

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXXVII

HELSINKI 2003

INDEX

EUGENIO AMATO	<i>Note esegetiche e testuali alla Descriptio orbis di Dionisio d'Alessandria (II)</i>	9
CHRISTER BRUUN	<i>Velia, Quirinale, Pincio: note su proprietari di domus e su plumbarii</i>	27
LAURENT CHRZANOVSKI	<i>Le photophore autophore</i>	49
ZBIGNIEW FIEMA	<i>Observations on the Byzantine Church at Jabal Haroun near Petra, Jordan</i>	53
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Inscriptions at Auction</i>	69
MARTTI LEIWO	<i>Both and All Together? The Meaning of ἀμφοτέροι</i>	81
UTA-MARIA LIERTZ	<i>Isis und ihre nordischen Schwestern</i>	101
LEENA PIETILÄ-CASTRÉN	<i>A Piece of Dionysian Hilarity</i>	115
ERJA SALMENKIVI	<i>A Note on the Ptolemaic ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων</i>	123
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>A Study of CIL XIV 375, an Interesting Inscription from Ostia</i>	133
RAIJA SARASTI-WILENIUS	<i>Latin, Swedish and French – Some Considerations on the Choice of Language in the Letter Collection of the Gyldenstolpe Family</i>	159
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CCVII–CCXV</i>	173
ANTERO TAMMISTO	<i>Swamp-Hens (Porphyrio spp.) and Ducks (Anatidae) in the Tomba di Morlupo and Other Republican and Early Augustan Romano-Campanian Mosaics and Wall Paintings</i>	207
HOLGER THESLEFF	<i>A Symptomatic Text Corruption: Plato, Gorgias 448a5</i>	251
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	259
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	308
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	310
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	313

INSCRIPTIONS AT AUCTION

MIKA KAJAVA

While it is widely attested by epigraphical and archaeological findings that honorific and other statues as well as the inscriptions on their bases were frequently re-used in the ancient world, there is much less explicit evidence for why this happened. Nonetheless one may assume that, in different times and places, the lack of suitable material, the fashion to be honoured with a statue, and the so-called *damnatio memoriae* (which is not an ancient term), were among the obvious reasons why statues and epigraphical materials were recycled.¹ But if one wishes to ask what the process was like that led to the re-use of a given slab or of a certain statue, there is very little evidence to work with, since usually nothing is known about the related procedures. This is understandable in the case of private persons who may have simply seized the monuments of others without leaving any record of why a monument had been taken over (warnings against such illegal acts of robbery are well documented in ancient inscriptions). But one is often equally perplexed in the case of public inscriptions (other than those automatically rededicated to emperors in the aftermath of the complete and systematic erasure by the order of the Roman Senate of the name of their predecessors). In ancient cities, who chose what inscriptions were to be re-engraved and how was this choice made?

There would have been various practices, though I would assume that if a public decree was passed in someone's honour, and for some reason an older statue with base was to be re-used, the dedicating civic body was responsible for finding an apposite object. In practice, however, the citizens

¹ General remarks in M. Kajava, in: *Acta Colloquii epigraphici Latini Helsingiae 3.–6. Sept. 1991 habiti*, Helsinki 1995, 201 ff. A useful account of *damnatio memoriae* in epigraphy, and the various strategies involved, is provided by H. I. Flower, in: E. R. Varner (ed.), *From Caligula to Constantine. Tyranny & Transformation in Roman Portraiture*, Atlanta 2000, 58 ff.

or the city council would have delegated such issues to an administrator who was to oversee the installation of the statue. If not a public official, this man was a colleague, relative, or friend of the honorand. Names of such specially appointed agents are frequently registered in inscriptions (cf. *curante, curam agente, ἐπιμεληθέντος τῆς ἀναστάσεως*, etc.). Though formally charged with the erection of statues, the administrator must also have been familiar with the recycling of them – and with the re-use of inscriptions. Being the administrator probably often meant being involved in these activities.

