Alexander the Great and the Double Nemesis:
The Construction of a Foundation Myth

Christina T. Kuhn

It was in the first and second centuries AD that the Graeco-Roman *poleis* of Asia Minor began to show an extraordinarily strong interest in their past and increasingly made foundation legends the focal point of their public representation.[1] The city of Smyrna was no exception. It prided itself on several glorious mythological and historical founders such as the Amazon, Theseus, Pelops and Alexander the Great.[2] Among the various foundation myths, the myth of Smyrna's foundation by Alexander as attested in Pausanias' *Periēgēsis* has particularly caught the attention of modern scholarship. As the story goes, the king of the Macedonians came, whilst hunting, to Mount Pagos. Exhausted, he fell asleep under a plane tree at the nearby temple of the Nemeseis. In a dream, two Nemeseis appeared to him; they told him to found a city at the place where he rested and to make the Smyrnaeans move from their former city (which had been destroyed) and settle there. The citizens thereupon sent ambassadors to the oracle of Apollo at Klaros near Kolophon, from whom they received the following promising message: 'Thrice blessed shall they be and four times blessed again, the men who shall dwell on Pagos beyond the holy river Meles'. As a result, the Smyrnaeans moved the new settlement across the river, and, in addition, started worshipping two Nemeseis rather than one.[3]

Pausanias' account, written in the second half of the second century AD, reveals some remarkable differences and inconsistencies when considered against the evidence of the earlier source material.[4] In his *Geography* Strabo does not mention Alexander as a founder of Smyrna at all. Instead, he attributes its foundation to Antigonos Monophthalmos and Lysimachos. He reports that Antigonos and later Lysimachos re-assembled the citizens, who had lived scattered in villages after the destruction of their

---

1   On the importance of foundation myths in the imperial period see Weiss (1984); Leschhorn (1984); Strubbe (1984-6); Chaniotis (1988), 135-139, 142-150; Scheer (1993); Lindner (1994); Chaniotis (2003); Price (2005); Kuhn (2009); Nollé (2009). For the importance of the past in the Second Sophistic see Bowie (1970); Cordovana - Galli (2007).

2   Cf. Kuhn (2009), 94-99.

3   Paus. 7.5.1-3: Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ὁ Φιλίππου τῆς ἐφ' ἡμῶν πόλεως ἐγένετο οἰκιστὴς κατ' ὄψιν ὀνείρατος· Ἀλέξανδρον γὰρ θηρεύοντα ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ Πάγῳ, ὡς ἐγένετο ἀπὸ τῆς θήρας ἀφικέσθαι πρὸς Νεμέσεων λέγουσιν ἱερόν, καὶ πηγῇ τε ἐπιτυχεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ πλατάνῳ πρὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, πεφυκυίᾳ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὕδατος. καὶ ὑπὸ τῇ πλατάνῳ καθεύδοντι κελεύειν φασὶν αὐτῷ τὰς Νεμέσεις ἐπιφανείσας πόλιν ἐνταῦθα οἰκίζειν καὶ ἄγειν ἐς αὐτὴν Σμυρναίους ἀναστήσαντα ἐκ τῆς προτέρας· ἀποστέλλουσιν οὖν ἐς Κλάρον θεωροὺς οἱ Σμυρναῖοι περὶ τῶν παρόντων σφίσιν ἐρησομένους, καὶ αὐτοῖς ἔχρησεν ὁ θεός τρὶς μάκαρες κεῖνοι καὶ τετράκις ἄνδρες ἔσονται, οἳ Πάγον οἰκήσουσι πέρην ἱεροῖο Μέλητος. οὕτω μετῳκίσαντο ἐθελονταὶ καὶ δύο Νεμέσεις νομίζουσιν ἀντὶ μιᾶς καὶ μητέρα αὐταῖς φασιν εἶναι Νύκτα, ἐπεὶ Ἀθηναῖοί γε τῇ ἐν Ῥαμνοῦντι θεῷ πατέρα λέγουσιν εἶναι Ὠκεανόν. On this foundation myth see Cadoux (1938), 94-97, 220-223; Leschhorn (1984), 217-218.

4   For a good overview of the source material see Parke (1985), 127-128. See also Cadoux (1938), 95-97; Dmitriev (2005), 258-259.

city by the Lydians,[5] thus implying that Antigonos and Lysimachos were the initiators of a *synoikismos*.[6] Equally, there is no mention of Alexander as a founder of the city in Tacitus' account of Smyrna's application for a temple for the imperial cult in 26 AD. Tacitus reports that when arguing their case before the Roman Senate, in competition with ten other *poleis* of Asia Minor, the Smyrnaean ambassadors proudly referred to the glorious foundation of their city by an Amazon, Theseus and Pelops as a mark of distinction.[7] In the time of Tiberius the idea of Alexander as a founder (*ktistēs*) had obviously not yet taken shape in the collective memory of the Smyrnaeans. It is indeed not until the middle of the first century AD that we encounter the first reference associating Alexander with the foundation of Smyrna. In his *Naturalis Historia* Pliny the Elder briefly mentions that Smyrna was founded by an Amazon and later restored by Alexander.[8] It is, however, not until the second half of the second century AD that the Smyrnaean foundation myth with Alexander in the role of a *ktistēs* is presented in the literary and numismatic sources with the key elements of Alexander's dream and the double Nemesis. This version of the legend has come down to us in the writings of Pausanias (see above) and Aelius Aristides.[9] The sleeping Alexander and the double Nemesis are furthermore depicted on the civic coins of Smyrna in the reigns of Marcus Aurelius and of the third century emperors Gordianus and Philippus.[10]

In view of these discrepancies and contradictions the historical evidence of our sources is by no means unambiguous. Was Alexander really involved in the foundation of Smyrna or were his 'successors', Antigonos Monophthalmos and Lysimachos, the genuine founders of the city? Those historians who (with some reservations) are willing to assign some historical credibility to Pausanias' story have attempted to reconcile the contradictory information in the sources as follows: when passing by the destroyed city of Smyrna on his campaign in 334 BC, Alexander decided to re-found the city, but, as he had to move on to fight the Persians, he delegated the various tasks concerning the actual establishment of the new city to others. At the instigation of Alexander, Antigonos Monophthalmos, who was appointed satrap of Phrygia in ca. 333 BC, re-established the city, either in the time of Alexander or, more likely, after Alexander's death.[11]

---

5   Strab. 14.1.37.

6   Cohen (1995), 180, concludes from this that 'Antigonos initiated the synoecism that produced the new Smyrna and that Lysimachos continued it'.

7   Tac. *Ann*. 4.55-6. Dmitriev (2005), 258, points out that this might be due to the fact that 'Tacitus, who mentions the legend of the foundation of Smyrna by an Amazon, was recording the earliest period of Smyrna's history, which did not include what happened just several centuries ago, in the time of Alexander'. However, this seems unlikely given the historical importance of Alexander and Rome's admiration of the king of the Macedonians in the early Principate (see Kühnen [2008], 107-155).

