



ΑΦΕΣΙΜΟΣ: A NEW READING IN THE OPRAMOAS DOSSIER FROM RHODIAPOLIS

Author(s): C. Bailey

Source: *Phoenix*, Vol. 67, No. 1/2 (Spring-Summer/printemps-été 2013), pp. 135-150

Published by: Classical Association of Canada

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7834/phoenix.67.1-2.0135>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Classical Association of Canada is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Phoenix*

JSTOR

ΑΦΕΣΙΜΟΣ: A NEW READING IN THE OPRAMOAS DOSSIER
FROM RHODIAPOLIS

C. BAILEY

THE SECOND-CENTURY A.D. BENEFACTOR OPRAMOAS OF RHODIAPOLIS is an important figure in any discussion of civic euergetism in Asia Minor or, indeed, in the entire Roman empire. The record of Opramoas' euergetism is largely preserved for us in the Opramoas dossier at Rhodiapolis. This collection of documents includes thirty-two decrees of the Lycian *koine*, twenty-six letters from Roman officials, and twelve letters from the emperor, all dated to between approximately A.D. 120 and 160.¹ A number of shorter inscriptions from other cities in Lycia also identify some of his local gifts or record honours voted to him.² It is not my intention here to offer a new discussion of the entire dossier or of the import of Opramoas' euergetism; Christina Kokkinia's text and extensive commentary will satisfy the reader in those respects.³ I wish instead to suggest a new reading to one of the documents in the dossier to shed light on the occasion upon which one of Opramoas' benefactions was offered. The occasion of the benefaction is often as important as the gift itself. In the case of Opramoas' cash distribution to the Lycian *koine*, the occasion enhances the quality of the gifts.

Since the initial discovery of the inscription adorning the tomb of Opramoas in Rhodiapolis, the details of his generosity have been carefully reconstructed, although the fragmentary nature of the inscription will continue to invite analysis. Fragments of the inscription remain at Rhodiapolis in Lycia. Kokkinia was able to inspect many of these first-hand, but some smaller fragments have been lost since earlier editions.⁴ My concern here is with one such fragment, which Heberdey was able to place at the ends of lines IX G1–3 (Figure 1). Photos of some of the blocks, including one which contains the ends of lines VIII G2–7 and the beginnings of IX G2–5 (Figure 2), are held in the photo archives of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (Istanbul).⁵ Heberdey's sketches of portions of the inscription may be consulted at the Österreichische Akademie der

I would like to thank the editor and anonymous reviewers at *Phoenix* for their suggestions and comments on this article.

¹Heberdey 1897; cf. Peterson and von Luschan 1889: 76–133; *IGRR* III.739; *TAM* II.3 905; Kokkinia 2000.

²For example, from Rhodiapolis: *TAM* II.3 907, 908, 915, 916; from Phaselis: *TAM* II.3 1203; from Xanthos: Balland 1981: 173–224, nos. 66–67; Coulton 1987.

³Kokkinia 2000.

⁴Kokkinia (personal correspondence).

⁵I would like to express my thanks to Christina Kokkinia for providing me with the location of this photograph, and to Anja Slawisch at the DAI (Istanbul) for providing the photograph.



Figure 1

Wissenschaften *Kleinasiatische Kommission* in Vienna.⁶ I have not been able to locate a sketch or photo of the small fragment containing the last letters of lines IX G1–3, whose location is now unknown. This fragment has, however, been included in line drawings of the inscription since Heberdey's edition (Figure 1).

The fragment belongs to the thirty-third document, one of several which refer to Opramoas' endowment for annual cash distributions to the *koine* of the Lycian *ethnos*. The document is a decree of the Lycian *koine* to report Opramoas' euergetism and generosity to Antoninus Pius just before A.D. 140 or 141.⁷ In resolving to do so, the *ethnos* was not acting unusually; indeed, it was performing its social obligation to ensure that Opramoas' generosity received the appropriate acknowledgement.⁸ It also recounts Opramoas' ancestry, his citizenship and involvement in the cities of Lycia, and his generosity to those cities. The decree notes his excellence and his service as agonothete; the distribution appears about halfway through the document. Opramoas' service as high priest and his attention to justice during his office conclude the decree. The distribution is described as follows (Kokkinia 2000: 42–43):

- IX G2 αἶς δὲ δωρεὰ[ς χρ]ημάτων ἐπιδε[δ]οκώ[ς],
 ἐξ ὧν ἡ κα[τ'] ἔτος [πρ]όσοδος ἐν ταῖς ἀί-
 σίμοις κ[α]ὶ σεβα[σ]μίοις ἡμέραις διανέ-
 μεταί, κοινῇ τε [τ]ῷ ἔθνεϊ ἄϊδιον δω-
 ρεὰν κεχάριστ[α]ι ἐς ὁμοίαν διανομήν

⁶Heberdey 1894.

⁷Kokkinia 2000: 42–43, IX F1–IX H8; cf. Heberdey 1897: 29, IX E15–IX H8.

⁸See Kokkinia 2000: 31, VI A2–4, VI C3; 54–58, XIII A11–F9; cf. the dispute between the citizens of Ephesus and the benefactor Vedius Antoninus (*IEph.* 1491–93), and the letter of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus to the Asiarch Aelius Martiales (*IEph.* 214); on Vedius Antoninus, cf. also Kalinowski 2002.



Figure 2

And having given gifts of money to these cities, the annual interest of which was to be distributed on the fated and revered days, he also gave a perpetual gift to the *koine* of the *ethnos* for a similar distribution.⁹

The endowment to fund the annual distributions was established early in Opramoas' career, not long before A.D. 124 after his service as *archiphylax*. Elsewhere in the document, we learn that the endowment was 55,000 denarii. The interest on this endowment was to be distributed to "those who gather for the common elections of the *ethnos*, the electoral officers, the members of the council, the common magistrates, and those who traditionally receive a share."¹⁰ The total available interest, the number of recipients, and the size of the individual shares are never specified. However, if the nine per cent specified in Gaius Vibius Salutaris' endowment in Ephesus approximately twenty years earlier is comparable, Opramoas made slightly less than 5,000 denarii available for distribution each year—a substantial amount.¹¹

The occasion of the annual distribution is specified here (and only here) as αἵσμοι καὶ σεβάσμοι ἡμέραι. Elsewhere, the distribution takes place explicitly

⁹ὅμοιαν διανομήν, "for a similar distribution," indicates both that the interest of the endowment to the *koine* was to be distributed every year, and that it was to be distributed on the days mentioned here, that is, on the αἵσμοι καὶ σεβάσμοι ἡμέραι. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations are my own.