Other civic groups such as associations, collegia, etc., or cultic organizations, would also have made a common decision, following which the matter was passed into the hands of a competent member within the body. However, the official approval for the statue and its location in a public place would have been in the hands of the civic administration. The same also largely concerns privately erected statues appearing in public space. Therefore, if in general the location of a public statue had to be confirmed by the community (cf. e.g. the formula *locus datus decurionum decreto*),² it seems logical that matters concerning erasure and the re-use of existing statues were also administered by civic authorities.³ The practical arrangements, however, were carried out by specially appointed agents.

² An instructive case is *CIG* 3657 from Cyzicus (early to mid-first century B.C.): *δεδοχθαι τῷ δήμῳ δεδοκιμάσθαι τε τὴν εἰκόνα καὶ ἐξεῖναι αὐταῖς ἀναθεῖναι καθάπερ ἀξιοῦσιν*, referring to a request by a group of female religious officials for permission to set up a statue of a priestess (another inscription, *Ath.Mitt.* 7 [1882] 151 ff., concerns the location of a *pinaks* for the same priestess: *δεδοχθαι τῷ δήμῳ δεδοκιμάσθαι τε τὸν πίνακα καὶ συνκεχωρηῆσθαι αὐτῷ τὸν τόπον καθάπερ ἀξιοῖ*). It was a general practice in antiquity that the use of public space for statues required public consent: for the Greek world, see R. van Bremen, *The Limits of Participation. Women and Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, Amsterdam 1996, 179 n. 132 (also 187 n. 160). For some interesting Latin inscriptions concerning the approval by the *ordo* for the location of statues, cf. *ILS* 5498 (Baetica), 5499 (Africa), 6148 (Ostia), 6334 (Puteoli), 6912 (Baetica). There are many other examples. Monuments erected on private property, *ex votis* in temples, etc. constitute a different category. However, permissions are sometimes recorded for monuments set up within the premises of associations or on property controlled by special authorities: *ILS* 1064 and 5095 (Narbo): *l(ocus) d(at)us d(ecreto) IIIIIviror(um)*; 4176 (Ostia): *a pontifex Volcani et aedium sacrarum* grants permission to erect a statue of a boy *in campo Matris deum*.

³ Cf. *ILS* 5486 (Barcino): a statue base was renovated *permittente ordine Barcinonensium*.

On the other hand, it is well known that the honorands themselves frequently paid for their own monuments and so it would have also been in their interest to be involved in the choice of the statue and its location (just as we know that the text of an honorific inscription could be composed by the person honoured). Sometimes the honorand was only given the right to choose a suitable place.⁴ One could imagine that, if old statues of great heroes were available in a Greek city, the future honorand might well have made it clear in advance that one of them was his preference. Whoever paid, this was a cheap alternative, including only the act of erasing a previous inscription (if there was one) and that of inscribing a new text. But in all such cases, if the statue was to stand in a public place, its location, and presumably its type as well, would have been formally approved by public consent. This also concerns the recycling of statues for Roman emperors, though it was normal that the Roman authorities, and the emperor himself, were consulted in advance. If interested, they might find reason to intervene.⁵

Not only private inscriptions include prohibitions against the re-use of statues and of the related texts. A number of public documents also refer to punishment for those who removed statues or remodified inscriptions.⁶ However, since such punitive prescriptions are relatively rare in the extant epigraphic record, they would have been inscribed on stone only occasionally when the dedicant(s) especially wished to protect the monument from destruction and exploitation. Nonetheless, the impression is that these acts were generally considered illegal, even impious (in the case

⁴ *ILS* 6271 (Ferentinum): ...*senat(us) statuam publice ponend(am) in foro, ubi ipse vellet, censuere* (the base of the statue is preserved: *CIL* X 5852); *IGR* IV 574 (Aezani, letter from the Athenians): ἐν τε τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ πατρίδι ταῖς Ἀθήναις ἐν ᾧ ἂν βούληται τόπωι καὶ παρ' ὑμῖν; *I. Iasos* 248, 34–35: ἐν οἷς ἂν βούλητα[ι] τόποις ἰρο[ῖς] ἢ δημοσίοις.