8   Plin. *HN* 5.118: *regredientibus inde abest XII p., ab Amazone condita, restituta ab Alexandro, in ora Zmyrna, amne Melete gaudens non procul orto*.

9   Cf. Paus. 7.5.1-3; Aristid. *Or*. 21.7.

10   Cf. Klose (1987), 36 with Tab. 39, R 1-5; Tab. 40, R 6-13; Tab. 52, R 14; Tab. 54, R 1. See also Klose (1996), 59.

11   It must be noted that two other synoecisms are attributed to Antigonos: his creation of Antigoneia in the Troad, which was later completed and renamed Alexandria Troas by

Lysimachos, who was made satrap of Thrace in 323 BC and who gained control over Asia Minor after the death of Eumenes (ca. 316 BC), finally finished the restoration project. Thus N.H. Demand, arguing along these lines, notes: 'Alexander may have suggested that the city be moved to the new location and made great promises about its future as he did at Ilium. It seems most likely, however, that he left Antigonos the practical details of the implication of the relocation (after the Smyrnians had gotten the approval of Apollo). Antigonos used methods that he would later utilize in his own relocations, while Lysimachus, as in other cases, completed the work that Antigonos had started'.[12] Similarly, C.J. Cadoux states that Alexander 'seriously initiated the project of a restoration but was prevented by circumstances', and W.W. Tarn speaks of Smyrna as a 'city that Alexander planned and others built'.[13]

   Despite a certain degree of plausibility of these explanations, one should not forget that there were in fact several *poleis* in Asia Minor in the imperial period which laid claim to the Macedonian king as their *ktistēs* although he had never set foot on their territory, let alone founded them.[14] Indeed, there are several particularities which cast doubt on Pausanias' account: the late appearance of the myth in the sources, the lack of archaeological evidence for a temple of the two Nemeseis on Mount Pagos, the dream element as a traditional topos in foundation legends and, last but not least, the pragmatic consideration that on his march from Sardis to Ephesos Alexander would hardly have taken the time to go hunting and initiate such a foundation.[15] But even if Alexander's involvement in the foundation of Smyrna may be doubted for these reasons and Pausanias' story seems to be nothing but mere fiction, nevertheless the question of when, why and under what historical circumstances this foundation myth may have emerged is, in itself, most intriguing. H.S. Lund vaguely dates the legend back to the Hellenistic period, suggesting that 'it may originate with Antigonos or Lysimachus, who aimed in this way to present their work as a fulfillment of Alexander's plan',[16] while H.W. Parke goes further and also takes the Roman period into consideration without, however, giving reasons for his view.[17] A diachronic and synchronic approach to the extant source material may provide some important clues and help to shed more light on the historical

---

Lysimachos, and his consolidation of Teos and Lebedos, which were later moved by Lysimachos into Ephesos. See Demand (1990), 158-162.

12   Demand (1990), 162-163.

13   Cadoux (1938), 97; Tarn (1948), 133. For a similar interpretation see also Merkelbach - Stauber (1998), 500. Merkelbach and Stauber are convinced of the reality of the dream element: 'Alexander hat wirklich geträumt — worunter auch ein Wachtraum gemeint sein kann — und nach dem Aufstehen gesagt, man solle am Pagos ein Neu-Smyrna gründen'.

14   Cf. Ziegler (1998), 679-697; see also Leschhorn (1984), 217-223. A paradigmatic case is Apollonia in Pisidia, which celebrated Alexander the Great as its *ktistēs* on its coins in the Severan period, though Alexander had never been to Apollonia; see Leschhorn (1984), 218; Ziegler (1998), 687-688; Tscherikower (1927), 37.

15   The arguments are summarized by Cadoux (1938), 95-97.

16   Lund (1992), 175. For a Hellenistic dating see also Cook (1958-9), 34.

17   Parke (1985), 127: '... the legend about Alexander's hunt is a romantic embellishment of the sort which might have been created locally in Hellenistic or Roman periods and have found its way into literature by the second century AD.' This view is also implied by Dmitriev (2005), 258-260.

forces and circumstances that may have been influential in the genesis and development of the Alexander-legend as attested in the literary and numismatic sources. To this end the following section will concentrate on the historical phenomenon of myth-making by examining the manifest interests underlying the construction, shift in focus and propagation of a foundation legend.

<div align="center">***</div>

At the beginning of this analysis of the Smyrnaean foundation legend attention must be drawn to an apparent paradox, namely, why Antigonos and Lysimachos, although their names are related to the foundation of Smyrna in several sources, never played a significant role in the public representation of the city in the imperial period. A possible explanation for this striking peculiarity may be the harsh competition for precedence (*prōteia*) between the Greek cities of Asia Minor. In this rivalry, foundation myths came to play a key factor, because they were employed by the cities as proof of their special *doxa* and *eugeneia* according to the maxim that the older the city and its founders, the greater the *doxa* and *eugeneia* of the *polis* — and the greater the prospects for imperial favours.[18] In this competitive environment it is not implausible that cities deliberately optimized or even 'invented' their foundation myth in order to outdo their rivals.[19]

One of Smyrna's strongest rivals in the imperial period was the provincial capital of Ephesos. It is most telling in the context of our analysis that this city prided itself on having Lysimachos as a founder. According to Strabo, Lysimachos had moved the original settlement around the Artemision to the slopes of the Koressos, reinforced the city with fortifications, renamed it Arsinoeia after his wife and increased the population with citizens from Kolophon and Lebedos.[20] Lysimachos was henceforth regarded as the original founder of Arsinoeia/Ephesos and, in accordance with the Hellenistic tradition, was honoured with a founder's cult.[21] In the imperial period, Lysimachos — besides other founders such as Androklos — continued to play an important part in the cultural memory of the citizens of Ephesos. This is most evident in the famous benefaction of the Ephesian equestrian Vibius Salutaris in 104 AD: among the gold and silver statues of

---

18   Cf. Strubbe (1984-6), 257-268; Ziegler (1998), 681-682.

19   For the invention of foundation myths see Strubbe (1984-6), 273-277; Nollé (2009), esp. 101-106. Nollé (2009), 102, has succinctly remarked: 'So stecken in vielen Gründungs-traditionen antiker griechischer Städte Historisches und Fiktives in einem oftmals unentwirrbaren Knäuel'. On the *poleis'* construction of their past through the medium of local historiography cf. Clarke (2008). See also Curty (1995). The local past gained particular significance for the Greek *poleis* in the context of the foundation of the Panhellenion. On this institution established by Hadrian cf. Spawforth - Walker (1985; 1986); Jones (1996).

