FROM THE SOCIAL AND CULTURAL CONSTRUCTION OF EMOTION TO THE EMOTIONAL CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIETY AND CULTURE

ANGELOS CHANIOTIS

Abstract: In ancient history, it is typically examined how society and culture 'construct' emotions, i.e., how they influence the way emotions are presented, displayed, controlled, and evaluated. Less attention has been paid to the way emotions are instrumentalized in order to consolidate political conditions, social values, norms, and ideals, to establish fictions, and to keep illusions alive. Examining a small selection of epigraphic, literary, and papyrological sources, this paper discusses how fictions in Greek politics (acceptance of hierarchical relations), society (slavery), culture (sexual behavior), and religion (divine power) had an emotional basis.

Keywords: Emotion – slavery – religion – disgust – elite

In 2008, when I applied for a grant of the European Research Council in order to study emotions in the documentary sources, inscriptions and papyri, I had to come up with a name for this project. Given the fact that social and cultural factors, such as education, values, and social conventions influence the manifestation of emotions in documentary sources, I called the project *The Social and Cultural Construction of Emotions: the Greek Paradigm*.[1] At least in one sense the project was fruitful: it allowed me to significantly reconsider some of my earlier conceptions concerning the study of emotions in history. I had started believing that we study texts in order to understand emotions, and I soon realized that we study emotions, in order to understand texts; I started to doubt whether emotions, as survival mechanisms,[2] have a history, but I was left with no doubt that history has emotions. And although there is no doubt that social and cultural parameters determine if and how emotions will be described, evaluated, aroused, displayed, controlled, performed or expressed in the written sources – and in this sense society and culture construct emotions –, I realized that it is equally important – and far less studied – to examine how emotions construct society and culture. How are emotions used in order to create fictions, to establish hierarchies, or to represent political and social relations? In this paper, I summarize some of the findings of my research by providing a few examples of how individual emotions contribute to the creation of fictions and illusions.

achaniotis@ias.edu, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton (NJ), USA.

---

[1] Main publications of the project: *Unveiling Emotions*; *Unveiling Emotions II*; *Unveiling Emotions III*.

[2] Chaniotis 2018.

Vol. 21, 2023, pp. 121-139
doi: 10.4454/incidant.v21-959

Disgust and the enhancement of morality

The importance of disgust as a medium used to stigmatize and marginalize individuals and groups whose behavior does not follow the generally acceptable norms has been discussed by David Lateiner and Dimos Spatharas in their introduction to an important collective volume on the feeling of disgust.[3] Disgust is also used to establish social hierarchies.[4] The display of moral disgust for condemnable behaviour is usually accompanied by facial expressions similar to those that accompany unpleasant tastes and smells or threats from pathogens, i.e. to the facial expressions of core disgust: a wrinkled nose, narrowed brows, a curled upper lip, and visible protrusions of the tongue.[5] Such bodily responses are occasionally described in written sources.

In a number of petitions and letters preserved in papyri the victims of attacks or abuse complain that their abusers spoke words through their nose. They complain: «he spoke to my face through his nose, wishing to end my life»;[6] «he spoke many terms of abuse into my face and through his nose»;[7] «he snorted his contempt for me and wanted to attack me».[8] The biological origin of snorting and speaking through the nose is disgust. The feeling of disgust is accompanied by autonomic physiological responses, such as changes in respiratory behaviour and unpleasant sensations in the throat and mouth, that aim at protecting the body from the intrusion of pathogens.[9] What these papyri describe are more than just facial and vocal expressions of contempt. They are displays of disgust in conflict situations aiming to arouse disgust also in those who observed them.

Deviant sexual practices are often condemned through their association with disgust. A decree from Tralleis presents a good example of a documentary source that demonstrates this.[10] The proposer of the decree that prohibited access to sanctuaries and gymnasia to passive homosexuals (οἱ ἐν κιναιδείᾳ βιοῦντες) first reminds citizens of the moral traditions of the city:

---

[3] Lateiner, Spatharas 2017. See also Spatharas 2021.

[4] Spatharas 2021, 45-50.

[5] Spatharas 2021, 42.