¹⁰Kokkinia 2000: 30, V H6–12: ἐπιδοῦς τῷ ἔθνει ἀργυρίου δηνάρια | πεντάκις μύρια καὶ πεντάκις χεῖλια ὅστε | τὸν κατ' ἔτος τόκον αὐτῶν χωρεῖν εἰς διανομήν τοῖς συνιοῦσιν εἰς τὰ κοινὰ τοῦ ἔθνους ἀρχαιρέσια ἀρχοστάταις καὶ βουλευταῖς καὶ κοινοῖς ἀρχουσι καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς ἐξ ἔθους λαμβάνουσιν. Cf. Kokkinia 2000: 31, VI B10–13; 32–33, VI D15–E5, VI F2–6; 40–41, IX B7–12; IX G2–5; 60, XIV C10–D1.

¹¹*IEph.* 27B, 220–222: Salutaris' 20,000 denarii endowment was expected to generate 1,800 denarii per year, of which only a portion was devoted to cash distributions.

or implicitly at the elections of the Lycian *koine*,¹² that is, the election days are described in the thirty-third document as ἀΐσμοι καὶ σεβάσμοι ἡμέραι. This singular description of the occasion deserves comment, but the first adjective is fragmentary. It was originally restored as [ἐπι]σήμοις.¹³ Heberdey was able to correct this with the lost fragment containing the end of lines IX G1–3 to ἀΐ[πι]σήμοις (<ἐ>πισήμοις),¹⁴ and the adjective makes sense here. The interest from Opramoas' capital endowment would have been distributed on conspicuous (or noteworthy) and revered days. Such a reading, however, causes difficulties.

We can only read ἐπίσημοις if we assume and restore a spelling error of αἰπι- for ἐπι-. Spelling errors and errors by the letter cutter do appear in the inscription, and even in this document (κέρρηται{ι} in line IX F8).¹⁵ It is, I think, probable that there is a spelling mistake in the adjective, but there is no need to restore an error. It is, of course, possible that in ἀΐ[πι]σήμοις we have not a spelling error, but a spelling variation. A lengthened αἰπι- for ἐπι- is not entirely unknown in inscriptions of imperial date. The variation appears in a funerary monument from Attaleia in Pamphylia and in an inscription from Pisidia honouring a successful athlete and council member.¹⁶ It also appears in a single inscription from Lycia, from the city of Olympos, identifying a man, his wife, and his two sons, one of whom was named Aipistrategios.¹⁷ The lengthened vowel, however, appears only very rarely, usually in the names of people or places. It does not appear in the Opramoas dossier; ἐπίσημος, however, does. The documents which make up the dossier were chosen, arranged, and edited preparatory to their final publication.¹⁸ Since ἐπίσημος appears without a spelling variation in other documents in the dossier, we can reasonably suppose that ἐπισήμοις would have been spelled as such here if it were the word required or wanted, unless an error were made.¹⁹

When we consider the other appearances of ἐπίσημος in the dossier, however, it becomes clear that it was neither required nor wanted in our document. The adjective appears once in the twenty-first document, once in the fifty-fourth document, and four times in the sixtieth document. The twenty-first document,

¹² Kokkinia 2000: 30, V H6–12; cf. 31, VI B10–13; 32–33, VI D15–VI E5, VI F2–6; 40, IX B7–12; 60, XIV B10–D1.

¹³ Peterson and von Luschan 1889: 91, 108.

¹⁴ Heberdey 1897: 29, IX G3; cf. *IGRR* III.739, VII.96.

¹⁵ There are, however, relatively few mistakes in the dossier as a whole: thirteen errors in 7000 words (Kokkinia 2000: 12, 14–15).

¹⁶ Attaleia: *Monumenti Antichi* 23: 29, 21: δς ἄν ἔθ[ε]ρον πτω[μ]α αἰπιβά|[λ]η δῶσι [τ]ῶ [ἰ]ε[ρ]ωτ[ά]τ[ω] τα[μ]ε[ί]ω [δ]ηνώρια; Pisidia: *SEG* 6.609 = 14.810 = 36.1203.14 (dated later than A.D. 235): [Ἀσκλ.]ήπεια ἐν Αἰπι[δαύρω].

¹⁷ *TAM* II.3, 1097: Ζωσιμάς Δ[ιο]τείμου π<ρ>ογονικῶν κατεσκευάσεν ἑαυτῷ καὶ | γυναικὶ Εὐκαρπία καὶ υἱοῖς Πορφύρω κ[α]ὶ Αἰπισ[τ]ρατηγίῳ, | ἑτέρῳ δὲ οὐδενί.

¹⁸ Kokkinia 2001: 17–18; D'Hautcourt 2002.

¹⁹ Cf. below, 142, n. 39 and *SEG* 2.746: ἐδεσιμωτάτου ἐπισκόπου (for αἰδεσιμωτάτου ἐπισκόπου).

an honorary decree, identifies Opramoas as outstanding, ἐπίσημος, among his ancestors.²⁰ We should note that in this case the adjective is entirely restored. The fifty-fourth document, like the thirty-third, is a decree of the Lycian *koine* resolving to report Opramoas' euergetism to Antoninus Pius. The benefactions to be reported include his construction of two temples of the ἐπίσημοι θεοί in Rhodiapolis.²¹ The ἐπίσημοι θεοί are Tyche and Nemesis, as a later document in the dossier informs us.²² The construction of the temples of the ἐπίσημοι θεοί is also reported in the sixtieth document.²³ This document also contains two partial restorations of the adjective, which are virtually certain, and one complete restoration.²⁴ It is only in this last case, with no trace of the adjective on the stone itself, that it is applied to ἡμέρα. Within the dossier, there is no clear use of ἐπίσημος ἡμέρα to parallel the restoration in IX G3, although the adjective was not unfamiliar to the letter cutter or the citizens of Rhodiapolis.

The restoration, however, is not without parallel. ἐπίσημος ἡμέρα does appear in second-century Lagina. Parallel inscriptions honour Marcus Ulpius Alexander Heraclitus and his wife, Ulpia Ammion, for, among other things, their service as gymnasiarchs on ἐπίσημοι ἡμέραι.²⁵ This appears, however, to be an unusual use of ἐπίσημος; nowhere else, to my knowledge, in the inscriptions from Asia Minor or Greece is the adjective applied to ἡμέρα. It is usually used to describe the location of a statue erected in honour of a benefactor, to describe the character of the benefactor himself, or to characterize the quality of his or her benefactions.²⁶

²⁰ Kokkinia 2000: 31, VI A13–15: [δς δὲ ἀντέγραψεν | τὸν Ὀπραμόαν] φῦν[αι ἐκ προγόνων ἐπίσημον?].

²¹ Kokkinia 2000: 55, XIII B12–14: ἐν τῇ μὲν Ῥοδιαπολειτῶν πόλει, τῇ] ἑαυτοῦ πατρίδι, μετὰ | τὸ πάσας τὰς ἀρχὰς φιλοτιμίως τετελεκεῖναι οἰκοδομήσεν δύο ναοὺς | ἐπισημων θεῶν.

²² Kokkinia 2000: 70, XIX A4–5: δύο ναοὺς Τύχης καὶ Νεμῆσεως.

