeyed specific rules, but Demades chose Karpos alone. However, it is worth pointing out that this great freedom of action was – at least formally – counterbalanced by the second decision recorded in the decree for Demades: a ratification of Demades' choice by vote ultimately entitled Karpos to participate in the Gerousia on a par with the other members. This not only served the purpose of placing some check on Demades but was also an attempt to publicly declare that the traditions of collective decision-making were still respected. A similar – though not identical situation – is envisaged in Hadrian's letter to the Ephesians concerning Erastos' candidacy for the Ephesian Council. The emperor declared his support and promised to pay the entrance-fee but left the examination and the final decision to the Ephesian Council itself.⁴⁹ Viewed in this light, the decree for Demades illustrates a carefully articulated scheme which recognized the influence of a prominent individual but at the same time sought to integrate his supremacy and excellence into the exigencies of the collective impersonal principles governing the function of Greek civic bodies and associations.

v. This brings us to what seems to be the most controversial point in the decree for Demades. Due to the fragmentary state of the stone, the proemium and the motivation clause are not preserved; in the remaining part of the inscription there is no reference to the body which issued the decree. According to Varinlioglu, "the surviving text begins with a résumé of a decision of the Council",⁵⁰ while Pleket suggested with caution that it might have been a decree of the Council and the People.⁵¹ This view might be considered quite plausible, since the decree for Demades presents certain striking similarities with the few surviving decrees of the Akmonian Council and Assembly. Hence the presence of 3 *dogmatographoi* appointed by lot, the dating of the ratification of the decree by reference to the names of the two Roman consuls and the recording of the votes by a public slave are also attested in the decree concerning Praxias' bequest (IGR IV 661) and in the decree for Demades son of Dionysogenes, dated to 68 and 85 AD respectively.⁵² Moreover, the use of the term *εισαγγέλομαι* to denote the bringing of

Moschos, a native of Antiocheia on the Maeander, it is explicitly stated that the deceased had become a member of the Gerousia upon reaching the appropriate age (ISultandağı 29; cf. Merkelbach – Stauber, *Steinepigramme* 3 16/55/04). The exact age limit is unknown and it may have varied from city to city but does not seem to have been necessarily very high. A funerary inscription from Nikaia records a *gerousiastes* who died at the age of 45 (Ilznik 275). The Gerousia-album from Sebaste (Paris 1883, 452–457; cf. Van Rossum, Gerousia 108–115), which contains the names of 71 persons who entered a newly founded Gerousia in 98/9 AD (see on this Ramsay, *Cities* 602), includes a couple and their three or five children (two daughters). This also suggests that the age limit was not very high (cf. Ramsay *Cities*, 602–604). Moreover, this list also proves that women could be admitted to the Gerousia (cf. Trebilco, *Jewish Communities* 123 with further evidence from other Asia Minor cities).

⁴⁸ The fact that Karpos was a freedman does not seem to have posed any significant problem. On the contrary, comparative material from other Greek cities suggests that freedmen were admitted to the Gerousia, of course in small numbers. The Gerousia of Sidyma, for example, included among its initial members at least three freedmen (TAM II/1 176). Cf. Van Rossum, Gerousia 97–108. A funerary inscription from Ephesus, dated to the 2nd or the 3rd century AD, also refers to an Imperial freedman who participated in the local Gerousia (see Keil 1930, 17–18 no. II 1–2; cf. Bailey, Gerousia 239 and 374 no. 75).

⁴⁹ Oliver, *Greek Constitutions* no. 82 ll. 12–13.

⁵⁰ Varinlioglu 2006, 370.

⁵¹ Pleket in SEG 56 1489 app. cr.

⁵² Varinlioglu 2006, 363–368 no. 4 (cf. AE 2006, 1426; SEG 56 1490). On the role of public slaves in the decrees of Akmonia see Weiss, *Sklave* 80 and 227 and Varinlioglu 2006, 368 fn. 33. On the different views regarding the duties of the *dogmatographoi* see Gschnitzer, *Kleine Schriften* II 285–292 and Rhodes, *Decrees* 494 and 557.

the proposal is also found in the decree for Demades son of Dionysogenes, examined in more detail below.⁵³

However, if indeed the decree for Demades was issued by the Council (and the Assembly), the role of the Gerousia's *proegoros* and *gymnasiarchos* indicate that there had also been a prior decision taken by the Gerousia itself. The course of events may be plausibly reconstructed as follows: the Gerousia decided to award to Demades the right to introduce an *asymbolos* member to the body and subsequently approached the Council and the Assembly via its *proegoros*,⁵⁴ who – if Artemidoros, the other *proegoros*, was a civic and not a Gerousia official –⁵⁵ collaborated with the *proegoros* of the city in proposing the decree. Hence, in the meetings of the Council and perhaps the Assembly the Gerousia's *proegoros* performed a function (*eisangeleia*) usually exercised by civic magistrates.⁵⁶ Of course, the possibility cannot be ruled out that the decree for Demades was passed jointly by the Council, the People and the Gerousia, again after an approach or an initiative by the latter. As we will soon see in more detail, such common decrees are attested in a number of Greek cities of the Imperial Period and Akmonia is one of them. The Gerousia's approach to (or collaboration with) the Council and the Assembly might have been dictated both by institutional and/or political concerns. Existing institutional restrictions perhaps limited the Gerousia's competence to alter established rules of admission or to accept new members without the city's consent. Alternatively, or at the same time, the Gerousia might not have felt politically secure enough to implement a decision which might have been considered an unwelcome inordinate increase in Demades' influence and an act of disrespect to established practice without the Council's and the People's approval.⁵⁷

But there is another possibility which should be considered. Like any other corporate body and association, several Gerousiai are known to have issued their own decrees according to the traditional

⁵³ The same term also appears in a fragmentary honorary inscription for a secretary (MAMA VI 267). On *eisangeleia* as a procedure related to the proposal of decrees see Robert, Amyzon 235–236, who assembles the relevant evidence.