⁵ T. Pékary, *Das römische Kaiserbildnis in Staat, Kult und Gesellschaft*, Berlin 1985, 38 ff. (Imperial statues and recycling), 44 f. (location confirmed by *ordo, boule*, etc.). Roman control and interventions (by the emperor or governors): *ibid.* 147; S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge 1984, 70 f., 173 f.

⁶ Examples from the Greek world in A. Wilhelm, in: *Festschr. O. Benndorf*, Vienna 1898, 243 ff. = *Kleine Schriften* II:2, Leipzig 1984, 161 ff.; L. Robert, *Hellenica* 2 (1946) 109 ff. The normal terms for removing and re-inscribing were μετατιθέναι (or μεταίρειν, etc.) and μετεπιγραφεῖν. The latter is also a common legal term in papyri (with the noun μετεπιγραφή 'transfer [by registration of title], conveyance').

of cult statues in particular), as is also attested by the resentment of some ancient writers. In fact, the illegal label assigned to the re-use of statues and statue bases might be one of the reasons why the administrative procedures related to the practice are so little known. The practice itself prevailed in many places but, as something contrary to moral rules, it was not recorded anywhere in the official records. It was normal to state in inscriptions that a statue had been voted to someone, but the same inscriptions do not reveal if the statue had previously represented someone else. Significantly, inscriptions sometimes do provide information about the cost of a statue, its material, and other details, which may imply that the statue was a new product. Likewise, only epigraphic expertise can tell that a new inscription has been engraved over an erased one. The takeover of an earlier inscription was never recorded in the new text. If some information about such cases was sometimes registered in civic or other proceedings, it may have been written on vulnerable and unstable materials (white boards, waxed tablets, etc.) which rarely survive.

However, there is at least one public document which throws light on the methodology of recycling. A long decree (of 150 lines) from the acropolis of Lindos on Rhodes, dating to A.D. 22, shows that the Lindians were in financial difficulties and that they needed money for the upkeep of cultic activities, sacrifices, festivals, etc.⁷ In order to preserve both the honour of their gods and the welfare of the community (lines 3–5: συμφέρον δέ ἐστι Λινδ[ίτοι]ς κ[α]ὶ τὰ[ς τῶ]ν θεῶν τειμὰς καὶ τὸ τοῦ [κ]οινοῦ πρέπον διαφυλά[σσει]σθαι), the Lindians decided to create a fund (*parakatatheke*) sacred to Athana Lindia and Zeus Polieus, controlled by the priest of Athana, and probably deposited in the temple of the two gods. Private persons were asked to donate money through a public subscription, officials and cultic personnel were supposed to contribute in various ways, and there were other measures, too. For example, it is stated in lines 18–30 that the *epistatai*, the supreme magistrates of the city, were to elect a mixed commission of five members who, after various preventive controls, were

⁷ *I. Lindos* 419 (now in Copenhagen) = F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplément*, Paris 1962, 153 ff. No. 90 = L. Migeotte, *Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités grecques*, Geneva – Quebec 1992, 121 ff. No. 41; cf. also D. Morelli, *I culti in Rodi* (SCO 8), Pisa 1959, 85 f. n. 3. For the underlying situation, and the objectives of the decree, see now B. Dignas, *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Oxford 2002, 94 f.

charged with selling the objects of bronze and iron that were preserved in the local *nakoreion*. The income was to be handed over to the *parakata-theke*.⁸

The text reveals that the decree was passed in Panamos, the tenth month of the year, and that the *epistatai* in question were those designated for the subsequent year (A.D. 23). Among them was also the proposer of the motion, Hippias, son of Hippias (lines 1, 4, 53). These magistrates were given a further task, as is revealed by the measure recorded in lines 30–44:⁹

ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ ἀνδριάντες

[τ]ινές ἐντι ἐν τᾷ ἀναβ[ά]σει καὶ αὐτᾷ τᾷ ἄκρα ἀνεπίγραφοι καὶ
 ἄσαμοι, συνφέρων δέ [ἐ]στι καὶ τούτους ἡμῖν ἐπιστάμους ἐπιγρ[α]-
 [φ]ὰν ἔχοντας ὅτι θεο(ῖ)ς ἀνάκεινται, δεδόχθαι Λινδίοις· κῶ τοῦδε
 35 [τ]οῦ ψᾶ τοῖ αὐτοῖ ἐπιστάται μ[ισθ]ωσάντων ἑκάστου ἀνδριάντος τὰν
 [ἐ]πιγραφάν, διαχειρο[τονησ]άντων Λινδίων, εἰ δεῖ τοῦ εὐρίσ-
 κοντος κατακυροῦ[ν ἢ μ]ή, καὶ [εἴ κ]α [δ]όξη τοῦ εὐρίσκοντος κα-
 [τ]ακυροῦν, τὸ πεσὸν ἀργύριον [ἀ]πὸ τοῦ[τ]ων, καταβαλόμε-
 [ν]οι λ[όγ]ον, π[ό]σου ἐ[κ]ά[σ]το[υ ἄ] ἐπιγραφ[ᾶ ἀπε]δόθ[η], παραδόντω ἱερὸν
 [ἦ]μ[ε]ιν εἰς πα[ρ]ακα[τ]α[θ]ήκαν τᾶς Ἄ[θ]ᾶνας τ[ᾶ]ς Λινδίας καὶ τ[οῦ]
 40 [Διὸς τοῦ Πολιέ]ως· [τοῖ δὲ] ὠνησά[μ]ε[ν]οι τὰς ἐπιγραφὰς μὴ
 [ἐ]χόντων ἐξουσίαν ἀπ[ε]νε[ν]κεῖ[ν] ἐκ τᾶς ἄκρας ἀνδριάν[τας]
 [τ]ρόπῳ μὴδ' ἐνὶ μὴδὲ παρευρέσει μὴδεμιᾷ ἢ ἔνοχοι ἐόντ[ω]
 [ἀ]σεβεῖ[α]· ποιησάμενοι δὲ τὰν αἴτησιν ἐχόντων ἐξουσίαν
 [μετενεκ]εῖν ἅ κα συνχωρήσωσι διὰ τᾶς αἰτήσιος Λίν[δ]ιοι.

And since there are some statues along the ascent and on the top itself, which are without inscription and undistinguished, it is expedient that these too shall be distinguished, bearing inscriptions (saying) that they are dedicated to gods, it was voted by the Lindians: when this decree has been sanctioned, the same *epistatai* shall lease out the inscription of each statue, the Lindians deciding by vote whether the winning bid should be confirmed or not, and if it will be decided that the winning bid should be confirmed, they (*epistatai*), after having made an account of the rate for which the inscription of each statue has been ceded, shall

⁸ According to P. Debord, *Aspects sociaux et économiques de la vie religieuse dans l'Anatolie gréco-romaine*, Leiden 1982, 212, the Roman administration would have been actively involved in the Lindian efforts to improve the financial situation. Perhaps indeed the Romans played a role, and probably they would have formally sanctioned the measures, though in the decree there are no explicit indications to that effect.

⁹ Line 37 is given by Sokolowski as follows: ...κα/[τ]ακυροῦν τὸ πεσὸν ἀργύριον, [ἀ]πὸ τοῦ[τ]ων καταβαλόμε/[ν]οι... However, the comma should be moved after τοῦ[τ]ων, cf. lines 48/49: τὸ μὲν πεσὸν ἀργύριον / [ἀ]πὸ τούτου εἶδους παραδόντω... (cf. also D. H. 20,17: τὸ πεσὸν ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς ἀργύριον). – Punctuation marks are not given in *I. Lindos*, and this passage is not published in Migeotte (l. c.).

hand over the money accrued from these to be sacred to the fund of Athana Lindia and Zeus Polieus. Those who have purchased the inscriptions shall not have the permission in any wise nor under any pretext to remove statues from the top; otherwise they shall be liable to be accused of impiety. But if they make a request, they shall have the permission to change (statues) according to what the Lindians agree on account of the request.