²³ Kokkinia 2000: 67, XVII F6: δύο ναοὺς ἐπισημων ἀπαρτίζει.

²⁴ Kokkinia 2000: 66, XVII A14–B3: [τ]αῖς ἐπισημοτάταις | πόλεσιν, τῇ Μυρέω[ν καὶ τῇ Πα]τα[ρέων], | ἐν αἷς ἄγουσιν παγ[ηγύρεσιν ἐ]πι[ση]μοῖς θεῶν; XVII B4–6: [κ]ονήγια καὶ [μ]ο[νο]μαχίας καὶ θεωρί[ας ἐν ἐπισημοῖς?] | ἡμέραις.

²⁵ Diehl and Cousin 1887: 156–158, no. 63.3–4 = *IStrat.* 668: τὸ γυμνασιαρχῆσαι πάσαις | ταῖς ἑορτασίμοις καὶ ἐπισημοῖς τῆς θεοῦ ἡμέραις; cf. *IStrat.* 530.

²⁶ For the location, see, for example, *IEph.* 27A.87: ἐν [τε τῷ] ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐπισημοτάτοις | τόποις τῆς πόλεως; *JÖAI* 35 1943 Beibl: 121–126, line 10: ἀνδριάντος ἀνάστασιν αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ ἐπισημοτάτῳ τῆς ἀγ[ο]ρᾶς τόπῳ; *BE* 1969: 432.2–3; [ἀνδρι]άντι δς ἀνατεθήσεται ἐν τῷ ἐπισημοτάτῳ τοῦ γυμ[νασίου] τόπῳ; for the quality of the benefactor, Kokkinia 2000: 31, VI A13–15 (cf. above, n. 20); *TAM* II.1 301.3–5: υἰὸν ἀνδρὸς ἐπισημοῦ | βουλευτοῦ τελέσαντος | ἀρχάς; 304.3–4: υἰὸν ἀνδρὸς | ἐπισημοῦ βουλευτοῦ; *TAM* II.2 665.6–9: ἄνδρα καλὸν | [καὶ] ἀγαθὸν καὶ με[γαλό]φρονα, προγόνων ἐπισημοῦ; *TAM* V.2 973.20–22: βίον ἐξηκὼς ἀνεπίληπτον καὶ ἐν ἅ[πα]σι ἐπισημον καὶ τὰς τῆς πατρίδος | ἑκτενῶς πεπληρωκῶς λειτουργίας; for the quality of benefactions, *IEph.* 721b.19–20: [μ]εγάλους καὶ ἐπισημοῖς ἔργοις κ[ε] [κ]οσμηκότα τὴν ἑαυ[τοῦ] πατρίδα; 1545.7–9: [κ]αὶ ἄλλοις ἐπισημοῖς | [ἔ]ργοις κοσμήσαντα | τὴν Ἐφε[σί]ων πόλιν; *TAM* III.1 4.9–12: ἐν τε ἀναλώ[μασιν] ἐπισημοτάτοις καὶ ἐν προχρήσεσιν | ἀργυρίων καὶ ἐπιδόσεσιν καὶ δωρεαῖς καὶ ἰε[ρω]σύναις; *TAM* V.2 989.6–8: εἰρηναρχήσαντα ἐπισημοῦ καὶ ἀγορανομήσαν[τα] λαμπρῶς καὶ φιλοδόξως.

Kalinka preferred to read ἀ[σ]ίμοις rather than ἀ[πι]σ[ί]μοις in *TAM* II.3 905, although he notes the inscriptions from Lagina. Following Kalinka, Kokkinia also reads ἀ[σ]ίμοις.²⁷ While this reading does match the remains of line IX G3, it requires a spelling error at the beginning of line IX G4. The line drawing of the document published by Heberdey, followed by Kalinka and reproduced by Kokkinia, shows]ΣΙΜΟΙΣ at the beginning of line IX G4 (Figure 1).²⁸ A photograph taken by W. Schiele in 1969, however, after the block was broken into smaller pieces, shows a ligature between the second and third letters of the line, indicating ημ, not υμ (Figure 2). Consequently, before considering the possibility of a spelling error in line IX G4, we need to establish that]σ[ί]μοις is in fact a mistake. The ends of the lines are not aligned, so we can only estimate the number of letters lost in line IX G3. The end of this line is damaged, but there does appear to be room for two to four letters, depending on the width of each. The fragment contains the remains of the first two of these letters: an apex and the top quarter or third of a hasta survive. Lines IX G2 and G4, the longest lines in this portion of the inscription, suggest that at most two more letters could complete this line. Discounting α[ι]πίσημος, two adjectives could match the remains while preserving the ligature at the beginning of line IX G4, namely διάσημος and δίσημος.²⁹ διάσημος, “distinct or conspicuous,” is common in both literary and epigraphic sources.³⁰ Opramoas himself is described several times as a διασημότατος Λυκίαρχης, a *clarissimus* Lyciarch.³¹ Epigraphically, this adjective is most often applied to a person or an office, and occasionally to a city; it is never applied to ἡμέρα.³² The adjective appears only in the superlative in the Opramoas dossier and in most other uses. In the two uses of the positive degree of the adjective, it is applied to ἀνήρ.³³ Moreover, the apex of a triangular letter is visible on the line drawings, but the apex appears to belong to A rather than to Δ, which is slightly wider than A in the dossier (Figure 1). The apices of A and Δ also differ. The diagonal strokes of Δ appear to intersect and continue slightly above the apex; the extension of the diagonals of A beyond the apex is not as pronounced. The line drawing and

²⁷ *TAM* II.3 905.IX G2–5; Kokkinia 2000: 42–43, IX G2–5.

²⁸ See Peterson and von Luschan 1889: the line drawing on page 91 shows]ΣΙΜΟΙΣ but the ligature is resolved in the text on page 108 ([ἐπι]σ[ί]μοις).

²⁹ See Buck and Patterson 1970: 189.

³⁰ διάσημος: for example, Soph. *Phil.* 209; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 19.12.6; Plut. *Aem.* 12.2, 23.2; Ath. 1.1d, 5.216e.

³¹ Kokkinia 2000: 68, XVIII A4, XVIII B8; 72, [XIX D13–14], XIX E12; 73, XX B12.

³² See, for example, *TAM* III.1 89.1–5: τὸν διασημότατον ἡγεμόνα | Λυκίας Παμφυλί|αζ Τερέντιον | Μαρκιανόν; *IErythai*, 106.2: ἡ διασημοτάτη Ἐρύθρου πόλις; *IEph.* 3217b.22–23: Κλαυδίου Ἀριστίωνος | ἀνδρὸς διασημοτάτου; *IEph.* 2053.1–5: τὴν λαμπρο|τάτην καὶ διαση|μοτάτην Κολων[ί]αν Ἰουλίαν Κονκορ[δί]αν Καρθαγίναν.