⁵⁴ Parallels include the 2nd-century BC decree of Iasos passed as a response to an approach made by the local *presbyteroi* to the Council and the People via their *gymnasiarchos* (Iasos 23). The decree authorized the *presbyteroi* to proceed to take legal action against their overdue debtors. A fragmentary decree from Magnesia on the Maeander, equally dated to the 2nd century B.C., refers to an approach (the term used is *epelthon*) made by the local Gerousia's *gymnasiarchos* to the Council and the Assembly with respect to the ratification of honours already voted by the Gerousia (IMagnesia 102). The honours included the erection of the honorand's image in the *palaistra* and the proclamation of the award of a crown during the Dionysia, thus required the Council's and the Assembly's approval. In similar circumstances the Rhodian demes sent ambassadors to the People of Rhodes to request approval of the honours bestowed by them (golden crown and publication of the decree in a sanctuary). See IG XII/1 890, 1032–1033. Cf. Rhodes, Decrees 273 and 501.

⁵⁵ The editors of SEG 56 1489, referred to Sosthenes as a Gerousia's *proegoros* but made no comment on Artemidoros. On the other hand, Varinlioglu (2006, 371) and Puech (AE 2006, 1427 p. 568) thought that both Sosthenes and Artemidoros were the Gerousia's *proegoroi* who represented the body in the Council. But if the decree for Demades was issued by the Council, it would be possible to consider Artemidoros as the city's *proegoros*.

⁵⁶ Cf. dn.a. 54 and dn.b. 61. A quite similar situation is attested in an honorific decree of *Euthalidai* at Rhodes (IG XII/1 890). An ambassador was elected to ask the Council and the People of Rhodes to ratify the honours awarded by the *Euthalidai* to a certain Sosikrates. Subsequently, this ambassador functioned as a proposer in the decree of the Council and the People (the term used is εἶπε).

⁵⁷ The views of other Akmonians aspiring to membership of the Gerousia perhaps also had to be taken into consideration and one should not forget that in the Greek cities of the Imperial Period the conferment of honours was always linked with competitive politics. Unanimity should not be considered self-evident within a Gerousia and an honorific decree of the elders of Iasos for their *dioketes* Kritios records four negative votes as opposed to seventy positive ones (Iasos 93).

decision-making procedures followed by the Council and the People.⁵⁸ Consequently, nothing in the inscription for Demades can prevent us from considering that this was a decree passed exclusively by the Gerousia which, following the principles set in Akmonia's civic decrees, appointed by lot its own *dogmatographoi* and used the *eisangeleia*-procedure for the submission of the proposal. If that was indeed the case, then we have to assume that it was considered unnecessary to specify that the second *proegoros*, Artemidoros, was also an official of the Gerousia (see dn.a. 55). Moreover, we should also assume that the Gerousia had access to the services of a public slave.

Admittedly, there can be no decisive argument in favour of either of the above-mentioned suggestions.⁵⁹ But it is important to note that both of them carry similar – though not identical – implications regarding the Gerousia's place in civic life. The hypothesis that the Gerousia regulated the whole affair on its own suggests a body which, exercising complete control over its own internal functions, claimed a position in local civic life similar to that enjoyed by the traditional civic bodies. The fact that the Gerousia used the services of a public slave for its own purposes illustrates this claim perfectly. On the other hand, the hypothesis that the Council and perhaps the Assembly played a significant role in the decree for Demades suggests that the internal affairs of an already functioning Gerousia were – at least in the particular situation envisaged in this decree – subject to an external intervention. But one cannot help noticing that this intervention also brought to the surface, admittedly via a different path from the one suggested above, the public significance of the Gerousia: its internal affairs entered the domain of local civic politics, as defined by the decisions of the Council and the Assembly, in which the Gerousia itself participated through the actions of its official(s). Hence, what emerges from the decree for Demades – irrespective of the interpretative problems presented above – is a clear picture of a well-organized body of elders which was deeply rooted in Akmonia's civic

⁵⁸ For example, the decree of the Gerousia of Magnesia ad Maeandrum regarding the financing of oil purchase (I Magnesia 116, dated to 117 – 138 AD) bears a prescript which is identical with the one appearing in a civic decree in honour of a doctor (IMagnesia 113 [Syll.³ 807]), dated to the 1st century AD): the name of the eponymous archon of the city (*stephanephoros*) is followed by the date, the enactment formula and the name(s) of the proposer(s) included in the formula γνώμη + the names and the offices of the persons involved in the genitive. When the Gerousia of Sardeis decided to honour Menogenes, it first issued a decree recognizing the latter's services but postponing the actual award of honours until the proper time (ISardis 8 v). Later the Gerousia issued a second decree bestowing on Menogenes specific honours (ISardis 8 vi). The Council and the People acted in exactly the same way. There was first a decree (solely of the Council) only praising Menogenes (ISardis 8 iii) and then a decree of the Council and the Assembly voting honours (ISardis 8 iv). It is clear that in this case the procedures established by the two traditional civic bodies were closely followed by the Gerousia as well. Cf. Rhodes, Decrees 402.

⁵⁹ One could raise the objection that, as noted above, *proegoroi* are usually associated with representing a party's interests before a third party, so, given Sosthenes' position, the decree for Demades could not have been issued by the Gerousia. However, in the decree of Sardeis for the bequest of Iollas published by L. Robert, the city's *proegoroi* function as formal movers of a motion before the Council and the Assembly (Robert, Hellenica IX 7–11 no. 1). Even if we accept that these *proegoroi* were at the same time *strategoï* (the formula βουλευτῶν καὶ Μηνογένου καὶ Ἀττάλου καὶ Κλεάνδρου στρατηγῶν καὶ προηγόρων γνώμη allows this conclusion but see Rhodes, Decrees 402), this does not alter the fact that they are recorded as acting in both their official capacities. In this respect, one could not exclude the possibility that the Akmonian Gerousia's *proegoroi* functioned as introducers of a decree of the Gerousia itself. On the other hand, another objection might also be raised, this time concerning the possibility that the decree for Demades was issued by the Council. The *eisangeleia* is not normally attested as a procedure denoting the approach of a third party to the Council, so, since Sosthenes exercised *eisangeleia*, he could have done so only within the framework of the Gerousia's internal decision-making procedures and not as a representative of the Gerousia to the Council. However, there are some decrees in which the *eisangeleia* denotes the informing of the Council on a matter by civic officials, as an act different from the actual submission of the motion (see Rhodes, Decrees 345 and 558 commenting on IMylasa 126, IMilet I.3, 146 and IEphesos 8; cf. Jones, Greek City 336 fn. 19). In this sense, if the decree for Demades was issued by the Council after an approach by the Gerousia, Sosthenes' involvement could be legitimately described as an *eisangeleia* and this of course would mean that in the meetings of the Council and the Assembly the Gerousia's official undertook a task which in Akmonia and other cities was normally exercised by the civic magistrates.

life during Nero's principate. Another contemporary inscription published by Varinlioglu confirms and enlarges this picture.