That this case refers to a competitive auction may be inferred from the use of τὸ εὐρισκόν which (together with τὸ εὐρόν) is a normal term for auction price, or the winning bid. But what was being knocked down at the auction? Inscriptions of statues (ἀνδριάντες) which are ἀνεπίγραφοι and ἄσαμοι, or rather, the permission to inscribe on the bases of such statues. *Andrias*, the generic Greek term for 'statue', was often used for life-size, honorific statues, though even a divine statue could be an *andrias*. In fact, considering that it was normal for cultic and votive statues of deities to be without inscription, one may assume that the Lindian *andriantes* also included some belonging to this category. What about *asamoi* then? It has been proposed that the adjective here also refers to painted inscriptions which were difficult to read because the colour had evanesced.¹⁰ This is conceivable, and such things surely happened, but in the present context I think *asamos* is better understood as referring to the undistinguished character of the statues: they were inscribed but had become obscure either because they were very old or because no one knew any longer whom they represented. I know only one further case where *andriantes* (or any statues) are characterized by the adjective *asemos*. Significantly, this case recurs in the Rhodian Oration by Dio of Prusa, which is mainly directed against the local habit of recycling old statues (for this city speech, see below). As an excuse for their course of action, the Rhodians pleaded that they never re-used well-known statues (γνώριμοι ἀνδριάντες) nor those which someone knows whose they are. What they admitted to having made use of were some statues that were *asemoi* and very old.¹¹ It follows logically that such statues were not *gnorimoi* but insignificant and obscure, and that nobody knew to whom they had been originally set up.

Thus it may well be that among the Lindian *andriantes* there were not

¹⁰ H. Blanck, *Wiederverwendung alter Statuen als Ehrendenkmäler bei Griechen und Römern*, Rome 1969, 101 f.

¹¹ *Or.* 31,74: ὡς ἄρα οὐδενὸς ἄπτονται τῶν γνωρίμων ἀνδριάντων οὐδὲ οὐς ἐπίσταταί τις ὧν εἰσιν, ἀλλὰ ἀσήμοις τισὶ καὶ σφόδρα παλαιοῖς καταχρῶνται.

only votive statues without inscription but also honorific ones with inscribed bases. The latter, however, were *asamoi* to the extent that they could – and should – be made *episamoi*.¹² This adjective obviously refers to the anepigraphic material as well, since all the statues would now become distinguished, whether by engraving on an anepigraphic base or by replacing an older text with a new one. As a pious justification for the measure, it is added (in line 33) that the new inscriptions will declare that the statues are sacred to gods. This was a realistic aim, and well in accordance with the common Greek practice of consecrating *anathemata* to gods. Among such offerings there were not only *ex votos* of various deities¹³ but also honorific or other statues of individuals with the addition of the name of the receiving god(s) in the dative, the simple *theois* being often enough.¹⁴ However, the clause ὅτι θεοῖς ἀνάκεινται does not show that those who purchased the inscriptions were bound to consecrate the related statues to the gods. Whether some felt obliged to do so is another matter.

According to the measure, the same *epistatai*, i.e., those who were already charged with selling the objects in the *nakoreion*, were to organize a competitive auction. As far as I can see, all the comments on this passage take it as a public auction where permissions to inscribe were sold for the highest bid offered. However, the verb μισθοῦσθαι (line 34) clearly points to an act of leasing (μίσθωσις). There is plenty of evidence for leasing in antiquity, and the procedures involved, and it is well known that the lessees could be determined by auction.¹⁵ But while we are well informed about leases of landed property, or of buildings, mines, etc., the leasing of the right

¹² Cf. Hld. 5,5,1: ἀγάλμασιν ἐπισήμοις ἔρμαῖς τε, etc. (referring to watchwords inscribed on distinguished statues, herms, etc.).

¹³ Like the other major Greek sanctuaries, the temple of the Lindian Athana was known for visiting gods, numerous votive offerings of many other deities being attested there from early times: B. Alroth, in: *Anathema. Atti del convegno internazionale* (Scienze dell'antichità. Storia, archeologia, antropologia 3–4 [1989–1990]), Rome 1991, 307 ff.