³³ *IG* XII.3, 326.6–7: Τ. Φλάουιος Κλειτοσθένης Κλαυδιανὸς | ἀνὴρ γένους τε ἐπιφανεία διάσημος; *IEph* 27A.14–15: Γαίος] τε Οὐίβι[ος Σαλο]υτάριος, ἀ|νὴρ ἱππικῆς τά[ξε]ος, γένει καὶ ἀξία διάσημος.

the context both favour A over Δ.³⁴ δίσημος (“of two time-units”) is similarly inappropriate, although this adjective would not, in any case, give a meaningful sense.

Several difficulties, then, are presented by]σήμοις. Kalinka and Kokkinia accept that the ligature at the beginning of line IX G4 was mistakenly carved, reading αἰ|σίμοις κ[α]ἰ σεβα[σ]μίοις ἡμέραις. This is quite clearly an improvement in that it appears to match the remains of the fragment. In fact, the reading would seem obvious once we accept the possibility of a spelling error which is visible on the stone. The restoration, however, creates new problems, as Heberdey seems to have recognized in his preference for the unusual αἰ|[πι]σήμοις. An archaic term, αἴσιμος is used primarily in poetry; in fact, it is used most frequently by Homer.³⁵ The word does occur outside of Homer, but usually in quotations or paraphrases of Homer. With very few exceptions, the non-Homeric instances of αἴσιμος parallel the Homeric use. Derived from the noun αἴσα (“allotted share, destiny”), connotations of fate predominate in attributive uses; fatedness is apparent in predicative uses of the adjective as well, but in predicative and substantive uses, fittingness and appropriateness may also be implied, in the sense of fitting or appropriate to one’s fate or destiny.³⁶ An attributive use would be out of place in the context of the Opramoas dossier. As noted above, the]σίμοις κ[α]ἰ σεβα[σ]μίοις ἡμέραις were the days on which Opramoas’ distribution was to take place each year. The competitive spirit among benefactors and the corresponding enthusiasm for providing lavish and memorable gifts were high, but identifying the days of the distributions as αἴσιμοι ἡμέραι is rather heavy-handed, for the adjective would properly mean “fated” or “destined” here, not simply “appointed in advance.” The second meaning of the adjective is unsatisfactory, for it does not indicate appropriateness when used attributively. When associated with ἡμέρα in our literary sources (there is no instance of αἴσιμος ἡμέρα in the epigraphic record),

³⁴ A comparison of the apex on the lost fragment in the line drawing with Schiele’s photograph cannot offer any certainty on this point.

³⁵ I would like to express my thanks to W. Slater for suggesting this point to me. See Hom. *Il.* 8.72: ἔλκε δὲ μέσσα λαβόν· ῥέπε δ’ αἴσιμον ἡμᾶρ Ἀχαιῶν; 21.100: πρὶν μὲν γάρ Πάτροκλον ἐπισπεῖν αἴσιμον ἡμᾶρ; 22.212: ἔλκε δὲ μέσσα λαβόν· ῥέπε δ’ Ἔκτορος αἴσιμον ἡμᾶρ (= Plut. *Quomodo adul.* 17a3 = Aesch. fr. 205a5); Hom. *Od.* 16.280: δὴ γάρ σφι παρίσταται αἴσιμον ἡμᾶρ; *Hymn to Apollo* 356: ὅς τῃ γ’ ἀντιάσειε, φέρεσκέ μιν αἴσιμον ἡμᾶρ; *Anthologia Graeca* 14.99.4: ὅταν αἴσιμον ἡμᾶρ ἐπέλθῃ (= Aristid. Quint. 3.26.43, 64 = Paus. 9.14.3); cf. Quint. Smyrn. 2.417, 6.523–5244, 10.100, 164.

³⁶ For examples of fittingness or appropriateness, see Hom. *Il.* 6.62, 7.121, 15.207; *Od.* 2.231, 5.9, 7.310, 8.348, 14.433, 15.71, 21.294, 22.45–46, 23.14; cf. Plut. *De Is. et Os.* 357e10; Ath. 14.6b (quoting Hom. *Od.* 21.294); For examples of fatedness, see Hom. *Il.* 8.72, 9.244–245, 15.274, 21.100, 21.291, 21.495, 22.212; Hom. *Od.* 15.239, 16.280; *Hymn to Apollo* 356; cf. Hdt. 9.43.2; Plut. *Quomodo adul.* 17a3; Paus. 9.14.3; Aristid. Quint. 3.26.43, 3.26.45–46, 3.26.64; Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 4.1225–26; *Anthologia Graeca*, 14.99.4; for two of the few non-Homeric uses, cf. Arist. *Resp.* 473b23: αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα πνεύματος ἐλλείποντος ἐσέρχεται αἴσιμον ὕδωρ; and 474a2: πνεύματος ἐμπίπτοντος ὑπεκθέει αἴσιμον ὕδωρ.

αἴσιμος always means “fated” or “destined”: the adjective never means “fitting” or “appropriate” in such a use.

Elsewhere in Asia Minor, αἴσιμος does appear, but as a name in every case but one.³⁷ The only adjectival use is in a first-century A.D. funerary inscription from Mysia written, notably, in pentameter verse.³⁸ the word is a poetic one, and out of place in an honorary prose inscription or a decree of a provincial *koine*. We cannot suppose that the adjective was deliberately chosen in order to add an artificial, epic air to the text. Such an air would be immediately undone, for we should then expect αἰσίμοις ἡμασι, not αἰσίμοις ἡμέραις. In no case do we have an epigraphic parallel to support αἴσιμος ἡμέρα in the Opramoas dossier; rather, the use of αἴσιμος elsewhere in the epigraphic record of Asia Minor suggests that the adjective should not be restored here. It does fit the remains of the fragment, but the word does not make sense. It is worth noting again that in spite of the apparent match with the fragment, Heberdey did not suggest αἰ|σίμοις, αἰπίσημος for ἐπίσημος makes far better sense of the days on which the distributions in question were provided. As we have seen, however, there are objections to ἐπίσημος.

There are several alternatives which might be suggested based on the context and the remains, if one accepts a spelling error in the penultimate syllable. Kalinka notes ἐν ταῖς ἑορτασίμοις τῶν Σεβαστῶν ἡμέραις (*IGRR IV.1257 = OGIS 524.8*). ἑορτάσιμος, a festival day, appears in the two Lagina inscriptions noted above in association with ἐπίσημος, but is too long and does not fit the remains on the fragment. The first letter must be Α or Λ, since Δ does not seem to match the line drawing of the fragment. The second letter is visible only as the upper third or quarter of a hasta. There are several possible adjectives which may be considered: αἰδέσιμος, αἰρέσιμος, ἀνέσιμος, and ἀφέσιμος. Λ does not yield an adjective with the necessary hasta and a suitable number of letters for the line.