[6] *P.Mich.* 17.793 (AD 381): λέγων εἰς πρ̣όσω̣π̣όν μ̣ου δ̣ιὰ τῆς ἑαυτ̣ο̣ῦ ῥινὸς βουλ̣όμενο̣ς μὲ τοῦ ζῆν̣ ἀπαλλάξαι. See Bryen 2008; Kotsifou 2012, 81-82; Chaniotis 2021a, 14-15.

[7] *P.Oxy.* 6.903 (fourth century AD): πολλὰ ἀσελγήματα λέγων εἰς πρόσωπόν μου καὶ διὰ τῆς ῥινὸς αὐτοῦ.

[8] *P.Col.* 8.242 (Arsinoite nome): περιερρόγχασέν μοι καὶ ἐβουλήθη μοι ἐπελθεῖν.

[9] Rozin, Lowery, Ebert 1994.

[10] Malay, Ricl, Amendola 2018; Chaniotis 2020: ἐπεὶ τὴν σώφρονα καὶ δικ̣α̣ίαν ἀγωγὴν | ὁ δῆμος ἀεὶ τετείμηκεν τῶν πατέρω[ν] | ἔν τε νόμοις καὶ ἔθεσιν καθαροῖς δια|κεκοσμηκότων τὴν πόλιν· πολλὰ δὲ νεώτερα δι᾽ ἀναισχυντίας τε|τόλμηται, ὥστε μήτε τῶν ἱερῶν μήτε τῶν γυμνασίων ἀπέχ̣εσθαι τοὺς οὐδὲ λαθεῖν δυναμένους,ὅτι πᾶσαν ἄρρητον ὕβριν πεπίνθασι[ν], | ἀ̣λλ᾽ ὡς μήτε περιραντηρίων μήτε | ν̣όμων κειμένων εἰσβιάζονται | ὅπου μὴ καλὸν μηδὲ ὅσιον αὐτοὺ̣[ς] | ὁρᾶσθαι· ὁ δὲ δῆμος οὕτως ἔρρωτ[αι] | πρὸς εὐκοσμίαν ὥστε καὶ τὰς ἐτ̣[αι|ρο]ύσας ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπ᾽ ἀμφοδίων ἐλα[ύ|ν]ε̣ι τόπ̣ων ἵνα μηδὲ μέχρις ὀχ̣[ετῶν | τ]ὸ σεμνὸν ἐνοχλῆται τῆς π[όλεως].

> Whereas the people have always revered the prudent and just conduct of our fathers, who adorned the city with pure laws and customs, and whereas due to the shamelessness many offensive things are attempted now, so that the ones who cannot even conceal that they have suffered every unspeakable insult do not keep away neither from the sanctuaries nor from the gymnasia, but as if no basins for lustral water nor laws are set up, they force their way into places wherever it is not good nor proper for them to be seen.

The image of 'purity' explicitly mentioned with reference to the pure laws and customs (νόμοις καὶ ἔθεσιν καθαροῖς) and implicitly alluded to by the reference to the lustral basins (περιραντηρίων) is contrasted with the image of filth that one associates with the gutters on the sides of the streets (ἀμφόδια) and the sewers (μηδὲ μέχρις ὀχ̣[ετῶν]). The local orator continues:

> The people has such vigorous zeal towards good order that it even removes the prostitutes from the places adjacent to the sewers that flank the streets, so that the city's sense of decency is not disturbed, not even as far as the gutters.

John Chrysostom used exactly the same vocabulary, when he explicitly associated prostitutes with ὀχετοί. In one of his homilies, he castigates people who turn to prostitutes: «leaving the clean source of water, you run to the sewer; for the body of the prostitute is a sewer of filth».[11] Similarly, in his attack against the Karpokratians, Epiphanios of Salamis compares the disclosure of their actions with the opening of a sewer (ὀχετός) that would let out a terrible stench:

> Again, I am afraid to say what sort of actions, or I might uncover a trench like a hidden sewer, and some might think that I am causing the blast of foul odor.[12]

With the arousal of disgust these orators sought to elicit the moral condemnation of their opponents – prostitutes, passive homosexuals, and heretics –, to strenthen the people's morality, and to dictate norms.