¹⁴ Cf. a Rhodian decree from the third century B.C. (Sokolowski, *LSCG Suppl.* 107), listing regulations about the placement of "*andriantes* and other *anathemata*" within the temenos of Asclepius. For the development over centuries of the habit of dedicating statues of individuals to deities, see P. Veyne, *Latomus* 21 (1962) 84 ff. Many of the Lindian *anathemata* represented priests of Athena: van Bremen (n. 2) 177.

¹⁵ Useful discussion, with bibliography, in M. Langdon, "Public Auctions in Ancient Athens", in: R. Osborne – S. Hornblower (eds), *Ritual, Finance, Politics. Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*, Oxford 1994, 253–265.

to inscribe a statue base would be a singular instance. In this context, how could one imagine a lease which normally implied regular payments of rent within a predetermined term? And for how long a term might an inscription be leased out? Would ten or twenty years be enough, or was the contract made for the life of the lessee? Were the annual rates subject to inflation adjustments?

Such questions are unnecessary, for in the present case one could hardly think of a lease with regular income to the lessor because having an inscription engraved was not long-term productive activity in the same sense as land-leasing or mine-working were. Therefore, even if this case is introduced as a *misthosis*, in reality it would have resembled a sale with a payment once and for all. One may note that Greek leasing documents sometimes speak of 'purchase' (πρᾶσις, ὠνεῖσθαι, etc.) because of the special character of the contract, including a substantial advance payment.¹⁶ It may not be a coincidence that in line 40 of the Lindian decree the winning bidders are styled τοὶ ὠνησάμενοι. Moreover, it also seems relevant that the measure concerning the *andriantes* was among those which were intended to yield profit only for the year to come (A.D. 23).¹⁷ This would not be compatible with a long-term lease.

But if the Lindian agreements were not real leases, as far as their contents are involved, being very much like sales, why should they be characterized by the verb μισθοῦσθαι? Perhaps because inscriptions were not conceived of as saleable objects in the same sense as portable utensils were, like those of bronze and iron preserved in the *nakoreion*.¹⁸ These the purchaser could take with him, while the statue bases were to remain in their previous position. Moreover, everybody knew that after some time the same inscriptions would be subject to possible re-use again. Should this happen, a purchaser might legally claim that his or her right of property had been violated. But if the inscriptions were leased out, the lessees would have the use and enjoyment of them until, for whatever reason, the bases were

¹⁶ D. Behrend, *Attische Pachturkunden. Ein Beitrag zur Beschreibung der μίσθωσις nach den griechischen Inschriften*, Munich 1970, 47, 60, 69 ff.

¹⁷ Migeotte (n. 7) 124.

¹⁸ The verb used for the selling of these objects is ἀποδίδοσθαι (line 26: καὶ ἀποδ]όσθω α[ὕ]τὰ...). Though it is sometimes also used for 'letting out for hire', the information provided by lines 143/144 of the decree is unmistakable: ἐκπωλὰν / τῶν χαλκωμάτων.

assigned to new recipients. One might compare the *misthosis* of the Lindian inscriptions to the modern leasing out of advertising space (and time) in various public places, and even television.

The role of the Lindians themselves is interesting as they decided whether the results of the auction should be ratified or not. This was useful because if the winning bid was considered too low, it could simply be rejected. But the popular vote could be preventive in another way too: if the highest bidder seemed inappropriate to the people, they had the chance to vote against. Perhaps indeed some bids were voted down because the question of who had an honorific statue on the Acropolis would have been a delicate one. The dignity and rank of the bidder had to accord with the location and style of the statue. In any case, the popular participation recalls what Aristotle wrote in his *Athenaion Politeia* (47,2) about the leasing, most probably by auction,¹⁹ of mine-working and tax-collecting: "to whomsoever the Boule chooses by vote, they (*poletai*) ratify (the leased mines...)" (καὶ κυροῦσιν, ὅτῳ ἂν ἡ βουλὴ χειροτονήσῃ). The terminology of the Lindian decree is very similar (lines 35–36), and just as in Athens the *poletai* who were responsible for the leasing would ratify the vote of the Council, one may assume that the vote of the Lindians was formally confirmed by the *epistatai* who had launched the auction. By the way, if the conduct at the Lindian assembly was similar to the Rhodian one, the voting was performed with dignity, by a mere nod.²⁰