The decree for Demades son of Dionysogenes

This inscription is the already mentioned decree for Demades son of Dionysogenes dated to 68 AD.⁶⁰ The honorand cannot be safely identified with the Demades of the previous decree since the latter's patronymic is not preserved and this name appears not to have been uncommon in Akmonia.⁶¹ Being a priest of Augusta Athena for life, Demades son of Dionysogenes erected several statues in various locations in Akmonia; among them there was a group of three statues standing on the city gate which represented the Polis, the Demos and the Gerousia:

[ἐπ]εὶ Δημάδης Διονυσσογένους, ἱερεὺς
 [τ]ῆς Σεβαστῆς Ἀθηνᾶς διὰ βίου, ἀνὴρ εὖσε-
 [β]έστατος περὶ τοὺς Οὐρανίους καὶ περὶ
 4 τοὺς Σεβαστοὺς θεοὺς κατὰ πᾶν μέρος
 [τ]ῆς πόλεως προσφιλοτειμούμενός τε
 [κ]ατ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν καὶ ἐρείδων ἑαυτῷ
 περὶ τῶν ἀναθημάτων, ἐπὶ τε τοῦ στατα-
 8 [ρ]ίου τὰ νῦν πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀναθήμασιν
 καὶ Ἑρμοῦ κάλλιστον ἀνδρειάντα ἀνέ-
 θηκεν, ἐπὶ τε τῆς πύλης τρεῖς ἄλλους
 [π]ρὸς τοῖς τάχειον καὶ πανθεῖον ἐκόσ-
 12 μησεν τοῦ τε δήμου καὶ τῆς πόλεως κα[ἰ]
 τῆς γερουσίας ἀνδρειάντας σὺν τῷ ἡμ[ι]-
 κυκλίῳ καὶ τὸν Κεραύνιον ἀνδρειάν-
 τα σὺν τῷ ἡμικυκλίῳ καὶ τοῖς περὶ αὐτὸν
 16 κοσμίῳ ἀναθέντα·

This was a noteworthy choice of images which deserves further commentary. The three statues were obviously intended to offer a symbolic expression of the political community of Akmonia as a whole, the Gerousia being one of its constituent parts. This is not entirely without parallels. In fact, images of the Gerousia appear on coins issued by two Greek cities in the vicinity of Akmonia: Hierapolis (under Marcus Aurelius) and Tiberiopolis (under Hadrian)⁶². Another noteworthy parallel is the inscribed base dedicated to Artemis and the Ephesian Gerousia by Vibius Salutaris in 104 AD, as part of a wide programme which also included bases dedicated to the Council, the *Epheboi* and the six tribes of the city. These bases supported portable images of Roman and local institutions and of Roman and local political, historical and mythical figures which were placed on them at every meeting of the assembly and on various other occasions.⁶³ In Akmonia too the statue of the Gerousia was part of a similar

⁶⁰ Varinlioglu 2006, 363–368 no. 4 (cf. AE 2006, 1426; SEG 56 1490).

⁶¹ In a list of names published by Varinlioglu 2006, 358–360 no. 2 (SEG 56 1491) l.31 a Demades son of Artemidoros is attested. There is also the Demades son of Asklepiades, father of the *dogmatographos* Patron in the decree for Demades (see on this the observations by Puech in AE 2006, 1427, 567–568).

⁶² Hierapolis: RPC online 9789–9790; Tiberiopolis: BMC Phrygia 421 no. 2 (von Aulock, Münzen 42 and 128 nos. 1169–1177; Leschhorn – Franke, Lexicon 79). See on all this Giannakopoulos, Θεσιμός της Γερουσίας 260–263. Unsurprisingly, images of the People and the Council also appear on the numismatic issues of these cities; of course this highlights even further the importance attributed to the local Gerousiai.

⁶³ For the statues and the procession see I Ephesos 27 ll. 202–214 and 420–421. On the inscriptions engraved on the bases see I Ephesos 28–35. An analysis is provided by Rogers, Sacred Identity 83–85.

programme⁶⁴ and in both these programmes the presence of the Gerousia was accompanied by two notable absences. Vibius Salutaris dedicated no base to the Ephesian *Demos*, while Demades erected no statue of the Akmonian Council. Thus, in Demades' scheme the Gerousia, standing next to the personifications of the more inclusive concept of the *Polis* and the traditional concept of the *Demos*, took the place of the Council as a distinctly important civic institution of Akmonia. This high position may of course be considered as the product of the benefactor's personal preferences.⁶⁵ However, the honours awarded to Demades son of Dionysogenes amply demonstrate that his initiative was officially approved by the community, i.e. by the Council itself. So there can be no doubt that the honorand's choices reflected and reinforced widely held views. When it came to public manifestations of Akmonia's image as a political community, the traditional civic hierarchy was flexible enough to allow the Gerousia to occupy a more prominent place.⁶⁶ It is also worth pointing out that the images erected by Demades son of Dionysogenes predated and surpassed in significance both the depiction of the Gerousia on the above-mentioned numismatic issues and the base dedicated by Vibius Salutaris in Ephesus. Hence, Akmonia appears to have been the first city – at least according to the available evidence – to treat the institution of the Gerousia as a symbol of civic identity, in a manifestly more impressive way than other cities which were to follow the same path in the future.

The Gerousia of Akmonia in the light of the honours awarded to Lucius Egnatius Quartus

Tracing the subsequent history of the Gerousia in Akmonia, we come upon two other honorary inscriptions dated to the 2nd or the 3rd century AD. A local benefactor was honoured by the Gerousia for constructing weighing-houses (*zygostasia*) in the market and separately by the Council and the People for having held the offices of *dekaprotos*, *chreophylax* and *agoranomos* and by the *neoi* and the *hymnodoi* for having held the post of *argyrotamias* (IGR IV 657). The Gerousia also joined the Council, the People and the *Artemeisias* tribe in honouring the Roman army officer Lucius Egnatius Quartus:

ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ.
κατὰ ψήψισμα πάνδη-
μον ἢ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆ-
4 μ[ος καὶ ἡ] γερουσία καὶ
φ[υλὴ Ἀρτε]μεισίας ἐτεί-
μησαν Λού]κιον Ἐγνάτι-
ο[ν Λ. υἱ]ὸν Τηρητεῖνα Κού-
8 αρ[τον ἔ]παρχον σπείρης
β' [Κλαυ]διανῆς, ἐπιμε-
λη[τὴν] εἰλης Σεβαστῆς
Διδύμου, χειλίαρχον λε-
12 γιῶνος ἡ' Ἀγούστης, ἔπ-

⁶⁴ An honorific inscription erected by the *demos* of Perge for the *geraioi* was perhaps engraved on the base of a statue representing the local Gerousia (IPerge 253). A similar inscription erected by the *geraioi* for the *boule* (IPerge 238) seems to have been engraved on a column at the entrance to the *bouleuterion*, but it is not certain if these two inscriptions, to which a dedication of the Council for the *Homonoia* of the *Demos* should be added (IPerge 236), belong to the same chronological context.