20   Strab. 14.1.21. See also Paus. 1.9.7; 7.3.5. On the Ephesian foundation myth see Leschhorn (1984), 255-257; Cohen (1995), 177-180. On the historical circumstances of the foundation of Arsinoeia see Karwiese (1995), 63-67 and Rogers (2001). For the dating of the foundation of Arsinoeia see Karwiese (1995), 64 and Rogers (2001), 606, n. 74, who argues that 'since Lysimachus was in Thrace between 294 and 289 BC, it is likely that the formal foundation was initiated in 294 BC, before Lysimachus went away, rather than after'. Arsinoeia was re-named Ephesos after Lysimachos' death in 281 BC.

21   See *IK* Ephesos Ia 29 (= *OGIS* 480); *CIL* III.6 14195 with Habicht (1970), 40-41.

mythical and historical figures which he dedicated to the city was a statue of Lysimachos. In compliance with Salutaris' will, it was carried together with the other statues in a deeply symbolic procession through Ephesos and finally set up before the *dēmos* in the theatre.[22] Salutaris' benefaction makes it clear that in the imperial period Lysimachos still figured largely in the cultural memory of the Ephesians and the public representation of their past. As suggested by Christian Habicht, the old Lysimachos cult might even have been re-established in Ephesos in this time.[23] The Smyrnaeans certainly would not fail to note the great esteem accorded to Lysimachos at Ephesos. Therefore it is conceivable that Smyrna, in the strong inter-city competition for precedence, would wish to dissociate itself from its strongest rival and outdo it by making Alexander the Great — a founding figure more glorious than Lysimachos — the focal point of the city's public representation.[24]

A closer study of the narrative elements of the foundation legend, especially Alexander's dream of the two Nemeseis, permits further insight into the historical process of its formation. Special attention must be given here to the numismatic representation of the *double* Nemesis, as it may provide a clue for a possible dating of the emergence of the foundation legend.[25] It is not until the time of Domitian that

---

22 *IK* Ephesos Ia 27 with Rogers (1991), 83, 99-100. Habicht (1970), 41, remarks: 'Diese Weihung erklärt sich nur unter der an sich selbstverständlichen Annahme, dass Lysimachos als Stadtgründer angesehen wurde, und mit Recht hat man in ihr ein Indiz des Gründerkultes für den König gesehen'. In the same sense Leschhorn (1984), 256.

23 Habicht (1970), 41: 'Im gleichen Jahr 104, dem die Stiftung des Vibius Salutaris angehört, erscheint zum ersten Male seit Lysimachos die Gerusie der Stadt wieder in einer Inschrift. Möglicherweise sind Gerusie und Gründerkult des Lysimachos zusammen neu konstituiert worden'. Even in a decree of the time of Commodus (*IK* Ephesos Ia 26), the citizens refer to a ruler in the time of the *oikismos*, presumably to Lysimachos. The document thus nicely reflects Lysimachos' presence in the collective memory of the Ephesians in the second century AD. On this decree see Leschhorn (1984), 256.

24 Demetrios was in control of Ephesos between 302 and 294 BC. During this time he promoted an image of himself as the liberator of the Greek cities. His rival Lysimachos, in contrast, was denounced by him and his supporters as a ruthless tyrant. This negative public image of Lysimachos, who finally captured Ephesos in 294 BC and re-built the city, had a lasting influence on the literary sources, which presented the foundation of Arsinoeia/Ephesos as the act of a destructive tyrant (cf. Rogers [2001]). It is therefore possible that the memory of Lysimachos in Ephesos and the neighbouring cities was not unambiguous during the early Roman Empire. This may also have been a reason why Smyrna decided to dissociate itself from Lysimachos as a *ktistēs*. I am grateful to one of the anonymous readers for this suggestion.

25 For the Smyrnaean cult of the double Nemesis, which is unparalleled in Asia Minor, see Cadoux (1938), 220-223; Hornum (1993), 11-13. There have been various attempts in modern scholarship to explain the puzzling duality of the goddesses: for instance that the doubling might represent the two sides of the goddess (punisher/balancer), or that it might result from the combination of the Attic Nemesis with the Aeolian goddess Adrasteia, or that it might reflect the existence of two cities, Old Smyrna and New Smyrna. For a good overview (with further bibliography) of the various explanations see Hornum (1993), 11; Cadoux (1938), 220; Herter (1935).

Smyrna started to depict Nemesis as a double figure on its coins.[26] Before Domitian all civic coins show merely a single Nemesis.[27] Smyrna's introduction of the two Nemeseis on its coins coincides with the climax of the fierce competition between the city and its major rivals, Ephesos and Pergamon:[28] in 83/4 AD these three *poleis* had applied for the privilege of an imperial Temple Wardenship (*neōkoros*), providing the site of the future temple for the imperial cult.[29] The timing suggests that it was in the context of this struggle that Smyrna began to mint coins with the two Nemeseis. One major reason for this may have been the widespread belief that the double representation of a goddess was expedient for increasing her dignity as a figure of worship.[30] The assumption that the two Nemeseis were deliberately implemented as a political strategy in the time of Domitian is corroborated by another small but significant detail in the pictorial representation of the goddesses: unlike the single Nemesis, who is generally depicted with wings,[31] the two Nemeseis are always represented unwinged.[32] We must surmise that this modification was deliberately made: the Smyrnaeans, who had already increased the dignity of the goddess by representing her as a double figure, furthermore made a point to augment her antiquity: as it becomes evident in a passage in Pausanias, the unwinged type of the goddess was associated with great antiquity.[33]

The appearance of the double Nemesis on Smyrnaean coins in ca. AD 83/4 raises a crucial question concerning the cult of the double Nemesis: did the notion of the two Nemeseis originate in the first century AD as a new phenomenon or had a cult of the two goddesses existed long before that time? Recent scholarship has questioned the dating of the cult back to the archaic period.[34] Emma Stafford has drawn attention to the fact that the passage in Pausanias, which has often been cited in support of an allegedly archaic

---

26   For coins depicting two Nemeseis see Klose (1987), Tab. 5, R 1-3; Tab. 7, R 1-14; Tab. 12, R 1, 5-6; Tab. 13, R 1-2, 9-10; Tab. 14, R 2-3; Tab. 15, R 1-11; Tab. 16, G 1-4; Tab. 18, R 1; Tab. 38, R 6; Tab. 41, R 1-7, 9-11; Tab. 42, R 2-4; Tab. 44, R 4-7, 24-25; Tab. 45, R 8-9, 26, 39, 43, 51; Tab. 48, R 1-15, 29; Tab. 50, R 8; Tab. 52, R 1, 6-7, 13; Tab. 54, R 3; Tab. 55, R 1-2, 7-11.