Unfortunately, just as no lists of private subscribers to the Lindian fund are preserved, nothing is known about how much money was collected at the auction. Much would have depended on the auctioned items and the interest of the participants. A Heracles αὐτῷ τῷ ἄκρῳ (31) might have aroused considerable passion, while the starting bid for, say, a local notable ἐν τῷ ἀναβάσει (31) was probably lower. Many recycled inscriptions are preserved on the Lindian Acropolis but it is impossible to know whether some could be connected with this decree.²¹

¹⁹ As pointed out by Langdon (n. 15), 259, 261, against the view of Klaus Hallof.

²⁰ Aristid. *Or.* 24, 56.

²¹ Chr. Blinkenberg, the editor of *I. Lindos*, suggested that a number of statue bases from the Acropolis could be related to the decree (Nos. 556–558 of his edition [*"I^{er} s. P."*], cf. *I. Lindos* vol. II, p. 896 n. 1). In these cases, after the erasure of the original text, the name ΛΙΝΔΙΟΙ would have been added above the erased inscription. However, this would mean that some statues had been purchased by the city itself. This sounds

Even though the inscriptions were probably purchased because of the statues they supported, and also because of their location, the official objects of the whole affair were the inscriptions, and so it is logical that the lessees could not make claims to the statues. Moreover, removing them from the Acropolis would be an impious act. This would accord with the notion that some of them probably represented gods. But it does not exclude the possibility that some were honorific *anathemata* since the removal of any statues from the sacred area of the Acropolis might have been taken as a profanation. However, the Lindians were not that rigid since, if someone preferred to exchange one statue for another,²² they might allow this upon request.²³ It would be interesting to know if, and why, any statues were replaced by others. If a bidder wished to switch the inscription on a statue so as to be honoured himself, the style and type of the *andrias* would have been of minor import because everybody knew that *andriantes* (unlike, presumably, the *eikones*) did not necessarily aim at likeness. Growing tired of one's statue over time seems a less plausible motive than a bidder's premeditated decision to change it immediately after purchase, whatever the reason for this may have been.

The Lindian decree is one of those cases where a historian is entitled to say that what is related by an ancient author is nicely illustrated by an epigraphic discovery. Since the above-mentioned Rhodian speech (No. 31) by Dio of Prusa is an attack against the uncontrolled re-use of ancient statues by the Rhodian people.²⁴ The speech, probably delivered to the Rhodian assembly under Trajan's reign,²⁵ provides a most elaborate display

somewhat peculiar, though anyone could bid, of course.

²² Blinkenberg restored the infinitive ἀπενενκεῖν in lines 41 and 44. This may be correct in line 41, also because the verb is followed by ἐκ τᾶς ἄκρας. However, in the other case one might rather think of [μετενενκ]εῖν, cf. L. Robert, *Hellenica* 2 (1946) 111. Like μετατιθέναι, this verb suggests 'exchanging' the statue for another. On the other hand, it may rather be that one of the verbs recurs in both lines because repetitive style is characteristic of ancient decrees and proceedings.

²³ A similar case is known from *I. Hierapolis* 27: statues dedicated by an individual should not be removed without public agreement (εἰ μὴ συγχωρηθεῖη [ὑπὸ τῆς πατρίδος μο[υ]). For the need for public approval in matters concerning statues, see above at n. 2.

²⁴ C. P. Jones, *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom*, Cambridge (Mass.) – London 1978, 26 ff.

²⁵ The speech was earlier dated to Vespasian's time, but cf. H. Sidebottom, *Historia* 41

of the author's arguments for his cause. By far the longest among the extant speeches of Dio, it produces an exhaustive mass of considerations for and against the main thesis, so that some readers (including me) may find it tiresome and too repetitive. However, Dio's exposition is full of interesting details, some of which are directly relevant to the present case. Apart from the discussion of *asemos* (above), for example, Dio reports the local version of the origin and development of the ignoble practice (31,141):²⁶

they tell us that this practice began with the statues that were broken and not even standing on their pedestals; it was these that the chief magistrates (*strategoî*) used after repairing them and in a way making them altogether different; then the next step was that those which were well preserved but bore no inscriptions were inscribed; and at last came the taking of some statues which did have inscriptions on them, provided they were very old.