⁶⁵ Demades son of Dionysogenes might have been a member of the Gerousia.

⁶⁶ A similar phenomenon may be traced in 2nd- and 3rd-century AD Syros. The *demothoiniai* offered by the eponymous *stephanephoroi* were regulated by a decree of the Council and the People but the Gerousia was the only civic institution participating in them as such. See IG XII 5, 659, 662, 663, 664, 665, 667. Cf. Van Rossum, Gerousia 157–158; Nigdelis, Πολίτευμα 282 and 292; Schmitt-Pantel, *Cité* 268–269, 292–293, 349, 351, 374 and 386–387; Giannakopoulos, Θεσμός της Γερουσίας 376–386.

[αρ]χον εἰλης [ἰππέων] Α[ύγού]στης,
 κτίστην καὶ ε[ὕεργέτην]
 τῆς πατρίδος.⁶⁷

Among the new Akmonian inscriptions published by Varinlioglu there is another honorary decree for Quartus, emanating solely from the Council and the People:

ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος [ἐ]τείμησεν
 Λούκιον Ἐγνάπιον Λουκίου υἱὸν
 Τηρητεῖνα Κούαρτον ἑπαρχον
 4 σπείρης δευτέρας Κλαυδίας,
 ἐπάνω εἰλης ἰππέων Σεβαστῆς
 Διδύμου, χειλίαρχον λεγιῶνος
 ὀγδῶς Αὐγούστης, ἑπαρχον
 8 εἰλης ἰππέων Αὐγούστης.⁶⁸

Comparing the vocabulary used in these inscriptions may contribute to a better understanding of the Gerousia's role in Akmonia.

As the editors of *SEG* note, in both inscriptions the *cursus honorum* of the honorand is exactly the same. However, the new inscription published by Varinlioglu attributes no title to Quartus, while in the inscription erected jointly by the Council, the People, the Gerousia and the *Artemeisias* tribe he bears the titles of *ktistes* and benefactor. It is this inscription which further specifies that the honours attributed to Quartus were awarded according to a *pandemon* decree. Now the formula 'the Council, the People and the Gerousia honoured so and so' is common all over Asia Minor.⁶⁹ However, in almost all the known cases there is no reference to a single decree; thus, one may be led to the conclusion that in these cases the Gerousia initially issued its own decrees, coordinating its decisions with similar decrees issued at the same time by the Council and the People, and subsequently collaborating with them on the erection of a common honorific monument. But in Quartus' case the procedure was clearly different. The formula κατὰ ψήφισμα πάνδημον demonstrates that there was a single decree at a joint meeting of the Council, the People, the Gerousia and the *Artemeisias* tribe. A similar situation is also attested in Patara, where an honorific decree for Iason son of Nikostratos, dated to the middle of the 2nd century AD, is stated to have been passed by the Council, the People and the Gerousia during the electoral meeting of the assembly.⁷⁰ A 3rd-century AD dedication from Arados also refers to a single decree passed jointly by the Council, the People and the Gerousia.⁷¹ Although none of these inscrip-

⁶⁷ IGR IV 642 with SEG 6 174 for a new reading of l.8. This inscription was first published by Ramsay 1901, 275; cf. also Ramsay 1902, 270 and Social Basis 145–148 no. 152 with comments on Quartus' career. The same man is known to have been honoured by the association of fullers (*gnapheis*) as *ktistes* and *philopatres* (SEG 6 167; on the possible provenance of this inscription not from Temenothyrai but from Akmonia see Thonemann 2010, 174 fn. 37 with further bibliography). On Quartus see also Birley, Roman Army 38; Devijver, Officers 286 no. 40; Ott 1995, 119, where the two inscriptions are reproduced; Thonemann 2010, 173–174 with further bibliography.

⁶⁸ Varinlioglu 2006, 362–363 no.3 (cf. AE 2006 no. 1425; SEG 56 1492).

⁶⁹ See the cases assembled in Giannakopoulos, Θεσμός της Γερουσίας 185–246.

⁷⁰ IGR III 704 II B: ἔδοξε Παταρέων τῆς μητροπόλεως τοῦ Λυκίων ἔθνους τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ καὶ τῇ γερουσίᾳ ... ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις ἀπασιν ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν ... ἔν τε τῇ ἀρχερεσιακῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐτείμησεν ...

⁷¹ SEG 48 1849 bis: ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος καὶ | ἡ γερουσία ψηφίσματι τὸν | ἀνδριάντα τῷ Λιμένι τῶν ἐν πόλιι πορφυρέων κτλ. Two inscriptions from Side dated to the late 3rd century AD present the Gerousia of Tetrapoleitai (a quarter of Side) awarding honours to two relatives in accordance with a common decision (*dogma* or *krisis*) of the city (ISide I 111–112; cf. Giannakopoulos, Θεσμός της Γερουσίας 155–157). However, it is not certain if the Gerousia participated in these common decrees.

tions makes it clear what the exact form of the Gerousia's participation in the common meetings and decrees was, it is highly probable that the Gerousia sat and voted in a visibly separate and distinct way.⁷² In any case, one cannot escape noticing that in certain circumstances the Gerousia in Akmonia, as elsewhere too, could be accepted by the Council and the People as an equal institutional partner in the procedures which led to the ratification of civic decrees.⁷³