The first two adjectives may be dealt with quickly. αἰδέσιμος, “venerable” or “holy,” is used almost always in the superlative as an honorary title in epigraphic contexts. It always appears in a Christian context, often attached to the name of a Bishop.³⁹ The adjective also appears frequently in literary texts, but carries more reverence and awe than would seem to be appropriate here.⁴⁰ Moreover, although the first two letters match the traces of the inscription, the adjective

³⁷ See, for example, *Allertümer von Pergamon* 8.2, 605; 8.3, 39, 40 (Sextus Claudius Silianus Aisimos, son of Claudius Aisimos); *Milet* I.3, 38q.8; cf. *Lys.* 13.80.3, 81.2, 81.6, 82.7; *Paus.* 1.3.3, 4.5.10; *Archil.* 1.14.10; *Ar. Eccl.* 208.

³⁸ Peek 1955: 336–337, no. 1160.11–13: ἐπλετο δ' οὐ [γονέων] ταίμας χάρις, οὔτε γε πάπποι | βαιὸν ἐμῆ τῆφρηι βῶλον ἐπισκεδάσ[αι] | α[ϒ]σίμον; cf. *LW.* 1745.11–13: οὔτε γονεῦσιν ἔην | ταίμας χάρις οὔτε γε πάπποι | βαιὸν [τυμβ]ήρει βῶλον ἐπισ[κ]εδάσα[ι]. | ἠδονῆ [γ]άρ ἔ[χ]ειν.

³⁹ αἰδέσιμος: *SEG* 6.580 (Pisidia): ἐπὶ τοῦ αἰδεσιμωτάτου | ἐπισκόπου Ὀπίμο[υ]; cf. *SEG* 2.746, 6.581, 20.417, 36.1306, 39.1592; *Ismyrn.* 887.

⁴⁰ See, for example, *App. BC* 3.4.29: καὶ οὐδὲν ἔχοντος αἰδέσιμον ἢ τίμον ἐς πρεσβυτέρους τε καὶ ἐς ἄρχοντας; 3.8.62: καὶ γὰρ συνθεμένην διὰ δύο ἄνδρας αἰδεσίμους; 4.6.41; *App. Mith.* 15.102:

may be too long for the line (given the condition of the end of the lines, however, this cannot be certain). There is space for two to four letters, but the width of ΑΙΔΕ– would extend the line beyond IX G4. αἰρέσιμος, “that can be taken,” is related to αἵρεσις, which Thucydides uses for “appointment” or “selection,” or for “capture.”⁴¹ αἰρέσιμος, however, is not used, for example, as an election day, but rather for something which can be taken or captured and so would be inappropriate here.⁴² Moreover, ΑΙΠΕ– may also extend the line too far.

ἀνέσιμος is used by the *scholia* on Thucydides in a gloss on the celebration of a festival;⁴³ an ἀνέσιμος ἡμέρα is a holiday, and would be meaningful in the context of the thirty-third document. It is not without its problems, however. The adjective does not appear at all in the epigraphic record and is otherwise attested only in the *scholia* on Hesiod and in Michael Attalates.⁴⁴ The diagonal of N in this inscription is generally very thin, meeting the first vertical stroke a variable distance below the top, as we see in both the line drawings and Schiele’s photograph (Figure 2, note particularly ὑπεσχημένος, καὶ τοῦ μὲν, and λέγοντος at the ends of lines VIII G4–6). The line drawing would seem to rule out AN, as the diagonal stroke does not appear; more of the hasta remains without the diagonal than in most cases of N. λέγοντος in Schiele’s photograph, however, shows the diagonal joining the hasta significantly below the top. Line IX G3 may have included a similarly unusual N. Without the fragment itself, which is lost, ἀνέσιμος cannot be ruled out with certainty. The adjective does not appear in the epigraphic record, however, and it would therefore be unusual, although not impossible, in a second-century inscription.

The *Constitution of the Athenians* uses ἀφέσιμος as a holiday or, more properly, a day of exemption:

οἱ δὲ πρυτανεύοντες αὐτῶν πρῶτον μὲν συσσιτοῦσιν ἐν τῇ θόλῳ, λαμβάνοντες ἀργύριον παρὰ τῆς πόλεως, ἔπειτα συνάγουσιν καὶ τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον· τὴν μὲν οὖν βουλὴν ὅσαι ἡμέραι, πλὴν ἐάν τις ἀφέσιμος ᾖ, τὸν δὲ δῆμον τετράκις τῆς πρυτανείας ἐκάστης.

First the members of the prytany eat together in the Round House, at the State’s expense. Then they convene meetings both of the council and of the people: the council everyday, except when there is a day of exemption, the people four times in each prytany.

(*Ath. Pol.* 43.3 [tr. Rhodes])

οὔτω καὶ φεύγων καὶ ἀτυχῶν αἰδέσιμος ἔτι καὶ φοβερὸς ἦν; Paus. 3.5.6: ἦν δὲ ἄρα τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦτο ἐκ παλαιοῦ Πελοποννησίου πασιν αἰδέσιμον.

⁴¹ On appointment or selection, see, for example, Thuc. 2.58.2, 61.1; on capture, Thuc. 2.75.1, 3.97.1.

⁴² Xen. *Cyr.* 5.2.4: οὔτω δὲ ὁ Κῦρος αὐτὸς μὲν τῷ ὄντι βουλόμενος ἰδεῖν εἴ που εἴη αἰρέσιμον τὸ τεῖχος.

⁴³ Sch. Thuc. and Hes. 7.73.2 (s.v. καὶ ἅμα ἐορτῆς οὔσης): ἦγον ἀνεσίμου ἡμέρας.

⁴⁴ Sch. Hes. *In opera et dies* 559 (s.v. ταῦτα φυλασσόμενος) : εἰ δὲ τούναντίον αἰ νύκτες μακρὰ καὶ ἀνέσιμοι; Michael Attalates, *Historia* 234: καὶ παρὰ τοῦτο μὴ ἀνείσης τῇ Βύζαντος τὸ ἀνέσιμον καὶ τὴν χορηγίαν τῶν ἀναγκαίων, λαμπρῶς καὶ σὺν πολλῇ τῇ ἀκμαιότητι ἐκυρίευσεν.

Mikalson notes that the ἀφέσιμοι ἡμέραι, the days of exemption, are days of “recess” or “dismissal”; they were days off from public business.⁴⁵ This use of the adjective, as Rhodes notes in his commentary on the *Constitution of the Athenians*, is paralleled in Aelius Aristides’ fourth *Hieros Logos*.⁴⁶ When Aristides learned that one of the legates of Asia had confirmed his selection as a liturgist (he was to serve as ἐκλογεύς) despite an earlier grant of immunity, he appealed directly to the governor of the province in 151/152. His letter of appeal to the governor Pollio arrived on an ἀφέσιμος ἡμέρα, but, Aristides insists on noting, the proconsul read it anyway and instructed his legate to reverse his earlier confirmation of Aristides’ selection for the liturgy.⁴⁷ Aristides’ insistence that the day was ἀφέσιμος suggests that Pollio was under no obligation to consider Aristides’ petition that day, that it was a day of exemption from official and administrative business. The adjective carries a meaning, then, which fits the context of the inscription. We can hardly expect that the day on which the Lycian elections took place was not a day of recess from most official business. We should also note that Aristides’ fourth *Hieros Logos* is contemporaneous with the decree honouring Opramoas in the thirty-third document.