27   For coins depicting a single Nemesis see Klose (1987), Tab. 3, V 23-51; Tab. 7, V 26-28; Tab. 8, R 19; Tab. 9, R 1-3, V 23-51; Tab. 12, R 7; Tab. 13, R 3, 7-10; Tab. 24, R 1-33; Tab. 29, R 11; Tab. 30, R 1-3; Tab. 31, R 8; Tab. 45, R 42.

28   That a conflict must have existed between the cities in the reign of Domitian can be inferred from later *homonoia* coins which celebrate the state of concord after the cessation of the conflict. For coins propagating *homonoia* between Smyrna and Ephesos cf. Pera (1984), 31-35, 150-152; Kampmann (1996), 25-28.

29   See Dmitriev (2005), 259; Dräger (1993), 107-142, 175-188.

30   For the significance of the double representation of goddesses in the Greek world see Hadzisteliou Price (1971), 48-69.

31   The single Nemesis with wings first appears on coins assigned to the reign of Tiberius (Hornum [1993], 12); they continue to appear in the first and second centuries AD (Klose [1987], 354). A wingless single Nemesis is first attested in the reign of Domitian (Klose [1987], 354; Hornum [1993], 13).

32   See Klose (1987), 354-355.

33   Pausanias (1.33.7) explicitly points out that in former times artists depicted Nemesis without wings and that the winged version was only a more recent development.

34   On this argument see primarily Stafford (2000), 97-104.

practice of the cult of the two Nemeseis in Smyrna, is not at all conclusive.[35] Pausanias here reports that golden Charites made by the sixth-century BC sculptor Boupalos were placed above the cult images (*agalmata*) of the Nemeseis.[36] One must, however, be wary of concluding from this statement that the images of the Nemeseis as well as the temple that housed them were as old as those of the Charites and thus date back to the sixth century BC. What the passage merely suggests is that the Smyrnaeans made an effort to embed the cult images of the Nemeseis in an ancient-looking environment by surrounding them with century-old Charites. Stafford has further argued that the cult statues of the Nemeseis as depicted on Hadrianic coins – each Nemesis holding a fold of her *himation* and carrying a measuring rod and a bridle – can hardly be archaic *korai*, since archaic statues 'scarcely manage to raise their arms from their sides and certainly never have such symbolic attributes'.[37] Hence, these cult statues cannot possibly be dated before the Hellenistic period. Another frequently quoted reference in support of a long-established existence of the cult of the double Nemesis is Pausanias' account of the myth itself. He relates that the Smyrnaeans, after moving to the new site, started worshipping Nemesis in her double form.[38] It thus seems at first glance that the cult of the double Nemesis must have existed from the late fourth century BC onwards. But here again one must proceed with caution. As Stafford has rightly pointed out, Pausanias' story is 'internally confused, since it presents Alexander sleeping in front of a pre-existing shrine of the twin Nemeseis, but goes on to imply that before his intervention the people of Smyrna only believed in one Nemesis.'[39]

Since there is no concrete evidence for the existence of a pre-Roman cult of the double Nemesis, we cannot preclude the possibility that the double representation of the goddess may indicate a new development in the context of the rivalry between the major *poleis* of Roman Asia Minor in the first century AD.[40] This view is supported by the fact that all the statues and reliefs of the double Nemesis that have come down to us date to

---

35   Stafford (2000), 98-99.

36   Paus. 9.35.6: καὶ Σμυρναίοις τοῦτο μὲν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῶν Νεμέσεων ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων χρυσοῦ Χάριτες ἀνάκεινται, τέχνη Βουπάλου. See, for example, Hornum (1993), 11, who wrongly concludes: 'we know from Pausanias (*Graecae descriptio* 9.35.6) that the cult existed earlier, because golden Charites made by the sixth century BC sculptor Boupalos were placed above the cult images'. Elsewhere (1.33.6) Pausanias speaks of *xoana* when referring to the statues of the Nemeseis in Smyrna. On Pausanias' use of the word *xoanon* cf. Pritchett (1998), 204-294; Arafat (1996), 54-57. See also Donohue (1988), 146, who notes that 'Pausanias does not say that all *xoana* are old, but rather that in early times all statuary was made in wood'. Arafat (1996), 55 rightly points out that 'we must be wary of circularity of argument since some objects (wooden ones above all) owed their presence in the sanctuary to their being perceived as antique, and are then perceived as antique because they are in the sanctuary.'

37   Stafford (2000), 99-100.

38   Paus. 7.5.3. See n. 3 above.

39   Stafford (2000), 98.

40   See also Dmitriev (2005), 259, who speaks of a 'new development' that 'emerged when her (i.e. Smyrna's) main rival, Ephesos, received its second *neokoria* from Domitian'.

the imperial period, and not earlier.[41] Likewise, all the epigraphic evidence for the cult of the double Nemesis dates to the first and second centuries AD.[42]

The question remains whether the full version of the foundation myth involving Alexander and the double Nemesis as its two key elements already circulated in Smyrna in AD 83/4.[43] What is most striking in this context is the fact that in the numismatic source material of the first century AD the two Nemeseis are never represented in combination with Alexander the Great: the coins invariably depict the Nemeseis without the king of the Macedonians. One could, of course, argue that the goddesses fulfilled a synecdochial function for the whole foundation legend. Yet there still remains the fundamental question of why, in those days of strong competition for precedence and imperial favours, the Smyrnaeans hesitated to portray such an eminent historical founding figure as Alexander the Great on their coins. In this context it may also be indicative that Pliny the Elder reports in the middle of the first century AD that Smyrna was founded by an Amazon and restored by Alexander, but does not mention the Nemeseis at all.[44] The evidence outlined so far suggests that in the first century AD the notion of the double Nemesis as developed in that period and the new (skilfully) propagated legend of Smyrna's restoration by Alexander the Great existed independently of one another as two local traditions before being combined later. Such a view takes into consideration that foundation legends are not static and timeless but a reflection of specific historical circumstances. They may change substantially over time because they can be subject to such processes of 'myth-making' as construction and modification by urban interest groups and their narrative extension or embellishment, before they are integrated into cultural memory. In the course of the second century AD this process is visible in Smyrna in the form of a new foundation ideology and historical self-image. The evolution of a new collective awareness is clearly reflected in the literary and numismatic sources. From this time onwards the two key elements of the myth, the sleeping Alexander and the two Nemeseis, are depicted *jointly* on a series of coins struck by the *stratēgos* Theudianos in the time of Marcus Aurelius,[45] and Aelius Aristides, the brilliant Smyrnaean orator, explicitly refers to the Alexander-Nemeseis story in a speech delivered at Smyrna in AD 178, taking for granted the familiarity of the story in his *polis*.[46] All this suggests that the two traditions must have been combined and embellished sometime between the middle of the first century AD and AD 178. The local tradition about Alexander which already existed in Smyrna in the first century could easily have been adorned with elements of the hunt, the dream and the double Nemesis. The new foundation myth, however, was certainly not conceptualized as a merely

---

41   See Fleischer (1978), 396; Robert (1937), 335-340.

42   Cf. *IK* Smyrna 628, 641, 649, 650, 697, 725, 740-742, 759.

43   See Dmitriev (2005), 259, who argues that the appearance of the single and double Nemesis on the coins testifies that the legend with the elements of the dream and the double Nemesis already existed.