But what exactly were these circumstances? Comparative evidence demonstrates that important honorific titles such as *ktistes* were undoubtedly conferred by the People and the Council according to institutionalized procedures.⁷⁴ If Quartus had already been awarded the titles *ktistes* and *euergetes* when he was honoured solely by the Council and the People, this surely would have been pointed out as an additional distinction to his *cursus honorum*. But the absence of these titles in the new inscription for Quartus suggests that this inscription was chronologically prior to the one erected according to the *pandemon* decree. We may thus conclude that Quartus was honoured on two different occasions in Akmonia, on the first occasion only by the Council and the People for some unknown reason and on the second one after a more impressive service which was considered worthy of the titles *ktistes* and *euergetes*. It was on this second occasion that the full and unanimous expression of Akmonia's gratitude,

⁷² Special seats reserved exclusively for the Gerousia are attested in the stadium of Saittai (Kolb 1990, 112 no. 5; cf. SEG 40 1063) and in the theatres of Ephesus (IEph. 2083–2086) and Maroneia (IAeg. Thrace, p. 330). Cf. on all this Van Rossum, *Gerousia* 177 fn. 66. It is noteworthy that in Saittai and Ephesus seats were also set apart for the civic *phylai* (Jones, *Organization* 314 and 360). A decree of Orkistos refers to a *pandemos* assembly which the Gerousia attended προκαθεζομένη (Buckler 1937, 1–10 ll. B 2–3; cf. Rhodes, *Decrees* 430). When the decree was passed Orkistos was not a city and Buckler (1937, 9) thought that the Gerousia exercised functions equivalent to those performed by the *boule* of a city. Buckler associated this decree with the decree passed by the *kome* Kastollos, situated in Philadelphia's *territorium* (OGIS 488), where again the meeting of an assembly included the Gerousia and the other *kometai*. Of course Patara, Akmonia and Arados were cities not *komai* lacking a *boule*. However, the Gerousia, an institutionalised assembly of mature wise men, enjoyed great prestige in the Greek cities of the Imperial Period and the honours awarded by the elders were highly esteemed (Van Rossum, *Gerousia* 217–227; Giannakopoulos, *Θεσμός της Γερουσίας* 247–259). For example, when the Council and the People of Termessos decided to safeguard their decrees by engraving them inside Zeus' sanctuary, the Gerousia's *syggrammata* were also included (TAM III 3A). Hence, it is not at all surprising that in certain cities the Gerousia could have obtained a distinct position in the decision-making procedures of the Council and the People. The Gerousia's own decisions may have functioned either as a sort of preliminary proposition, or as an approval of the Council's *probouleuma*, in addition to the one given by the People. The order by which the enacting bodies were recorded supports the second hypothesis. In any case the crucial point is that, whereas in the 2nd century BC the *presbyteroi* of Iasos and the Gerousia of Magnesia on the Maeander only requested a decree of the Council and the Assembly (see dn. a 55), in the 2nd- and 3rd- century decrees of Patara, Akmonia and Arados the Gerousia was presented as a body actively and independently participating in the decision-making process. With respect to the participation of lesser bodies in civic decrees, a topic which has not yet been systematically treated, Ruzé (1983, 304–305) has argued that the formula ἔδοξε Μυλασεῦσιν, ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης, καὶ ἐπεκύρωσαν αἱ τρεῖς φυλαί (IMylasa 1–3, dated to the 4th century BC) shows that the three Mylasian tribes voted separately in the common assembly. On the contrary, Jones, *Organization* 328–329 believes that the three *phylai* held separate meetings ratifying a prior decision taken in the full assembly. Cf. Rhodes, *Decrees* 500–501.

⁷³ With respect to the participation of tribes in civic decrees see dn.a.. Jones (*Organization* 347 and 363), based on the Akmonian inscriptions cited below dn.b. 80 and on comparative evidence from other Greek cities of the interior of Asia Minor, assumes the erection of similar honorific monuments for Lucius Egnatius Quartus in the name of the other tribes of Akmonia as well. However, it should be borne in mind that the evidence cited by Jones concerns inscriptions honouring the same persons with similar – and sometimes identical – wording erected only by tribes, not inscriptions recording tribes collaborating with other civic institutions as honouring parties. In any case, if honorary inscriptions for Lucius Egnatius Quartus were indeed erected in Akmonia in the name of the other tribes as well, these surely would also have mentioned the Council, the People and the Gerousia as honouring parties.

⁷⁴ For example one of the honours voted for L. Vaccius Labeo by the Kymaeans was the award of the titles *ktistes* and *euergetes* (IKyme 19 ll. 7–8 and 16–17). In Tlos the benefactress Lala was awarded the title *meter poleos* according to a *probouleuma* proposed by the priest of the Augusti (Naour 1977, 265–271 no. 1; cf. SEG 27 938 and Jones 1989, 196). An inscription from Kos refers to the award of the title *philopatris* by means of a civic decree (Buraselis, Kos 105–106).

highlighted by the formula *κατὰ ψήφισμα πάνδημον*, required a single decree passed by the Council, the People and the Gerousia as well, the latter probably having profited from Quartus' deeds.⁷⁵ Now it is worth pointing out that so far as we know only three other persons in Akmonia bore similar honorific titles. The well-known son of Ioulia Severa Lucius Servenius Cornutus, who assumed various senatorial posts, was honoured as *euergetes* by the *polis*;⁷⁶ the high priest Titus Flavius Priscus Vibianus was honoured as *ktistes* and *prostates* by the *patris*;⁷⁷ finally, the consul Titus Flavius Montanus Maximianus was honoured as *ktistes* and *euergetes* by the *patris*.⁷⁸ Honours voted only by the Council and the People are unsurprisingly more frequent but the honorands do not bear any title at all.⁷⁹ If the inclusive terms *patris* and *polis* corresponded to decisions taken not only by the Council and the People but also by the Gerousia – and there is no way of knowing that with certainty – one may discern a hierarchical pattern: for honorands awarded high distinctions and titles the participation only of the Council and the People was inadequate.⁸⁰ The Gerousia too had to be enlisted as an honouring party. Even if this was not an overall pattern, it certainly applied in Quartus' case. The Gerousia's enhanced position in local politics as far as the award of honours was concerned is also highlighted by another similar comparison. In the first half of the 1st century BC the Roman patron of Akmonia Quintus Decmius was honoured by the *Demos*⁸¹. But by the 2nd or the 3rd century AD, bestowing honours on important benefactors of the community involved the Gerousia as well.