ἀφέσιμοι ἡμέραι are rare in the epigraphic record. Unlike ἀνέσιμος, however, ἀφέσιμος does appear in inscriptions, and always in association with ἡμέρα. Including the possible attestation in the Opramoas dossier, there are only four instances of the adjective, to my knowledge, one of which is very fragmentary.⁴⁸ In the third quarter of the second century B.C., Athens passed a decree concerning the revival of the cult of Apollo. This decree is fragmentary, particularly at that portion which is most relevant, but enough survives to offer a parallel.

τη. βου[-----]ατων ἐπὶ
 τῶν ε[-----] αἱ δὲ παρθένοι φερέτω]σ[α]ν τὸ ἱερὸν κα-
 νοῦν [τῷ θεῷ -----] ὅ[τ]αγ κατὰ τὰ πάτρια ἀφέσι-
 μοι ἡμ[έ]ραι -----] καὶ τὸν κοσμη-
 τήν καὶ π[-----] τῷ Ἄπολλωνι τῷ Ἀλεξικάκῳ
 ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ [ἀνίσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων τοῦς οἰκέτας] καὶ τοῦς δημοσίους πάν-
 τας {καὶ} λειτουργείας ἀπ[ὸ] πάσης - -]⁴⁹

and let the *parthenoi* carry the sacred basket to the god . . . whenever according to tradition the days of exemption . . . and the director and . . . to Apollo who wards off evil; and likewise that the household slaves be released from their labours and all the public servants from every liturgy . . .

⁴⁵ Mikalson 1975: 193.

⁴⁶ Aristid. *Hieros Logos* 4.98; Dindorf 1964: 1.530, 344: εἰς δὲ τὴν Φιλαδελφίαν ἀφίκοντο οἱ πεμφθέντες, καὶ ἦν μὲν ἀφέσιμος, ὡς ἔφασαν, ἡμέρα, ἥ τὰ γράμματα ἀπεδίδοσαν.

⁴⁷ Aristid. *Hieros Logos* 4.95–100; Behr 1968: 77–79; Aristides’ dispute over liturgical service did not, however, end with Pollio’s decision.

⁴⁸ *SEG* 17.17, 36.149, 41.39: -] ἢ ἀφέ[σιμον ἐναί (?)-], recording an agreement between Athens and Troezen.

⁴⁹ *LSS* 14.45–51 = *SEG* XXI 469.45–51.

The decree gives directions for the celebration of the Thargelia, assigning roles to the priest of Pythian Apollo, the archons, the *hierophantes*, and others. The ἀφέσιμοι ἡμέραι coincided with the Thargelia, or portions thereof, but we do not know what exactly happened on them. It seems, however, that they may have brought exemption from certain regular tasks.⁵⁰

A second inscription from Athens, also very fragmentary, reflects the use of the word in the *Constitution of the Athenians*:⁵¹

[-----]μορος,
[οἱ πρυτάνεις συναγόντων]
[καὶ τὴν βουλὴν καὶ τὸν δῆμον],
[τὴν μὲν οὖν βουλὴν]
[ἴσαι ἡμέ]ραι
[πλὴν ἐά]ν τις
[ἡμέρα ἀφ]έσιμος
[ἦ, τὸν δὲ δῆ]μον
[τετράκις τῆς]
[πρυτανείας]
[ἐκάστης]

Let the *prytaneis* summon both the council and the assembly, the council on everyday except if there is a day of exemption, and the assembly four times in each prytany.

The *prytaneis* are to summon the council on those days which are not ἀφέσιμοι; on those days which are ἀφέσιμοι, the members of the council are clearly not expected to meet: they are days off.

While the epigraphic evidence for ἀφέσιμος comes centuries before the Opramoas dossier, this is not problematic in view of the fact that Aristides uses the adjective in precisely the same manner as the *Constitution of the Athenians*. The interest of the authors of the Second Sophistic in classical words and usage is all too familiar. The evidence for the use of ἀφέσιμος (unlike ἀΐσιμος or ἀνέσιμος) in Asia Minor in the mid-second century A.D. makes it a plausible candidate for the thirty-third document of the Opramoas dossier.

Such a reading, however, is not immediately apparent from the traces of the inscription. The available illustrations do not provide conclusive support. The line drawings of the fragment at the end of line IX G3 must be used cautiously, as we have already seen: they do not show the ligature at the beginning of IX G4 which appears in Schiele's photograph. Nonetheless, the line drawings in Heberdey and Kokkinia must suffice, since neither a photograph nor a squeeze of this fragment is available, and Heberdey's sketches of the fragments seen on his 1894 journey to Lycia do not include this fragment.⁵² The initial alpha is

⁵⁰One may note the restoration of ἀνίσθαι two lines below ἀφέσιμοι ἡμέραι, related to ἀνέσιμος (LSJ s.v. ἀνέσιμος). On ἀφέσιμοι there is release from (ἀνίσθαι) from labours.

⁵¹IG II.5 4334.1–11.

⁵²Heberdey 1894.

virtually assured, but the second letter is less clear. The hasta does not appear to extend above the level of the line as we would expect of a phi and as we see in the case of μ[εγ]αλοφρόνως in the eighth line or ἐφ' ο[ῦ] π]ᾶσιν the ninth line. The extension of the hasta, however, may not be enough on its own to dismiss the possibility that the letter originally represented was not an iota but a phi. Moreover, the upper loop of a phi may be visible on the line drawing. It is unclear if this is an illusion caused by the fracture. ἀφέσιμος would fit into the remaining space at the end of line IX G3, even with the addition of the relatively wide epsilon, for which there does seem to be room. A comparison of the individual letters in both the line drawing and the photograph suggest that ΑΦΕ– would occupy approximately the same space as ΑΙΠΙ– (and so would match the length of the line approximated by Heberdey). Certainty cannot be achieved since the ends of the lines are badly damaged, but ἀφέσιμος can be considered a reasonable alternative to αἴσιμος. This portion of the inscription would then read:

IX G2 αἴς δὲ δωρεὰ[ς χρ]ημάτων ἐπιθε[δ]οκῶ[ς],
 ἐξ ὧν ἡ κα[τ'] ἔτος [πρ]όσοδος ἐν ταῖς ἀφ[ε–]
 σ<ί>μοις κ[α]ὶ σεβα[σ]μίοις ἡμέραις διανέ–
 IX G5 μεταί, κοινῇ τε [τ]ῶ ἔθνεϊ αἴδιον δω–
 ρεᾶν κεχάριστ[α]ὶ ἐς ὁμοίαν διανομήν.⁵³

Reading ἀφέσιμος is not without its difficulties, but it does seem to be a more reasonable reading than the alternatives.⁵⁴ αἴσιμος is archaic, poetic, and out of place in an official document. ἀνέσιμος is not supported by the epigraphic evidence. ἐπίσημος requires us to assume and restore a spelling error in order to read a word which would be unusual in the context. It is true that ἀφέσιμος also requires a spelling error, but it is more reasonable to correct an existing spelling error than to create a spelling error which must then be corrected.