From fear to love: the construction of divine power

In one of the *Stories of Mr. Keuner* Bertolt Brecht has someone ask Mr. K. if there is a god. Mr. K. responds:

---

[11] *PG* 60.626.33-35: καὶ τὴν πηγὴν ἀφέντες τὴν καθαράν, ἐπὶ τοῦ βορβόρου τὸν ὀχετὸν τρέχετε. ὅτι βόρβορος τὸ τῆς πόρνης σῶμα. Cf. Germ. *Hom.* 5, p. 249.21-24: νῦν δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς αὐτοὺς τοὺς τριγέροντας, ἡ τοιαύτη τῆς γλώττης ἕρπει πορνεία καὶ ὁ τοῦ τοιούτου μολύσματος ὀχετὸς ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἐκχεῖται τὴν πόλιν δίκην ὑπονόμων τινῶν. The association of prostitution and filth (βόρβορος) is very common in Christian authors, esp. John Chrysostom; e.g., see *PG* 59.28.54-58; 62.307.8-11; see also Greg. Nyss. 46.125.43-46; Epiph. *Pan.* 1.299.22-23; Aster. *Hom.* 12.17.16-20.

[12] *Pan.* 1.274.5: ποίαν δέ πρᾶξιν δέδια πάλιν εἰπεῖν, μὴ βορβόρου δίκην κεκαλυμμένου ὀχετὸν ἀποκαλύψω καί τισι δόξω λοιμώδους δυσοσμίας ἐργάζεσαθαι τὴν ἐμφόρησιν (trans. by F. Williams).

> I suggest that you ask yourself whether the answer would impact your behaviour. If your behaviour would remain unchanged, then we can drop the question. If it would change, then I can at least be of assistance to you by telling you that you have already decided: you need a God.

Long before Brecht associated belief in god with human needs, Greek intellectuals traced the origins of the belief in gods back to the emotion of fear. The author of the late fifth-century BC satyr-play *Sisyphos*, perhaps the Athenian sophist Kritias, argued that the gods were invented by a man who observed that only open deeds of violence were punished. In order to deter secret offenders as well, he invented the gods and made people believe that superior beings could see, hear, and know everything.

> When the laws prevented men from open deeds of violence, but they continued to commit them in secret, I believe that a man of shrewd and subtle mind invented for men the fear of the gods, so that there might be something to frighten the wicked even if they acted, spoke or thought in secret. From this motive he introduced the conception of divinity. There is, he said, a spirit enjoying endless life, hearing and seeing with his mind, exceedingly wise and all-observing, bearer of a divine nature. [...] For a dwelling he gave them the place whose mention would most powerfully strike the heartsers of men, whence, as he knew, fear comes to mortals and help for their wretched lives; that is, the vault above, where he perceived the lightning and the dread roars of thunder, and the starry face and form of heaven fair-wrought by the cunning craftsmanship of time. [...] With such fears did he surround mankind, and so by his story gave the godhead a fair home in a fitting place, and extinguished lawlessness by his ordinances. [...] So, I think, first of all, that someone persuaded men to believe that there exists a race of gods.[13]

In the second century AD, Lucian has two crooks introduce the cult of Glykon Neos Asklepios, after they had observed that they could make money by exploiting human fear and hope:

> They readily understood that human life is ruled by two great tyrants, hope and fear, and that a man who could use both of these to advantage would speedily enrich himself. [...] Thanks to these two tyrants, hope and fear, men continually visited the sanctuaries and sought to learn the future in advance, and to that end sacrificed hecatombs and dedicated ingots of gold.[14]

The idea that the gods do not only punish impious people who insulted them and disparaged their power, but also observe crimes and punish offenders, was propagated by religious agents – priests and other religious personnel, authors of narratives of miracles in prose and metre – who used a variety of media. Inscriptions set up in sacred spaces were the most effective medium. They contained narratives of punitive miracles, confessions, dedications by people who had requested and received divine assistance against their opponents, and cult regulations that threatened transgressors with divine punishment.[15]

---

[13] Sext. Emp. *Math.* 9.54. Translation and discussion: Guthrie 1971, 243-244; see also Davies 1989.

[14] Luc. *Alex.* 8. On the cult see more recently Sfameni Gasparro 1996 and 1999; Chaniotis 2002; Thonemann 2021.