Final Remarks

To sum up: we do not know when and under what circumstances the Gerousia of Akmonia was founded. However, upon its first appearance in as early as the mid-1st century AD, it emerges as a well-established institution with an elaborate internal organization indicating that the elders engaged in serious economic and legal activities. Financed – at least partly – by contributions from its own members, the Gerousia could also attract benefactions from prominent local figures (Ioulia Severa). More importantly, although not a governmental body, the Gerousia could nonetheless replace the Council in public manifestations of Akmonia's collective identity. This prominent place in Akmonia's civic life is

⁷⁵ The honours awarded by the association of the fullers (dn.a 68) should be probably placed within the same context.

⁷⁶ The inscription for Lucius Servenius Cornutus (PIR² S 566) is MAMA VI 262. On the same person see also now MAMA XI 5 (<http://mama.csad.ox.ac.uk/monuments/MAMA-XI-005.html>). Cf. the bibliography cited dn.a. 12.

⁷⁷ On Titus Flavius Priscus Vibianus see MAMA VI 266, erected by the *Asklepias* tribe and Reinach 1890, 66–67 no. 18 (Ramsay, *Cities* 641 no. 532) erected by the *Artemisias* tribe. The honorand may have been the father of Flavius Priscus who appears on Severan coins of Akmonia as secretary and son of Asiarches.

⁷⁸ MAMA XI 104 (<http://mama.csad.ox.ac.uk/monuments/MAMA-XI-104.html>). The honorand was a prominent Akmonian who also held various senatorial posts.

⁷⁹ IGR IV 657; MAMA VI 265; Ramsay, *Cities* 643 no. 536 (MAMA VI List p. 149 no. 163); Ramsay 1901, 275 with Chapot 1902, 81–82 (MAMA VI List p. 149 no. 165); Varinlioglu 2006, 356–358 no. 1 (cf. AE 2006, 1424; SEG 46 1493); MAMA XI 100–102 (<http://mama.csad.ox.ac.uk/monuments/MAMA-XI-100-102.html>). We should also add MAMA VI 270 and 271a, two very fragmentary honorary inscriptions emanating solely from the Council. In the first one the honorand was a *chreophylax*. The Council and the People are also restituted as awarding honours in Ramsay, *Cities* 637 no. 529 (MAMA VI List p. 149 no. 169). A notable exception is the *hyios poleos* Tiberios Klaudios Asklepiades, honoured by the Council, the People and the Roman residents (Ramsay, *Cities* 641 no. 533; cf. IGR IV 632; as Thonemann 2010, 169 fn. 21 points out, this inscription should be attributed to Akmonia and not to Alia). On the other hand, there are also persons honoured by the *polis* or the *patris* who do not bear any title. MAMA VI 261 is an honorary inscription for an *ephebarchos* erected by the *patris*. See also the fragmentary inscription MAMA VI 267 and 269.

⁸⁰ In an honorary inscription from Stratonikeia the notion of *patris* is equated with decisions taken by the Council, the People and the Gerousia, although it cannot be ascertained whether these decisions were taken jointly or separately. See IStratonikeia 541 (Oliver, *Sacred Gerusia* no. 39).

⁸¹ MAMA VI 258. Cf. Eilers, *Patrons* 254 C 133.

further highlighted by the Gerousia's participation in the *pandemon* decree for Quartus dated to the 2nd or the 3rd century AD. By that time, the Gerousia had come to find its own distinct place not only in symbolic schemes but also in collective decision-making procedures expressing the views of the Akmonian political community. Viewed in this light, the Akmonian Gerousia provides a telling example of a widespread multifaceted institution, which, due to its diverse functions, constituted an important feature of civic life in the Greek cities of the Imperial Period.

Abbreviated Literature

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Arnaoutoglou 1994 | I. Arnaoutoglou, ΑΡΧΕΠΑΝΙΣΤΗΣ and its Meaning in Inscriptions, ZPE 104, 1994, 107–110. |
| Arnaoutoglou, Thusias | I. Arnaoutoglou, Thusias eneken kai synousias: private religious associations in Hellenistic Athens, Athens 2003. |
| Bailey, Gerousia | C. Bailey, Gerousia of Ephesus (PhD Diss.), University of British Columbia 2006. |
| Birley, Roman Army | E. Birley, The Roman Army. Papers 1929–1986, Amsterdam 1987. |
| Boulay 2013 | Th. Boulay, Les «groupes de reference» au sein du corps civique de Téos, in: P. Fröhlich – P. Hamon (edd.), Groupes et associations dans les cités grecques (IIIe siècle av. J.-C. – IIe siècle apr. J.-C.), Genève 2013, 251–275. |
| Bresson, Recueil | A. Bresson, Recueil des inscriptions de la Pérée rhodienne (Pérée intégrée), Paris 1991. |
| Buckler 1937 | W. H. Buckler, A Charitable Foundation of A.D. 237, JHS 57, 1937, 1–10. |
| Buraselis, Kos | K. Buraselis, Kos between Hellenism and Rome, Philadelphia 2000. |
| Chapot 1902 | V. Chapot, Sur quelques inscriptions d'Acmonia de Phrygie, REA 4, 1902, 77–84. |
| Devijver, Officers | H. Devijver, The Equestrian Officers of the Roman Imperial Army, Amsterdam 1989. |
| Dmitriev, City Government | S. Dmitriev, City government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor, New York 2005. |
| Durrbach – Radet 1886 | F. Durrbach – G. A. Radet, Inscriptions de la Pérée rhodienne, BCH 10, 1886, 245–269. |
| Eilers, Patrons | C. Eilers, Roman Patrons of Greek Cities, Oxford 2002. |
| Foucart, Associations | P. Foucart, Des associations religieuses chez les Grecs. Thiasés, éranes, orgéons, Paris 1873. |
| Gauthier 1980 | Ph. Gauthier, Études sur des inscriptions d'Amorgos, BCH 104, 1980, 197–220. |
| Giannakopoulos, Θεσμός της Γερουσίας | N. Giannakopoulos, Ο Θεσμός της Γερουσίας των ελληνικών πόλεων κατά τους ρωμαϊκούς χρόνους, Thessaloniki 2008. |
| Le Guen, Associations I | B. Le Guen, Les associations de technites dionysiaques à l'époque hellénistique I, Paris 2001. |
| Gschnitzer, Kleine Schriften II | F. Gschnitzer, Kleine Schriften zum griechischen und römischen Altertum. Band II, Stuttgart 2003. |
| Habicht 1975 | Chr. Habicht, New evidence on the province of Asia, JRS 65, 1975, 64–91. |
| Hepding 1907 | H. Hepding, Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1904–1905. Die Inschriften, MDAI (A) 32, 1907, 241–377. |
| IAeg. Thrace | L. Loukopoulou – A. Zournatzi – M. G. Parisaki – S. Psoma, Επιγραφές της Θράκης του Αιγαίου, Athens 2005. |
| IAnkyra | S. Mitchell – D. French, The Greek and Latin Inscriptions of Ankara (Ankyra) (Vestigia 62), Munich 2012. |
| IAphrodisias | Joyce Reynolds, Charlotte Roueché, Gabriel Bodard, Inscriptions of Aphro- |