44   See n. 8 above.

45   For the coins see n. 10 above. As Theudianos also struck a series of coins under Antoninus Pius in his function as *stratēgos*, it is plausible to suggest that the coins depicting the legend date to the early period (rather than the end) of Marcus Aurelius' reign.

46   Aristid. *Or.* 20.7.

entertaining story to float in a vacuum. It had to serve political purposes in the wider context of inter-city relationships and the city's diplomacy with Rome,[47] and it may be worth examining to what extent the myth itself and its major elements may have been motivated and determined by the political conditions and cultural framework of the period.

On several occasions in the second century AD, as our sources attest, Smyrna tried to gain the attention and goodwill of the Roman emperors, and, as was the common practice, the ambassadors must have used the relevant foundation legends in order to prove the worthiness of their city. Philostratos reports that Smyrna sent an embassy to Trajan regarding 'a most important matter'.[48] The Smyrnaeans chose one of their best orators, M. Antonius Polemon, to represent their case before the Emperor.[49] The Alexander-Nemeseis legend and the Nemeseis cult itself seem to have appealed to Trajan, since he donated cult images of the double Nemesis to the city as a special gift.[50] As is well known, Trajan was an ardent admirer of Alexander the Great. During his campaign against the Parthians, Trajan stayed in Babylon and offered a sacrifice in the room in which Alexander had died.[51] Trajan's image on coins alluded to Alexander, and he often compared his actions and deeds with those of the king of the Macedonians.[52] It was during his reign that authors such as Arrian and Plutarch wrote major works about Alexander the Great, and in Dio Chrysostom's famous *Kingship Orations*, addressed to Trajan, Alexander figured largely as a model for royal *imitatio* and *aemulatio*.[53] In the wake of this 'renaissance' of Alexander the Great it may well have been part of the persuasion strategy of Smyrna's ambassadors that, when telling Trajan about their city's glorious history, they deliberately turned to the figure of Alexander as its glorious founder, in the hope of impressing the Emperor and winning his favour. When some years later Trajan's successor Hadrian travelled through Asia Minor (ca. AD 123/4),[54] Smyrna again turned to the Emperor to ask for imperial favours, once more employing Polemon as its ambassador. According to Philostratos, Polemon succeeded in re-directing Hadrian's favour from Ephesos to Smyrna, and the Smyrnaeans received an immense sum of money, with which they built a corn-market, a magnificent gymnasium and a temple.[55] An inscription from Smyrna adds further details and informs us that 'by

---

47   On the broader context cf. Clarke (2008), 354-363.

48   Philostr. *VS* 521.

49   The embassy to Trajan was Polemon's first diplomatic mission. According to Philostratos, Polemon, therefore, publicly prayed for good luck and expressed his hope that he would have the same persuasive charm as Scopelian, his great rhetoric teacher (cf. Philostr. *VS* 521). On M. Antonius Polemon see Philostr. *VS* 530-544. See also Cadoux (1938), 254-263; Stegemann (1952); Campanile (1999); Puech (2002), 396-406; Quet (2003); Witulski (2007), 139-153. For the reconstruction of Polemon's family tree see Thonemann (2004).

50   Dio Chrys. *Or.* 40.14.

51   Cass. Dio 68.30.

52   On Trajan's *imitatio Alexandri* see Kühnen (2008), 165-172.

53   See Dio Chrys. *Or.* 2 and 4. On Dio Chrysostom's *Kingship Orations* see von Arnim (1898), 393-435; Moles (1990); Swain (1996), 192-200; Kühnen (2008), 169-170.

54   On Hadrian's journey see Halfmann (1986), 188-210, esp. 199-201; Birley (1997), 162-174; Magie (1950), 611-629; Bowersock (1969), 120-123; Witulski (2007), 153-168.

55   Philostr. *VS* 531. See Bowersock (1969), 45; Millar (1977), 420-421; Bowie (1982), 52, 55.

the agency of Polemon' the city was awarded the title of a second Temple Wardenship and could enjoy additional *beneficia* such as immunity from tribute, precious marble columns for an *aleiptērion*, sacred games, *theologoi* and hymnodists.[56] It is plausible to suggest that, among other factors, Smyrna's foundation legend involving Alexander the Great was employed by Polemon as part of his rhetorical strategy and contributed to Hadrian's change of mind in favour of Smyrna.[57] In particular, the legend's embellishing motif of Alexander's hunt could find a correlate in the emperor's passion for hunting. A notice in Polemon's *De Physiognomia* tells us that the brilliant rhetor, while accompanying Hadrian on his journey, had been witness to the emperor's hunting activities and passion for this sport.[58] It is not difficult to imagine that, when telling the emperor the story of Smyrna's foundation, he made a point of referring to Alexander's hunt on Mount Pagos to arouse Hadrian's special interest in Smyrna.[59] After all, Smyrna would not have been the first city that attempted to impress Hadrian with a constructed local past.[60]

Whether or not the version of Alexander's dream emerged and developed from one (or even several) of these occasions,[61] there is no doubt that Smyrna's appeal to Alexander as its founder brought the *polis* material advantages and considerable prestige.[62] It could now pride itself on a historically important ruler as its *ktistēs*, who was held in great esteem by both the Greeks and the Romans. Moreover, with its re-constructed foundation myth Smyrna could now rank as high as some other prominent foundations of Alexander the Great, the most important undoubtedly being Alexandria in Egypt. It is indeed interesting to note how much Smyrna's foundation myth resembles that of Alexandria. According to Plutarch, the foundation of the *polis* near the Nile was

---

56 *CIG* 3148 = *IGR* IV 1431 = *IK* Smyrna 697 = Puech (2002) no. 209. On Hadrian's beneficence see Boatwright (2000), 158-162. Cf. also Cadoux (1938), 256-259; Burrell (2004), 42-48; Witulski (2007), 90-97.

57 On Polemon's strategic use of Dionysos and the Dionysia in the diplomatic interaction with Rome in order to draw the emperor's attention to Smyrna see Kuhn (2011), 148-150.