Decorated with suggestive images, the inscriptions attracted the attention of the visitors of sanctuaries. The message was clear: ‘learn about the suffering of others, fear the gods, and be just and pious’! A ‘confession inscription’ is a good example. In Saittai (Lydia) the community performed the preventive cursing of those who might commit theft in a public bath. A thief who ignored this was punished by the god and forced to confess his crime and deliver the garment he had stolen. A relief shows the statue of the punishing god Mes and the thief who brings the stolen garment to the sanctuary. The text reads:

> A sceptre was set up in case someone should steal something from the bath. When a garment was stolen, the god angrily prosecuted the thief and made him, after some time, bring the garment to the god. And he confessed. Through a messenger the god ordered the garment to be sold and (the manifestation of) his power to be written on a stele.[16]

If the visitors of the sanctuary were not able to read the text themselves, they could ask another worshipper or the priests. But it is also possible that such inscriptions were read out to the worshippers from time to time, as happened with the narratives of miracles in the worship of Sarapis. A papyrus fragment from Egypt (second century AD) reports that the priest read out passages from a collection of miracles to the worshippers; the audience was asked to respond with acclamations.[17]

The healing miracles of Epidauros, inscribed on *stelae* dedicated to Apollo and Asklepios (fourth century BC), include narratives that deal with disbelievers in Asklepios’ healing powers or with individuals who thought that they could cheat the god and deprive him of his reward. When the god revealed his power and punished the disbeliever, he restored faith. One of the very first miracles is such a story:[18]

---

[15] For a more detailed discussion of the construction of the fear of god see Chaniotis 2012.

[16] Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, no. 3 lines 2–11 (Saittai, AD 164): ἐπεὶ ἐπεστάθη σκῆπτρον, εἴ τις ἐκ τοῦ βαλανείου τι κλέψι, κλαπέντος οὖν εἱματίου ὁ θεὸς ἐνεμέσησε τὸν κλέπτην καὶ ἐπόησε μετὰ χρόνον τὸ εἱμάτιον ἐνενκῖν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, καὶ ἐξωμολογήσατο. ὁ θεὸς οὖν ἐκέλευσε δι’ ἀνγέλου πραθῆναι τὸ εἱμάτιν καὶ στηλλογραφῆσαι τὰς δυνάμεις.

[17] *P.Oxy.* 11.1382: ἡ ἀρετὴ ἐν ταῖς Μερκουρίου βιβλιοθήκαις· οἱ παρόντες εἴπατε ‘εἷς Ζεὺς Σάραπις’ («this miracle is contained in the *Library* of Mercurius; those who are present should exclaim: ‘One Zeus Sarapis!’»).

[18] *IG* IV^2 1.121, lines 22–33; cf. LiDonnici 1995, 86–87, A3; Martzavou 2012, 197.

> A man who was paralyzed in all his fingers except one came as a suppliant to the god. When he was looking at the plaques in the sanctuary, he didn’t believe in the cures and was somewhat disparaging of the inscriptions. Sleeping in the shrine, he saw a vision. It seemed he was playing the knucklebones below the temple, and as he was about to throw them, the god appeared, sprang on his hand and stretched out these fingers one by one. When he had straightened them all, the god asked him if he would still not believe the inscriptions on the plaques around the sanctuary and he answered no. «Therefore, since you doubted them before, though they were not unbelievable, from now on», he said, «your name shall be “Unbeliever”». When day came, he left well.

The use of the verb ὑποδιασύρω («to ridicule, to scorn») makes it clear that the ‘Unbeliever’ interacted with other worshippers; the inscription made his punishment public. The fear of divine anger guided people to the right path.

The best sources for the arousal of fear through narratives of divine justice are the so-called ‘confession inscriptions’ and the praises of gods that refer to divine punishment. Since I have treated this subject extensively in another publication (see n. 15), I only give here one example, an inscription from Lydia (AD 57).[19]

The text consists of acclamations and an account of a family conflict given by a certain Glykon. Glykon had been locked up by his nephew. However, when the nephew interpreted an unknown incident (a disease?) as divine punishment, he set his uncle free and accompanied him to the sanctuary of the moon god Mes or Men. There, before an audience, Glykon castigated his nephew’s ingratitude and praised the god:

> Great is the Mother of Mes Axiottenos! – Glykon, the son of Apollonios, and Myrtion, the wife of Apollonios, (set up) this praise for Mes Ouranios and for Mes of Artemidoros who rules over Axiotta, for their rescue and for that of their children. – For you, Lord, have shown mercy, when I was a captive. – Great is your holiness! Great is your justice! Great is your victory! Great your punishing power! Great is the Dodekatheon that has been established in your vicinity! – For the son of my brother Demainetos made me his captive. For I had neglected my own affairs and helped you, as if you were my own son. But you locked me in and kept me a captive, as if I were a criminal and not your paternal uncle! Now, great is Mes, the ruler over Axiotta! You have given me satisfaction. I praise you.