Moreover, if Opramoas' euergetism took place on ἀφέσιμοι ἡμέραι rather than on αἴσιμοι or ἐπίσημοι ἡμέραι, the perceived quality of the benefaction would be enhanced. It is not necessary here to discuss the institution of euergetism in great detail, but the context of Opramoas' distributions is important for the reading of the inscription. Distributions of food, oil, or money were far from the most prestigious benefactions; indeed, Plutarch describes the honour and repute earned from such distributions as ephemeral.⁵⁵ An annual or regular distribution, such as that established by Opramoas, offered more prestige than a one-time gift, but even annual gifts provided only uncertain reputation and fame, as Plutarch suggests. Opramoas' distributions, however, drew attention not simply to him as a benefactor, but to the day itself and to the elections. The

⁵³ Kokkinia 2000: 42–43.

⁵⁴ The implications of ἀφέσιμος (“day of exemption”), which I note below, are equally applicable to ἀνέσιμος (“holiday”). I prefer ἀφέσιμος to ἀνέσιμος because the latter is not epigraphically attested, while the former is.

⁵⁵ Plut. *Præ. ger. reip.* 802d, 821f–822a; cf. *IEph.* 214, 1491–93; Bell 2004.

timing ensured a larger audience for his munificence, which magnified the gift and enhanced the prestige gained by Opramoas, since he would be associated with the days of exemption and the elections.⁵⁶

To draw a comparison with a parallel case from Attica, the tomb of Herodes Atticus “near the Panathenaic” afforded Herodes a symbolic supervision over the Panathenaic games even after his death in A.D. 179.⁵⁷ Opramoas’ provision of cash gifts at the elections of the *koine* of the Lycian *ethnos* offered a similar metaphorical presence, even when he neither held nor stood for an elected (or appointed) position. Euergetic display in the first and second centuries A.D. allowed the benefactor to demonstrate his or her generosity, and the beneficiary to assert his or her belonging to the city or, in this case, the *koine*. During the hellenistic period, by attending celebratory and military processions, “people were ritually confirmed in a respective position of passive subjecthood at once both physical and symbolic.”⁵⁸ Opramoas’ distributions at the elections may have allowed him to suggest a similar relationship between himself and the political participation in his community. He thereby indicated concern for the *ethnos* and for the continuing political well-being of the *koine* even on days of exemption.⁵⁹

Opramoas is not the only Lycian benefactor to provide distributions to the electoral officers and establish a presence at the elections. At the beginning of the third century A.D., for example, Naeuius of Balbura was honoured after having given distributions to the election officers, the members of the council, and the common magistrates.⁶⁰ Timing his distributions to coincide with the elections made Opramoas’ concern for the well-being of the Lycians apparent to the entire *ethnos*; it also gave the citizens the opportunity to express their approbation of him in a very public forum.⁶¹ The attendance of the voting citizens combined with the provision of the distribution ensured that the entire political process was inseparable from Opramoas’ munificence. He was a benefactor of all the voters and thereby of the election itself, or at least he presented himself as such. Opramoas’ distributions ensured that he was physically and symbolically present at the elections by virtue of his benefaction. He thus maintained a prominent

⁵⁶ See Bell 2004: 128–129; Gleason 2006: 237.

⁵⁷ Rife 2008: 121.

⁵⁸ Bell 2004: 130.

⁵⁹ See Engelmann 2005: 123.

⁶⁰ *LW*. 1221.41–44: δόντα δὲ καὶ τοῖς συνε[λ]θοῦσιν Λυκίων ἀρχοστάταις | καὶ βουλευταῖς καὶ κοινοῖς ἀρχου[σ]ιν διανομῆς ἀνά (δηνάρια) β’ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων; this, however, was a one time distribution, not a distribution funded from an endowment; cf. *IGRR* III.473, *TAM* II.1 508. Similarly, the statues commissioned by Gaius Vibius Salutaris at the beginning of the second century A.D. in Ephesus were to be displayed at meetings of the Ephesian assembly (*Ieph*. 27A.48–52). This ensured the symbolic presence of Artemis (in various incarnations), of Trajan and Plotina, of the Senate, Equestrian order, and People of Rome, and of the public institutions and citizens of Ephesus, not to mention the benefactor, Salutaris himself.

⁶¹ See Bell 2004: 174; Cic. *Sest.* 106: “The verdict and inclination of the Roman *populus* regarding the *res publica* can best be expressed in three places: a *contio*, the *Comitia*, and the crowd at games and gladiatorial shows.” The *populus Romanus* is not a direct parallel to the Lycian *koine*, but the sentiment is comparable.

and lasting position in the public life of the Lycian *koine* beyond that of a euergetic magistrate.⁶²

The description of the distribution in the thirty-third document is, therefore, very important in that it is only here that the occasion of the distribution is not described as the elections of the *koine* of the Lycian *ethnos*. In every other mention of the distribution in the dossier, the elections are emphasized through the presence of the ἀρχοστάται, who, unlike the other recipients, are consistently identified: Opramoas provided distributions above all to the ἀρχοστάται.⁶³ Opramoas initially chose the election days as the occasion for his display, but subsequently described it, or allowed the occasion to be described, as the ἀφέσιμοι καὶ σεβάσιμοι ἡμέραι.⁶⁴ Engelmann has argued that Opramoas' tenure as *archiphylax* was informed by a concern for the welfare of the *koine* as a whole.⁶⁵ Such a concern is, perhaps, made clearer by the use of ἀφέσιμος. His provision of distributions ensured that his example would be obvious to the members of the council, the magistrates, and his successors in the office of *archiphylax*. The use of ἀφέσιμοι ἡμέραι in the thirty-third document suggested that even on days off from public business, Opramoas continued to benefit and oversee the welfare of the *koine*.

The description in the thirty-third document of the distributions as taking place on ἀφέσιμοι ἡμέραι, “days of exemption,” rather than on the election days τοῖς συνιούσιν εἰς τὰ κοινὰ τοῦ ἔθνους ἀρχαιρέσια, “for those who gather for the common elections of the *ethnos*,” enhances the element of magnificence in a way that “election days,” or even ἐπίσημοι ἡμέραι, simply could not. Thériault has noted that the gymnasium was “un lieu de promotion par excellence pour l'évergétisme,”⁶⁶ but in the increasingly hereditary elite and bouletic classes, elections within a provincial *koine* may have played a similar role. ἀφέσιμοι ἡμέραι could serve as an example of what Plutarch describes as “an occasion which offers a good and excellent pretext, one which is connected with the worship of a god and lends the people to piety,”⁶⁷ allowing Opramoas to show

⁶² See Rife 2008: 95.