58 Polemon *De phys.* 138-142. On this work cf. Swain (2007).

59 Hadrian's passion for hunting is well-known. He had, for example, killed a bear in Mysia and founded the city Hadrianotherae ('Hadrian's hunt') in memory of his great success. Similarly, his hunting activities left such a deep impression on the citizens of Stratonikeia that they later worshipped him as 'Zeus, the hunter' (Cynegesius), that is, as a tutelary god of hunting. On Hadrian's passion for hunting see *HA* Had. 20.13; Dio 69.10.2. See also Birley (1997), 164; Robert (1978), 133-148; Gutsfeld (2000), 79-99; Nollé (2005), 67.

60 See Pretzler (2005b).

61 The rivalry between Smyrna and her neighbours, Ephesos and Pergamon, continued in the following years. In ca. AD 143 Polemon was appointed to defend 'the temples and their rights' before the emperor — a mission that was probably 'necessitated by some question of relationship (involving precedence, finance, proper titulature, or any of a number of factors) among rival *neokoroi* cities in the *koinon*' (Burrell [2004], 46). A letter of Antoninus Pius (*SIG* 849) further suggests that there was an additional quarrel between the three cities concerning the proper use of titulature. The tense situation continued until the time of Marcus Aurelius, in whose reign the famous orator Aelius Aristides pleaded before the provincial assembly for the establishment of concord (*homonoia*) between Smyrna, Ephesos and Pergamon (Aristid. *Or.* 23).

62 On the attractiveness of Alexander the Great as *ktistēs* see Ziegler (1998), 682.

also initiated after a dream, in which an old man appeared to the Macedonian king and, quoting Homeric verses, indicated the site where Alexandria was to be built.[63] We can only speculate, of course, as to whether the Smyrnaeans took this foundation legend as a model when constructing their own myth.[64] But there is no doubt that Alexandria was generally admired by Smyrna at this time. There is indeed clear evidence that the city deliberately exploited the comparison with Alexandria as a persuasive political argument for self-aggrandisement. In an encomiastic speech delivered before the Roman governor in AD 179, after the rebuilding of the earthquake-smitten Smyrna, Aelius Aristides draws a direct parallel between the two cities: 'The third foundation [of Smyrna] and settlement was due to Alexander, whose most wonderful and greatest monuments are this city and the city of the Nile.'[65]

As noted above, the foundation legend of Alexander and the two Nemeseis was propagated on civic coinage from the reign of Marcus Aurelius onwards.[66] The memory of Lysimachos was not entirely obliterated,[67] but there is no doubt that he was sidelined and that Alexander the Great was regarded as the genuine glorious founder of Smyrna from the second century AD onwards. Alexander was now the most important *historical* founder, alongside Smyrna's *mythical* ones — the Amazon and Pelops — who also appear on coins in the second century AD.[68] When Pausanias conducted research for his *Periēgēsis* in ca. AD 160-180, it was the story of Alexander the Great and the Nemeseis which was told to him.[69] What he recorded for posterity was thus a version that had presumably developed only some decades before his visit to the city. Incidentally, one should not exclude the possibility that Pausanias himself was involved in the further embellishment of the myth: H.W. Parke has already drawn attention to the fact that Pausanias' story falls into 'two very loosely connected parts' and remarked that the Klaros oracle is 'couched in the most general terms and contains no reference linking it

---

63 Plut. *Alex.* 26.2-4.

64 One may wonder whether it is only coincidence that papyri dating to the first century BC attest a cult of multiple (probably two) Nemeseis for Alexandria. For the papyri see Hornum (1993), 182 (no. 51), 186 (no. 60), with Volkmann (1928), 300; Kunkel (1927), 169-215, 208-210, no. 12 II. Relating to Alexandria, Hornum (1993), 14 remarks: 'The Memphis reference to two Nemeseis and Roman double representations from Egypt (...) seem to imply that the cult image at the Alexandria temple was either derived from the Smyrna Nemeseis or influenced by them'. Our interpretation, however, makes it clear that it was rather the other way round: Smyrna was influenced by Alexandria.

65 Arist. Or. 21.3 (Keil): καὶ τρίτη δὴ θέσις καὶ κατοίκισις τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον, οὗ δύο ταῦτα κάλλιστα καὶ μέγιστα μνημεῖα, ἥδε τε ἡ πόλις καὶ ἡ τοῦ Νείλου πρόσοικος. See also Aristid. *Or.* 17.3 (Keil).

66 See n. 10 above.

67 For the mention of Lysimachos as a founder of Smyrna by Aelius Aristides see Aristid. *Or.* 19.4 (Keil).

68 On the Amazon cf. Klose (1987), 27-28; 351-352; 356-357. On Pelops cf. Klose (1987), 36, 355; Klose (1996), 59.

69 For an introduction to Pausanias and his work see Habicht (1985) and Pretzler (2007). On the date of the composition of the *Periēgēsis* see Bowie (2001); Pretzler (2007), 21-24. For the importance of 'oral tradition' as a source for Pausanias' *Periēgēsis* see Pretzler (2005a). On Pausanias' work methods cf. Jones (2001); Pretzler (2004).

with Alexander's dream'.[70] He points out that the oracle could have originated in any other historical context, such as the Smyrnaean *synoikismos* initiated by Antigonos or Lysimachos. Pausanias, who had developed a special passion for searching and quoting oracles, might have come across the oracle in the city archives whilst doing research for his work,[71] and, irrespective of its context, might have 'tagged it on to the legend of Alexander's dream'[72] — a suggestion which does not seem unlikely against the background of our observations and the general public interest in oracles in this period.[73]

<div align="center">***</div>

Our analysis of the growth and development of the Smyrnaean foundation legend with a special focus on the political and cultural circumstances that may have contributed to the specific formation of the legend shows that one cannot but adopt a critical attitude towards the historical reliability of Pausanias' account. The extant source material suggests that the Smyrnaean foundation legend with Alexander the Great and the Nemeseis as its key figures is a construct, a paradigm of an 'invented tradition' (Hobsbawm),[74] devised to serve and advance the interests of the *polis* in the Roman imperial period. It must be viewed in the context of the fierce competition for precedence between the *poleis* of Asia Minor in the first and second centuries AD and their attempts to curry favour with the emperors and gain imperial *beneficia*. Myth-making through the manipulation of local history proved to be an effective instrument for the urban elites to assert their claims when dealing with the Roman authorities and rival neighbouring cities. The *polis* did not care much about historical truth (in the modern sense of the word), as long as a certain degree of plausibility was maintained. Those who went as ambassadors or advocates on diplomatic missions to Rome were often the same men who acted as 'sophists' on the theatre stages of the Greek cities, displaying their rhetorical skills in epideictic declamations on historical topics to entertain their audiences.[75] In the world of sophistic performances, the past was something flexible and dynamic that could be adapted to the situation.[76] It is therefore not surprising that these men did not draw a strict line between the world of theatrical declamation and that of diplomacy. What really mattered when dealing with the local past was its potential as a political asset, which means that the past had to be 're-invented', if necessary, to serve the interests of the *polis* community. It is this particular cultural context of the world of the Second Sophistic that

---

70   Parke (1985), 127-128. On the idea of Pausanias as 'both the collector and creator of local historiography' see Clarke (2008), 357.