Presumably, Glykon’s praise was followed by the nephew’s propitiation of the god in accordance with the manner often described in such records of divine punishment. After the public confession, the culprit asked for forgiveness, performed a propitiatory ritual, and praised the gods.

---

[19] *SEG* 53.1344 (Magazadamları, Lydia): Μεγάλη Μήτηρ Μηνὸς Ἀξιοττηνοῦ. Μηνὶ Οὐρανίῳ, Μηνὶ Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἀξιοττα κατέχοντι. Γλύκων Ἀπολλωνίου καὶ Μύρτιον Γλύκωνος εὐλογίαν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίας καὶ τῶν ἰδίων τέκνων. σὺ γάρ με, κύριε, αἰχμαλωτιζόμενον ἠλέησες. μέγα σοι τὸ ὅσιον, μέγα σοι τὸ δίκαιον, μεγάλη νείκη, μεγάλαι σαὶ νεμέσεις, μέγα σοι τὸ δωδεκάθεον τὸ παρὰ σοὶ κατεκτισμένον. ἠχμαλωτίσθην ὑπὸ ἀδελφοῦ τέκνου τοῦ Δημαινέτου. ὅτι τὰ ἐμὰ προέλειψα καί σοι βοΐθεαν ἔδωκα ὡς τέκνῳ. σὺ δὲ ἐξέκλεισές με καὶ ᾐχμαλώτισάς με οὐχ ὡς πάτρως, ἀλλὰ ὡς κακοῦργον. μέγας οὖν ἐστι Μεὶς Ἀξιοττα κατέχων. τὸ εἱκανόν μοι ἐποίησας. εὐλογῶ ὑμεῖν. Discussion: Chaniotis 2009b, 116-122.

Set up in sacred space, such texts reached their audiences through oral performances, such as the acclamations and the reading aloud of the inscriptions. These inscribed testimonia of divine anger and punishment could attract a worshipper's attention in different ways: through their location – for instance, at the entrance of a precinct, in front of a temple, near the incubation room in a healing sanctuary –, with their decoration, or by their size. In numerous cases, the records of divine punishment are explicitly called 'exempla' (ἐξεμπλάριον, ὑπόδειγμα) and proofs (μαρτύριον) of the effectiveness of divine justice.[20] These media of religious instruction show that piety (εὐσέβεια) was constructed as fear of the divine (δεισιδαιμονία). Fear of god (θεούδεια) is explicitly mentioned in an unclear context in an oracle of Apollo Klarios from Hierapolis (late second or early third century AD).[21]

It goes without saying that the emotional construction of the divine was not limited to polytheism. The term θεοσεβής («god-fearer») designated a religious group influenced by Judaism;[22] and the prophetess Nana, a member of the Montanist movement, declared in a metrical inscription (c. AD 350) that «from the beginning she felt the fear of god all night long» (παννύχιον θεοῦ φόβον εἶχεν ἀπ' ἀρ̣χῖς).[23]

But I should also briefly mention an important development that can be observed in the Imperial period and in Late Antiquity: the idea of a compassionate god who loves mankind. In this case, it is love not fear that contributes to the emotional construction of the divine. The traditional relationship between the worshipper and the deity was transactional: divine help was granted in response to the promise of a gift (κατ' εὐχήν) or to piety.[24] There is a fundamental difference between a god who is moved by the prayer of a human being on one specific occasion and a god who has the emotional disposition of affection towards mankind (φιλανθρωπία). The idea that certain divinities did not simply respond to individual human pleas for help, but their very nature was to have kind feelings and compassion towards all mankind, is explicitly formulated for the first time in the Imperial period.[25] Asklepios is *par excellence* the god 'who loves mankind' (φιλάνθρωπος). His φιλανθρωπία is praised in both literary sources and inscriptions.[26] In addition to Asklepios, we find the notion of φιλανθρωπία in connection with Mes, a healing god called Δαίμων φιλάνθρωπος νέος Ασκληπιός («the mankind-loving daemon, the new Asklepios»),[27] and Zeus in Panamara.[28] It is against this trend of perceiving polytheistic gods as loving mankind, independent of social status, citizenship, and gender that a Christian vocabulary that made compassion a cardinal property of the Christian God and Christ emerged.[29] The shift from the gods who respond to vows in expectation of a votive, to God who responds to prayers because of his compassionate nature is also reflected by the use of the word εὐχή in polytheistic and Christian inscriptions. While polytheistic dedications use the word εὐχή in the meaning «vow» in the stereotypical expressions εὐχήν and κατ' εὐχήν («dedicated as a vow» or «dedicated in fulfilment of a vow»), in Christian (and Jewish) inscriptions the very same word is always used in the nominative in the meaning «prayer».