Or, when referring to statues on sacred land, he states (31,87):

For you Rhodians are perfectly aware that, while the whole city is sacred, yet you will find that many of the statues which stand within your very sanctuaries have been subjected to this indignity. For it so happened that these are very ancient; and whenever one of your chief magistrates wants to flatter any person, he is always eager, carrying out the idea that you are giving the honour, to have him set up in bronze in the finest possible place.

One of the main points in Dio's speech is that, though they are cultivated and prosperous, and their city is the last true stronghold of Hellenism, the Rhodians nevertheless show little respect for their glorious past. By shamelessly destroying the statues of their ancient benefactors, under the plea of saving expenses, or for other reasons, the Rhodians in fact betray themselves. However, though described by Dio as typically Rhodian, this practice is well known all over the ancient world, being attested not only by recycled inscriptions but also by various literary sources besides Dio Chrysostom (Cassius Dio, Cicero, Diogenes of Laertes, Favorinus, Pausanias, Philo, Pliny the Elder, Plutarch).²⁷ In the Greek East, with the expansion of Roman rule, numerous old statues went to Roman individuals,

(1992) 407 ff.; S. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250*, Oxford 1996, 428 f.; G. Salmeri, in: S. Swain (ed.), *Dio Chrysostom. Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*, Oxford 2000, 77 n. 115, 82 n. 140.

²⁶ Translations of this and the next passage are by J. W. Cohoon (Loeb ed. 1940).

²⁷ Some of these are discussed by W. Kendrick Pritchett, *Pausanias Periegetes I*, Amsterdam 1998, 87 ff.

generals, office-holders, and others. Many of the Romans residing or travelling in the Greek East were anxious to be honoured with statues there, no matter whether new or ancient. According to Dio, the Rhodians also pointed out that many of the visitors honoured were Romans (e.g., 31,43). Some, however, refused, like Cicero who loved Athens and wanted a monument of his own there but hated the altering of inscriptions on statues:

Equidem valde ipsas Athenas amo. Volo esse aliquod monumentum, odi falsas inscriptiones statuarum alienarum (Att. 6,1,26).

To conclude, the "leasing out" of inscriptions described in the Lindian decree from A.D. 22 shows a very specific, and lucrative, way of managing the re-use of inscriptions and statues. The case seems unique, though the possibility exists that similar procedures were known elsewhere, too.²⁸ However, the Lindians of the early Empire were no novices in the art of collecting money. An early and illustrious pioneer, Cleobulus, one of the Seven Sages, came from their city. He was credited the invention of a peculiar ceremony, "Playing the Swallow" (χελιδονίζειν), during which little boys went about singing a Swallow-Song at the annual return of the birds in the month of Badromios. According to Theognis, who described the practice in the Second Book of his *Rhodian Festivals*, this institution resulted from the need to collect money during hard times. In the course of the ritual, the citizens were supposed to make donations. The position of those who refused grew worse, as emerges from the lyrics of the song:

If you give us something – otherwise, we won't let you be. We'll carry off your front door, or the lintel over it, or the goodwife sitting within. She's a little thing, we can easily lift her. So if you give us anything, make it something big!²⁹

Fortunately, such menaces were unnecessary during the crisis of A.D. 22. But what would be the case if some auctioned inscriptions were not bid upon?

Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, Rome

²⁸ Though nothing points to an auction, there is something similar in *IGLS* IV 1261 (Laodicea ad mare in Syria): erecting a statue within a temenos involved payment of a fee (lines 22–25).

²⁹ Ath. 8,360 c (*FrGrH* III 526), transl. C. B. Gulick (Loeb ed. [1930], vol. 4, p. 131). For the verb χελιδονίζειν, and similar expressions, see my remarks in *Arctos* 33 (1999) 50.