71   It is interesting to note that a fragmentary inscription, presumably dating to the second century AD, was found in Smyrna, quoting the oracular response. See *IK* Smyrna 647 = *SEG* 18.495 = *SEG* 26.1296 = Merkelbach - Stauber (1998), 499, no. 5.1.1 with Woodward (1959), 194-196; Cook (1961); Peek (1976).

72   Parke (1985), 128.

73   On the revived interest in and popularity of oracles in the second century AD see Lane-Fox (1986), 200-241, 250-256; Nollé (2007), 285-295.

74   On the concept of 'invented tradition' cf. Hobsbawm - Ranger (1983).

75   Cf. Bowie (1982). On the Second Sophistic in general cf. Bowersock (1969); Anderson (1993); Swain (1996); Schmitz (1997); Whitmarsh (2001; 2005); Borg (2004).

76   Menander Rhetor 341.

one has to bear in mind when using and assessing Pausanias' *Periēgēsis* as a source for the study of ancient history.[77]

University of Oxford

Bibliography

Alcock, S.E. – J.F. Cherry – J. Elsner (eds.) (2001). *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece.* Oxford.

Anderson, G. (1993). *The Second Sophistic. A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*. London.

Arafat, K.W. (1996). *Pausanias' Greece. Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers*. Cambridge.

Arnim, H. von (1898). *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa.* Berlin.

Bennett, J. (2000). *Trajan. Optimus Princeps*. 2nd edition. London.

Birley, A.R. (1997). *Hadrian. The Restless Emperor*. London.

Boatwright, M.T. (2000). *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire.* Princeton.

Borg, B. (ed.) (2004). *Paideia. Die Welt der Zweiten Sophistik. The World of the Second Sophistic*. Berlin.

Bowersock, G.W. (1969). *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*. Oxford.

Bowie, E.L. (1970). 'The Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic'. *P&P* 46: 3-41.

Bowie, E.L. (1982). 'The Importance of Sophists'. *YCS* 27: 29-59.

Bowie, E.L. (2001). 'Inspiration and Aspiration. Date, Genre, and Readership'. In: S.E. Alcock – J.F. Cherry – J. Elsner (eds.). *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*. Oxford: 21-32.

Burrell, B. (2004). *Neokoroi. Greek Cities and Roman Emperor*s. Leiden - Boston.

Cadoux, C.J. (1938). *Ancient Smyrna. A History of the City from the Earliest Times to 324 AD*. Oxford.

Campanile, M.D. (1999). 'La costruzione del sofista. Note sul βίος di Polemone'. *Studi Ellenistici* 12: 269-315.

Cardovana, O.D. – M. Galli (eds.) (2007). *Arte e memoria culturale nell' età della Seconda Sofistica*. Catania.

Chaniotis, A. (1988). *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften*. Stuttgart.

Chaniotis, A. (2003). 'Vom Erlebnis zum Mythos. Identitätskonstruktionen im kaiser-zeitlichen Aphrodisias'. In: E. Schwertheim – E. Winter (eds.). *Stadt und Stadtentwicklung in Kleinasien*. Bonn: 69-84.

Clarke, K. (2008). *Making Time for the Past. Local History and the Polis*. Oxford.

Cohen, G.M. (1995). *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands and Asia Minor*. Berkeley.

Cook, J.M. (1958-9). 'Old Smyrna, 1948-1951'. *ABSA* 53/4: 1-34.

Cook, J.M. (1961). 'The Clarian Oracle for the Smyrnaeans'. *CR* 11: 7-8.

---

[77] On the historical and cultural context of Pausanias' work cf. Habicht (1985), 117-140; Arafat (1996), 12-36.

Curty, O. (1995). *Les Parentés légendaires entre cités grecques*. Geneva.

Demand, N.H. (1990). *Urban Relocation in Archaic and Classical Greece. Flight and Consolidation*. Bristol.

Dmitriev, S. (2005). *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. Oxford.

Donohue, A.A. (1988). *Xoana and the Origins of Greek Sculpture*. Atlanta.

Dräger, M. (1993). *Die Städte der Provinz Asia in der Flavierzeit*. Frankfurt.

Fleischer, R. (1978). 'Eine neue Darstellung der doppelten Nemesis aus Smyrna'. In: M.B. de Boer – T.A. Edridge (eds.). *Hommages à Maarten J. Vermaseren*. Leiden: 392-396.

Gutsfeld, A. (2000). 'Hadrian als Jäger. Jagd als Mittel kaiserlicher Selbstdarstellung'. In: W. Martini (ed.). *Die Jagd der Eliten in den Erinnerungskulturen von der Antike bis in die Frühe Neuzeit*. Göttingen: 79-99.

Habicht, C. (1970). *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte.* 2nd edition. Munich.

Habicht, C. (1985). *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece*. Berkeley.

Hadzisteliou Price, T. (1971). 'Double and Multiple Representations in Greek Art and Religious Thought'. *JHS* 91: 48-69.

Halfmann, H. (1986). *Itinera Principum. Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im römischen Reich.* Stuttgart.

Herter, H. (1935). 'Nemesis'. *RE* XVI.2. Stuttgart: 2263-2264.

Hobsbawm, E. – T. Ranger (eds.) (1983). *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge.

Hornum, M.B. (1993). *Nemesis, the Roman State and the Games*. Leiden.

Jones, C.P. (1996). 'The Panhellenion'. *Chiron* 26: 29-56.

Jones, C.P. (1999). *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World.* Cambridge, Mass.

Jones, C.P. (2001). 'Pausanias and his Guides. In: S.E. Alcock – J.F. Cherry – J. Elsner (eds.). *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*. Oxford: 33-39.

Kampmann, U.M. (1996). *Die Homonoia-Verbindungen der Stadt Pergamon oder der Versuch einer kleinasiatischen Stadt unter römischer Herrschaft eigenständige Politik zu betreiben.* Saarbrücken.

Karwiese, S. (1995). *Groß ist die Artemis von Ephesos. Die Geschichte einer der großen Städte der Antike.* Wien.

Klose, D.O.A. (1987). *Die Münzprägung von Smyrna in der römischen Kaiserzeit.* Berlin.

Klose, D.O.A. (1996). 'Münzprägung und städtische Identität. Smyrna in der römischen Kaiserzeit'. In: W. Leschhorn – A.V.B. Miron – A. Miron (eds.). *Hellas und der griechische Osten. Studien zur Geschichte und Numismatik der griechischen Welt*. Saarbrücken: 53-65.

Kühnen, A. (2008). *Die Imitatio Alexandri in der römischen Politik (1. Jh. v. Chr. – 3. Jh. n. Chr.).* Münster.