---

[20] 'Εξεμπλάριον: Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, nos. 106, 111, 112, 120, 121. Μαρτύριον: Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, nos. 9 and 17; cf. the verb μαρτυρεῖν: Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, nos. 8, 17, 68.

[21] *Steinepigramme*, I, no. 02/12/03: ὧδε γὰρ οὐκ ἀφαμαρτήσεις ὧν τοι θε[ὸς αὐδᾳ̃], | ἐκ δὲ θεουδείης κύρσεις, ἥ σ' οὔτι [κακώσει] («in this way you will not fail in what the god pronounces, and through the fear of god, which will not harm you, you shall achieve something»).

[22] On the θεοσεβεῖς see more recently Ameling 2004, 13-20.

[23] *SEG* 43.943; *Steinepigramme*, II, no. 16/41/15.

[24] On reciprocity in Greek religion see Parker 1998.

[25] A god is called φιλάνθρωπος in Plat. *Lg.* 4, 713d6-7 (Kronos). For the Imperial period, see Parker 2016, 76.

Affection and the illusion of social and political harmony

«I love Apollonios, my master» (φιλῶ Ἀπολλώνιον κύριον) is written on a pillar in Aphrodisias (c. AD 200).[30] Around the same time, in Patara in Lykia, a slave was praised by a fellow slave who had erected his grave monument as φιλοκύριος («affectionate toward the master»).[31] No matter whether these texts are expressions of true feelings, public manifestation of loyalty, or flattery, one thing is certain: the alleged affection of a slave towards the master expresses the expectations of the master, not those of the slave. The voice of slaves is often manipulated in epitaphs that put in their mouth statements that praise the master, construct the image of the obedient and loyal servant, praise the slaves for qualities that the master appreciates – friendly attitude towards the master (φιλοδέσποτος, φιλοκύριος, εὔνοια), love of order (εὔτακτος), and industriousness (ἐργάτις, κόποι, ὑπηρεσίη).[32] An epigram by Poseidippos even presents a slave saying that burial near the grave of her master was more desirable than freedom.[33] However, when the voice of a slave is unchained, it expresses a sad reality: slavery is characterized as 'hateful', 'wretched'[34] and death is regarded as liberation from servitude.[35] Although there are instances in which we may recognize genuine bonds of affection between slave and master, most of the relevant material is shaped by the theatrical display of emotion. An exceptional case, in which we can confidently recognize true feelings, is a moving epigram from Naples (first century AD). It describes the close bond between two men of the same age, the slave Kosmos and his master M. Opsius Navius Fannianus, who not only manumitted Kosmos, but also provided him with burial:

---

[26] Ael. Aristid. *Or.* 38.15; 39.5 and 11; 42.12 (mid-second century AD); Ael. *NA* 9.33: θεῶν φιλανθρωπότατε, Ἀσκληπιέ (cf. 8.12; c. AD 200); *IGR* 1.826 (epitaph of a worshipper of Asklepios, Thrace, third century AD: θ[ε]ραπευτὴς τοῦ φιλαν[θρ]ώπου θεοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ); 1.546 (dedication to Aklepios and Hygieia, Ulpia Traiana, c. AD 235-238); cf. Julian. *Ep.* 78, 419b.

[27] Mes: *Steinepigramme*, IV, 108 (Makropedion in Pisidia, AD 125/6). Daimon Neos Asklepios: *I.Erythrai Klazomenai* 223 (Erythrai, second century AD).