⁶³ Kokkinia 2000: 31, VI B12–13: τοῖς ἀρχοστάταις [καὶ] τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς ἐξ ἔθνους λαμβάνουσι; 32, VI E4–5: [τοῖς] ἀρχοστάταις καὶ κοινοῖς ἀρχουσι καὶ [τοῖς] λοιποῖς ἐξ ἔθνους λαμβάνουσι; 33, VI F4–6: τοῖς ἀρχοστάταις καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς ἐξ ἔθνους λαμβάνουσι; 41, IX B10–12: τοῖς ἀρχοστάταις καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς ἐξ ἔθ[ο]υς λαμβάνουσιν; 60, C11–D1: [τοῖς ἀρχοσ]τάταις καὶ βο[υ]λευταῖς καὶ κοινοῖς ἀρχουσι–.

⁶⁴ Kokkinia 2000: 190–210. The twenty-first document contains the first specific mention of the endowment and distribution at the elections, and may be dated to the proconsulship of Sufena Verus and the priesthood of Jason the son of Embromus, that is, shortly before A.D. 125. The thirty-third document, specifying the ἀφέσιμοι καὶ σεβάσιμοι ἡμέραι, may be dated by the proconsulship of Gnaeus Cornelius Proculus to just before 141 (Kokkinia 2000: 190–210).

⁶⁵ Engelmann 2005; cf. above, 147.

⁶⁶ Thériault 2003: 250. It should be noted that Thériault discusses burials in the gymnasium in this context.

⁶⁷ Plut. *Prae. ger. reip.* 822c (tr. Fowler).

his attention to the *koine*, and the citizens to assert their involvement in the *koine*.

Although my concern here has been with Opramoas' cash distributions at the elections, we must not forget that he did provide a number of more enduring gifts to the Lycians.⁶⁸ The distributions on the ἀφέσιμοι ἡμέραι served to associate the cash distributions not only with the elections, but also with his construction of buildings and monuments and his liturgical service throughout Lycia, which continued after the initial endowment. The donations commemorate and mark Opramoas' continuing and widespread service to the entire *koine*, earning him a prestige which was much greater than that of a distribution offered to mark the dedication of a building, the assumption of a public office, or a coming-of-age.⁶⁹

Thus, ἀφέσιμος provides a subtle and meaningful description of the days on which Opramoas offered his distribution without stressing the details of the endowment and the list of recipients. ἀφέσιμος is a term which does credit to the reputation of Opramoas himself, without the epic air of αἴσιμος. He did not establish a quinquennial festival of which he or a member of his family was the regular agonothete in the style of Gaius Julius Demosthenes, or an annual parade to celebrate his native city's history in the style of Gaius Vibius Salutaris, both of whose endowments were available as precedents for Opramoas' own euergetism; he did, however, establish himself as an outstanding benefactor (indeed, an ἐπίσημος benefactor) of the Lycian *koine* on a continuing basis.

Opramoas was making his distributions on a very timely, meaningful, and visible day each year. By placing his distributions on the election days and ἀφέσιμοι ἡμέραι, Opramoas reminded the Lycian *ethnos* of his service and his continuing concern for it even on days when he could have exempted himself. He became a sort of overseer of the elections, of the magistrates, and of the entire *koine*, for not only did his distributions take place on election days, the elections also took place on the days of his distributions.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
MACÉWAN UNIVERSITY
10700 – 104 AVENUE
EDMONTON, ALBERTA
T5J 4S2

BaileyC26@macewan.ca

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Balland, A. 1981. *Fouilles de Xanthos 7: Inscriptions d'époque impériale du Létôon*. Paris.
Buck, C. D. and W. Patterson. 1970. *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives*. New York.
Behr, C. A. 1968. *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales*. Amsterdam.

⁶⁸ See Balland 1981: 173–224, nos. 66 and 67; Coulton 1987; Kokkinia 2001.

⁶⁹ See Plin. *Ep.* 10.116–117.

- Bell, A. 2004. *Spectacular Power in the Greek and Roman City*. Oxford.
- Coulton, J. J. 1987. "Opramoas and the Anonymous Benefactor," *JHS* 107: 171–178.
- Diehl, C. and G. Cousin. 1887. "Inscriptions de Lagina," *BCH* 11: 145–163.
- Dindorff, W. 1964. *Aristides*. Hildesheim.
- Engelmann, H. 2005. "Opramoas als Archiphylax (TAM II 3, 905)," *ZPE* 152: 121–124.
- Fowler, H. N. 1936. *Plutarch: Moralia 10*. Cambridge, MA.
- d'Hautcourt, A. 2002. Review of Kokkinia 2000. *BMCR* 2002.09.06. <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2002/2002-09-06.html>.
- Heberdey, R. 1894. *Skizzenbücher Lykien 1894 2: Milyas, Trykanda, Rhodiapolis, Korneis, Akalissos, Tolebessos*. Vienna.
- 1897. *Opramoas: Inschriften vom Heroon zu Rhodiapolis*. Vienna.
- Kalinka, E. ed. 1944. *Tituli Asiae Minoris* 2.3. Vienna.
- Kalinowski, A. 2002. "The Vedii Antonini: Aspects of Patronage and Benefaction in Second-Century Ephesos," *Phoenix* 56: 109–149.
- Kokkinia, C. 2000. *Die Opramoas-Inschrift von Rhodiapolis*. *Antiquitas* 40. Bonn.
- 2001. "Verdiente Ehren: Zu den Inschriften für Opramoas von Rhodiapolis und Iason von Kyaneai," *Antike Welt* 32: 17–23.
- Mikalson, J. D. 1975. *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year*. Princeton.
- Peek, W. 1955. *Griechische Versinschriften*. Berlin.
- Peterson, E. and F. von Luschan. 1889. *Reisen in Lykien, Milyas und Kibyratien*. Vienna.
- Rhodes, P. J. 1981. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford.
- Rife, J. 2008. "The Burial of Herodes Atticus: Elite Identity, Urban Society, and Public Memory in Roman Greece," *JHS* 128: 92–127.
- Thériault, G. 2003. "Évergétisme grec et administration romaine: La famille cniidienne de Gaios Ioulios Théopompos," *Phoenix* 57: 232–256.

FIGURES

Figure 1: Line drawing of IX G1–13 (Kokkinia 2000, Beilage 2).

Figure 2: Lines VIII G2–7 and IX G2–5 on the left and right, respectively, of the background block. DAI-Istanbul (D-DAI-IST-R 2976). ©DAI, Photo: W. Schiele (reproduced with permission, all rights reserved).