Kuhn, C.T. (2009). 'Mythos und Historie im kaiserzeitlichen Smyrna. Kollektive Identitätsstiftung im Kontext der Romanisierung'. *SCI* 28: 93-111.

Kuhn, C.T. (2011). 'M. Antonius Polemon und die Dionysia. Zur Bedeutung des Prora-Motivs auf kaiserzeitlichen Münzen Smyrnas'. *Athenaeum* 99: 145-153.

Kunkel, W. (1927). 'Verwaltungsakten aus spätptolemäischer Zeit'. *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 8: 169-215.

Lane Fox, R. (1973). *Alexander the Great*. London.

Lane Fox, R. (1986). *Pagans and Christians in the Mediterranean World. From the Second Century AD to the Conversion of Constantine*. London.

Leschhorn, W. (1984). *Gründer der Stadt. Studien zu einem politisch-religiösen Phänomen der griechischen Geschichte*. Stuttgart.

Lindner, R. (1994). *Mythos und Identität. Studien zur Selbstdarstellung kleinasiatischer Städte in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Stuttgart.

Lund, H.S. (1992). *Lysimachus. A Study in Early Hellenistic Kingship*. New York.

Magie, D. (1950). *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*. 2 vols. Princeton.

Merkelbach, R. – J. Stauber (eds.) (1998). *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten, Bd. 1: Die Westküste Kleinasiens von Knidos bis Ilion*. Stuttgart - Leipzig.

Millar, F. (1977). *The Emperor in the Roman World*. London.

Moles, J.L. (1990). 'The Kingship Orations of Dio Chrysostom'. *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 6: 297-375.

Nollé, J. (2005). 'Boars, Bears and Bugs. Farming in Asia Minor'. In: S. Mitchell (ed.). *Patterns in the Economy of Roman Asia Minor*. Swansea: 53-82.

Nollé, J. (2007). *Kleinasiatische Losorakel. Astragal- und Alphabetchresmologien der hochkaiserzeitlichen Orakelrenaissance*. Munich.

Nollé, J. (2009). 'Zu den Gründungstraditionen des thrakischen Hadrianopolis'. *Chiron* 39: 101-161.

Parke, H.W. (1985). *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor*. London.

Peek, W. (1976). 'Zitat eines Orakels für Smyrna'. *ZPE* 21: 145.

Pera, R. (1984). *Homonoia sulle monete de Augusto agli Antonini. Studio storico-tipologico*. Geneva.

Petzl, G. (1978). *Die Inschriften von Smyrna. Teil II.1 (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, Bd. 24,1)*. Bonn.

Petzl, G. (1982). *Die Inschriften von Smyrna (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien., Bd. 23)*. Bonn.

Pretzler, M. (2004). 'Turning Travel into Text. Pausanias at Work'. *Greece and Rome* 51: 199-216.

Pretzler, M. (2005a). 'Pausanias and Oral Tradition'. *CQ* 55: 235-249.

Pretzler, M. (2005b). 'Pausanias at Mantinea. Invention and Manipulation of Local History'. *PCPhS* 51: 21-34.

Pretzler, M. (2007). *Pausanias. Travel Writing in Ancient Greece*. London.

Price, S. (2005). 'Local Mythologies in the Greek East'. In: C. Howgego *et al.* (eds.). *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*. Oxford: 115-124.

Pritchett, W.K. (1998). *Pausanias Periegetes*. Amsterdam.

Puech, B. (2002). *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d'époque impériale*. Paris.

Quet, M.-H. (2003). 'Le sophiste M. Antonius Polémon de Laodicée, éminente personnalité politique de l'Asie romaine du IIe siècle'. In: M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni *et al.* (eds.). *Les Élites et leurs facettes*. Rome: 401-443.

Robert, L. (1978). *Documents d'Asie Mineure*. Paris.

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

Rogers, G.M. (2001). 'The Foundation of Arsinoeia'. *Med.Ant.* 4.2: 587-630.

Scheer, T. (1993). *Mythische Vorväter. Zur Bedeutung griechischer Heroenmythen im Selbstverständnis kleinasiatischer Städte*. Munich.

Schmitz, T. (1997). *Bildung und Macht. Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der Zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*. Munich.

Spawforth, A.J.S. – S. Walker (1985). 'The World of the Panhellenion I: Athens and Eleusis'. *JRS* 75: 78-104.

Spawforth, A.J.S. – S. Walker (1986). 'The World of the Panhellenion II: Three Dorian Cities'. *JRS* 76: 88-105.

Spawforth, A.J.S. (1999). 'The Panhellenion again'. *Chiron* 29: 339-352.

Stafford, E. (2000). *Worshipping Virtues. Personification and the Divine in Ancient Greece*. London.

Stegemann, W. (1952). 'Polemon'. *RE* XXI.2. Stuttgart: 1320-1357.

Strobel, K. (2010). *Kaiser Traian. Eine Epoche der Weltgeschichte*. Regensburg.

Strubbe, J.H.M. (1984-6). 'Gründer kleinasiatischer Städte. Fiktion und Realität.'. *Anc.Soc.* 15-17: 251-304.

Swain, S. (1996). *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism and Power in the Greek World, AD 50-250*. Oxford.

Swain, S. (ed.) (2007). *Seeing the Face, Seeing the Soul. Polemon's Physiognomy from Classical Antiquity to Medieval Islam*. Oxford.

Tarn, W.W. (1948). *Alexander the Great*. Vol. 1. Cambridge.

Thonemann, P. (2004). 'Polemo, Son of Polemo (Dio, 59.12.2)'. *EA* 37: 144-150.

Tscherikower, A. (1927). *Die hellenistischen Städtegründungen von Alexander dem Großen bis auf die Römerzeit*. Leipzig.

Volkmann, H. (1928). 'Studien zum Nemesiskult'. *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 26: 296-321.

Weiss, P. (1984). 'Lebendiger Mythos. Gründerheroen und städtische Gründungs-traditionen im griechisch-römischen Osten'. *WJA* 10: 179-211.

Whitmarsh, T. (2001). *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire. The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford.

Whitmarsh, T. (2005). *The Second Sophistic*. Oxford.

Witulski, T. (2007). *Kaiserkult in Kleinasien. Die Entwicklung der kultisch-religiösen Kaiserverehrung in der römischen Provinz Asia von Augustus bis Antoninus Pius*. Göttingen.

Woodward, A.M. (1959). 'The Greek Inscriptions in the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden at Leyden'. *JHS* 79: 194-196.

Ziegler, R. (1998). 'Alexander der Große als Städtegründer. Fiktion und Realität'. In: U. Peter (ed.). *Stephanos Numismatikos. Edith Schönert-Geiss zum 65. Geburtstag*. Berlin: 679-697.