[28] Zeus' priest invited the citizens of the neighbouring city of Mylasa to Zeus' festival «on behalf of the god, who invites all people to the mystery of philanthropy, not only the relatives, the members of the same tribe, and the friends» (*I.Stratonikeia* 30, second century AD: διὰ τὸν θεόν, ὃς πάντας ἄμ[α ἀνθρώπους ἐπὶ τὸ τῆς φιλ]ανθρωπίας καλῖ μυστήρ[ι]ον, οὐ μόνον τ[οὺς συγγενεῖς καὶ ὁμοφύλου]ς καὶ φίλους).

[29] Greg. Nys. *Or. cat. magna* 15.8: ἴδιον γνώρισμα τῆς θείας φύσεως ἡ φιλανθρωπία. See also e.g. Clem. Al. *Protr.* 1.4.4; 6.1; 2.27.3; 9.83.1; 85.3; 10.91.3; Origen. *Hom. in Job* 17.81; *Exp. in Prov.* 17.201; 17.236. Inscriptions: *I.Chr. Egypte* 587, 650, 666; *I.Syringes* 522; *SEG* 18.724.

[30] Chaniotis 2010, 205.

[31] *TAM* 2.466 (Imperial period).

[32] Detailed discussion: Chaniotis 2021b, 94-99.

> This Kosmos, here, well endowed by fortune, / accomplished every happiness. / My master placed me here with his own hands. / He came to my grave shedding tears – you have to believe me! – / and he stood, tireless, near my dead body. / Already when I was an infant, he longed for me, being an infant himself, / and now, showing piety, he buried me, an old man another old man.[36]

These verses make us eyewitnesses to an old man shedding tears for a lifelong friend. The epigram does not conceal the social differences. On the contrary, the imperative πιστεύσατε («believe this!») shows that the scene the poem describes was anything but self-evident.

Exactly as the epigraphy of slavery exploited emotions in order to consruct a human face for an inhumane institution, Greek cities of the Hellenistic and Imperial periods constructed the fiction of the city as a big family by exploiting the emotion of affection. Two media were used. First, the burial of a benefactor was transformed from a ritual performed by the family into a public ritual, in which the entire city participated.[37] The attendance of the funeral by the entire community created the fiction of the orphaned people. This is directly stated by Philostratos in connection with the funeral of Herodes Atticus.[38] When his freedmen were planning to perform the burial in Marathon, the Athenian ephebes marched from Athens to Marathon, «seized the body with their own hands», brought it back to Athens in procession, and buried it near the stadium which Herodes had donated. All the Athenians attended the funeral lamenting the death of their benefactor like children who have lost a good father. Secondly, the fiction of a family relation between the people and the elite was expressed through the honorary titles of 'the son of the people', 'the daughter of the people', and 'the father of the people'.[39] This established a relationship of mutual care.

---

[33] Austin, Bastianini 2002, no. 48: τοῦθ' ἱκανὸν συνετῆι Βιθυνίδι τοὐγγύθι κεῖσ[θαι] | τῆι δούλη[ι χ]ρηστῶν, ὦ Θέμι, δεσποτέων· | [οὐ γὰρ] ἐλευθερίηι προσεμόχθεον, εὖ χαριτοῦμ[αι], | [ἥτις ἔ]χω στήλην κρέσσον' ελευθερίης («this is enough for the wise Bithynis, to lie | as a slave next to excellent masters, O Themis, | [I did not] strive from freedom, I am well favoured, | [I who] possess a tomb that is better than freedom»).

[34] *IGUR* 3.1330 (Rome, third century AD): δουλοσύνης ἐξάγαγεν στυγερῆς; cf. *SEG* 59.1318 (Ephesos): θρηνεῖ δὲ ἀφόρητος Ἀνάνκη | δουλοσύνην, ἣν σοὶ Μοῖρ' ἐπέκλωσεν ἔχειν.

[35] *IGLS* 5.2336 (Emesa, AD 538; cf. *Anth. Plan.* 7.553): [Ζω]σίμη ἡ πρὶν ἐοῦσα μόνωι τῶι σώματι δούλη | καὶ τῶι σώμα[τ]ι νῦν ηὗρον ἐλευθερίην («I, Zosime, who used to be a slave only in the body, have now found the freedom for my body too»). See also *I.Mésie sup.* I, no. 70.