- disias (2007), available <<http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/iaph2007>>, ISBN 978-1-897747-19-3.
- IAsos W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Iasos*, Bonn 1985 (IK 28).
- Iİznik S. Şahin, *Katalog der antiken Inschriften des Museums von Iznik (Nikaia)*, Bonn 1979 (IK 9–10).
- IJO II W. Ameling, *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis II: Kleinasien*, Tübingen 2004.
- IKyme H. Engelmann, *Die Inschriften von Kyme*, Bonn 1976 (IK 5).
- IMagnesia O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, Berlin 1900.
- IMylasa W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Mylasa*, Bonn 1987–1988 (IK 34–35).
- IPergamon II M. Fränkel, *Die Inschriften von Pergamon II*, Berlin 1895 (*Altertümer von Pergamon* 8, 2).
- IPerge S. Şahin, *Die Inschriften von Perge*, Bonn 1999/2004 (IK 54/61).
- IPrusa ad Olympeum Th. Corsten, *Die Inschriften von Prusa ad Olympeum*, Bonn 1991/1993 (IK 39–40).
- IPrusias ad Hypium W. Ameling, *Die Inschriften von Prusias ad Hypium*, Bonn 1985 (IK 27).
- IRhod. Peraia W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften der Rhodischen Peraia*, Bonn 1991 (IK 38).
- ISide I J. Nollé, *Side im Altertum I–II* Bonn 1993/2001 (IK 43–44).
- IStratonikeia M. Ç. Şahin, *Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia I–II*, Bonn 1981/1982/1990 (IK 21–22).
- ISultandağı L. Jones, *The Inscriptions of the Sultan Dagi. Part 1: Philomelion, Thymbria/Hadrianopolis, Tyraion*, Bonn 2002 (IK 62).
- Jones, Greek City A. H. M. Jones, *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*, Oxford 1940.
- Jones 1944 A. H. M. Jones, *Review of J. H. Oliver, The Sacred Gerusia*, *JRS* 1944, 145–146.
- Jones, Organization N. F. Jones, *Public Organization in Ancient Greece: A Documentary Study*, Philadelphia 1987.
- Jones 1989 C. P. Jones, *Τρόφιμος* in an Inscription of Erythrai, *Glotta* 67, 1989, 194–197.
- Keil 1930 J. Keil, *Vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Ephesos*, *JÖAI* 26, 1930, Beiblatt 1–66.
- Kloppenborg 1996 J. S. Kloppenborg, *Collegia and Thiasoi: Issues in Function, Taxonomy and Membership*, in: J. S. Kloppenborg – S. G. Wilson (edd.), *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, London – New York 1996, 16–130.
- Kloppenborg – Ascough, Greco-Roman Associations J. S. Kloppenborg – R. S. Ascough, *Greco-Roman Associations. Texts, Translations, and Commentary. I. Attica, Central Greece, Macedonia, Thrace*, Berlin – New York 2011.
- Knibbe 1987 D. Knibbe, *Zeigt das Fragment IvE 13 das steuertechnische Inventar des Fiscus Asiaticus?*, *Tyche* 2, 1987, 75–93.
- Kolb 1990 F. Kolb, *Sitzstufeninschriften aus dem Stadion von Saittai (Lydien)*, *EA* 15, 1990, 107–119.
- Leschhorn – Franke, Lexicon W. Leschhorn – P. R. Franke, *Lexicon of Greek Coin Inscriptions*, Vienna 2002.
- Levick, Roman Colonies B. Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, Oxford 1967.
- Lupu, NGSL E. Lupu, *Greek Sacred Law. A Collection of New Documents*, Leiden – Boston 2005.
- Macro 1991 A. D. Macro, *The Cities of Asia Minor under the Roman Imperium*, in: H. Temporini – W. Haase (edd.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II. 7. 2*, Berlin – New York 1980, 658–697.
- Magie, Roman Rule D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, Princeton 1950.

- Marek, Stadt Chr. Marek, Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia, Tübingen 1993.
- Merkelbach – Stauber, Steinepigramme 3 R. Merkelbach – J. Stauber, Steinepigramme aus dem Griechischen Osten, vol. 3. Der “Ferne Osten” und das Landesinnere bis zum Tauros, Leipzig 2001.
- Menadier, Ephesii J. Menadier, Qua condicione Ephesii usi sint inde ab Asiam in formam provinciae redacta, Berlin 1880.
- Merola, Autonomia G. D. Merola, Autonomia Locale Governo Imperiale. Fiscalità e amministrazione nelle province asiatiche, Bari 2001.
- Migeotte 2013 L. Migeotte, Les souscriptions dans les associations privées, in: P. Fröhlich – P. Hamon (edd.), Groupes et associations dans les cités grecques (IIIe siècle av. J.-C. – IIe siècle apr. J.-C.), Genève 2013, 113–127.
- Mommsen, Geschichte Th. Mommsen, Römische Geschichte V, Berlin 1885.
- Müri 1931 W. Müri, συμβολή, σύμβολον, RE IV A 1, Stuttgart 1931, col. 1088–1090.
- Naour 1977 C. Naour, Inscriptions de Lycie, ZPE 24, 1977, 265–290.
- Nigdelis, Πολίτευμα P. M. Nigdelis, Πολίτευμα και κοινωνία των Κυκλάδων κατά την ελληνιστική και αυτοκρατορική εποχή, Thessaloniki 1990.
- Oliver, Sacred Gerusia J. H. Oliver, The Sacred Gerusia, Baltimore 1941 (Hesperia Suppl. VI).
- Oliver, Greek Constitutions J. H. Oliver, Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors, Philadelphia 1989.
- Ott 1995 J. Ott, Die Kommandeure der norischen Hilfstruppen, Tyche 10, 1995, 107–138.
- Paris 1883 P. Paris, Inscriptions de Sébasté, BCH 7 (1883), 448–457.
- Poland, Geschichte F. Poland, Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens, Leipzig 1909.
- Pugliese Carratelli 1939/40 G. Pugliese Carratelli, Per la storia delle Associazioni in Rodi Antica, ASAA 22, 1939/40, 147–200.
- Rajak, Jewish Dialogue T. Rajak, The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome. Studies in Cultural & Social Interaction, Leiden – Boston – Köln 2001.
- Ramsay, Cities W. W. Ramsay, The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, Oxford 1895–1897.
- Ramsay 1901 W. W. Ramsay, Deux jours en Phrygie, REA 1901, 269–279.
- Ramsay 1902 W. W. Ramsay, Nouvelles remarques sur les textes d’Acmonia, REA 4, 1902, 267–270.
- Ramsay, Social Basis W. W. Ramsay, The Social Basis of Roman Power in Asia Minor, Aberdeen 1941.
- Reinach 1890 S. Reinach, Inscriptions inédites d’Asie Mineure et de Syrie, REG 3, 1890, 48–85.
- Rhodes, Decrees P. J. Rhodes (with D. M. Lewis), The Decrees of the Greek States, Oxford 1997.
- Robert, Hellenica IX L. Robert, Hellenica IX, Paris 1950.
- Robert, Documents L. Robert, Documents de l’Asie Mineure méridionale, Genève – Paris 1966.
- Robert, Amyzon L. Robert, Fouilles d’Amyzon en Carie. Tome I, Paris 1983.
- Rogers, Sacred Identity G. M. Rogers, The Sacred Identity of Ephesos, London 1991.
- Ross, Assembly J. C. Ross, An Assembly of Good Fellows. Voluntary Associations in History, London 1976.
- Roueché, Performers Ch. Roueché, Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias, London 1993.
- RPC I A. Burnett – M. Amandry – P. P. Ripollès, Roman Provincial Coinage I, London 1992.
- RPC online Roman Provincial Coinage online project, available <<http://rpc.ashmus.ox.ac.uk/>>

- Ruzé 1983 Fr. Ruzé, Tribus et décision politique dans les cités grecques archaïques et classiques, *Ktêma* 8, 1983, 299–306.
- Sartre, Orient M. Sartre, L'Orient romain. Provinces et sociétés provinciales en Méditerranée orientale d'Auguste aux Sévères, 31 avant J.-C. – 235 après J.-C., Paris 1991.
- Schaefer 1957 H. Schaefer, *προήγορος*, RE XXIII 1, Stuttgart 1957, col. 104–107.
- Schmitt-Pantel, Cité P. Schmitt-Pantel, La Cité au Banquet, Paris – Rome 1992.
- Thonemann 2010 P. Thonemann, The Women of Akmoneia, JRS 100, 2010, 163–178.
- Trebilco, Jewish Communities P. Trebilco, Jewish Communities in Asia Minor, Cambridge 1991.
- Van Rossum, Gerousia J. Van Rossum, De Gerousia in de Griekse Steden van het Romeinse Rijk, Leyden 1988.
- Van Nijf, Civic World O. Van Nijf, The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East, Amsterdam 1997.
- Varinlioğlu 2006 E. Varinlioğlu, Five Inscriptions from Acmonia, REA 108, 2006, 355–373.
- von Aulock, Münzen H. von Aulock, Münzen und Städte Phrygiens. Teil II, Tübingen 1987 (Ist. Mitt. Beiheft 27).
- Weiss, Sklave A. Weiss, Sklave der Stadt. Untersuchungen zur öffentlichen Sklaverei in den Städten des Römischen Reiches, Stuttgart 2004.

Özet

Akmonia Gerousia'sı

Makalede Akmonia'dan ele geçen ve 2006 yılında Ender Varinlioğlu tarafından yayımlanan üç yazıt aracılığıyla Gerousia kurumu incelenmektedir. Demades kararnamesi (İ.S. 64), yazıtın içerisinde geçen ifadeye göre halkın *proegoros*'u (avukat) tarafından takdim edilmektedir. Bu *proegoros* mevki Gerousia'nın adli ve mali meselelerinin çapraşık doğasını ortaya sermektedir. Ayrıca, özellikle Demades (Azatlı Karpos) tarafından seçilen yeni bir üyeye verilecek *asymbolos* statüsü ödülü, Gerousia'nın kendi üyelerine düzenli destek verdiğinin ilk tartışmasız delilidir. Bu kararnamenin Gerousia'nın kendisi tarafından mı ya da Gerousia'nın girişimine cevaben danışma ve halk meclisleri tarafından mı yasandığından emin değiliz. Fakat Demades'in ödül için üye seçiminin oylamayla tasdiklenmesi, özenle dile getirilmiş bir tasarımı resmetmektedir. Bu tasarı Yunan sivil toplumlarının ve birliklerinin işleyişini sağlayan ortak gayrı-şahsi ilkelerin gereklerine, önde gelen bir bireyin yetki kullanımının entegre edilmesini amaçlamaktadır. Aynı dönemlerden, İ.S. 68 yılına tarihlenen bir kararname Dionysogenes'in oğlu Demades'in kent kapısı önünde Polis, Demos ve Gerousia'yı betimleyen üçlü bir heykel grubu diktirdiği hakkında bilgi vermektedir. Boule'nin bu grup içerisinde bulunmayışı, Akmonia'nın politik birliğinin sembolik gösterimi söz konusu olduğunda, sivil hiyerarşinin Gerousia'nın daha önemli bir yer tuttuğunu vurgulayabilecek kadar esnek olduğu ile ilgili olabilir. Akmonia'da Gerousia'nın halk içerisindeki önemini, İ.S. 2. ya da 3. yy.'a tarihlenen ve Roma subayı L. Egnatius Quartus için çıkarılan *pandemon* kararnamesindeki halk müdahalesi öne çıkarmaktadır. Aynı kişi daha önceleri sadece Danışma ve Halk meclisleri tarafından onurlandırılmışken, ona daha üst derecede itibarı olan *ktistes* ve *euergetes* unvanları verilmek istendiğinde Gerousia'nın da iştiraki gerekli olmuştur.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Akmonia; Gerousia; kent organları; Demades; L. Egnatius Quartus.