[36] *IG Napoli* 133 (with further references): Κόσμος ὅδε εὐμοίρως πληρώσας ὄλβια π[άντα]· | ἔνθα με χερσὶν ἑαῖς θήκατο δεσπόσυν[ος]· | ἧκεν δακρυόεις πρὸς ἐμόν, πιστεύσατε, τύμ[βον], | ἔστη μὴ κάμνων ἄνχις ἐμοῦ φθιμέν[ου]· | καὶ βρέφος ὡς ἤμην, ἐπόθει βρέφος αὐτὸς ὑ[πάρχων]· | καὶ νῦν εὐσεβέων θάψε γέροντα γέρων.

[37] Jones 1999; Chaniotis 2006.

Similar fictions can be observed in Hellenistic monarchies and their public display of affection. The court consisted of 'friends' (φίλοι), the top peer of whom were the 'relatives' (συγγενεῖς), and those 'equal in honor with the relatives' (ὁμότιμοι τοῖς συγγενέσιν).[40] Official epithets highlighted the affection between the king, the queen, and their living and deceased relatives: 'father-loving', 'mother-loving', and 'brother- or sister-loving' (φιλοπάτωρ, φιλομήτωρ, φιλάδελφος). The wife of Antiochos III, Laodike, designated him as her 'brother', although she was not his biological sister.[41] The subjects of these kingdoms were given the impression that they were ruled by a group of people joined with bonds of affection; they were expected to believe in the image of dynastic continuity and harmony.

Literary works that praised Hellenistic royalty, such as Theokritos' 12th *Idyll*, and narratives detailed the affection between members of the royal family, in particular the king and the queen,[42] confirming the fiction of harmony in the royal family, and friendship and loyalty in the court. They show the importance of emotional display for royal propaganda. Two well-known cases of such emotional display are the love stories of the young prince Antiochos, son of Seleukos I, and his father's wife, Stratonike, and the dedication of the lock of Queen Berenike for the safe return of her husband, Ptolemy III, from the war. When the love-sick Antiochos tried to starve himself to death, the physician Erasistratos convinced King Seleukos to divorce Stratonike and marry her to Antiochos:[43]

---

[38] Philostr. *VS* 15.20: ἀποθανόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Μαραθῶνι καὶ ἐπισκήψαντος τοῖς ἀπελευθέροις ἐκεῖ θάπτειν Ἀθηναῖοι ταῖς τῶν ἐφήβων χερσίν ἁρπάσαντες ἐς ἄστυ ἤνεγκαν προαπαντῶντες τῷ λέχει πᾶσα ἡλικία δακρύοις ἅμα καὶ ἀνευφημοῦντες, ὅσα παῖδες χρηστοῦ πατρὸς χηρεύσαντες κτλ.

[39] Canali De Rossi 2007; van Nijf 2013, 353-357.

[40] On royal 'friends' see Savalli-Lestrade 1998; Strootman 2014, 117-135, 174-184. On *philoi* and *syngeneis* in the Ptolemaic kingdom, Mooren 1977.

[41] *I.Iasos* 4, line 4 (letter to Iasos).

[42] See Caneva 2014.

[43] Main sources: Plut. *Demetr.* 38; App. *Syr.* 59-61; Luc. *Syr. D.* 17-18. Müller 2004 dates its origin to the second half of the third century BC. A selection of recent scholarly discussions: Müller 2004; Almagor 2016; Engels, Erickson 2016; Ogden 2017, 207-246; Chaniotis 2021b, 84-85.

> Consequently, Seleukos called an assembly of the entire people and declared it to be his wish and decision to make Antiochos king of all the upper satrapies and Stratonike his queen, the two being husband and wife. In his opinion, his son, accustomed as he was to be compliant and obedient in all things, would not oppose his father in this marriage; and if his wife was reluctant to take this extraordinary step, he called upon his friends to teach and to persuade her to regard as good and just whatever the king thought beneficial.[44]

The most likely explanation is that Seleukos I wanted to secure a smooth transition of power.[45] If people wondered about the divorce and the new marriage, it is not unlikely that the court had provided the version that we have. It had no reason not to tell the story of an affectionate father willing to make a sacrifice for the sake of his son, of a respectful and obedient son willing to starve himself to death and keep his love a secret, and of a dutiful and prudent wife willing to follow Seleukos' instructions. A loving family found a solution supported by their friends. The royal family appeared to their subjects as people with emotions.[46]

While in the case of Antiochos and Stratonike we can only suspect the origin of the love story in the court, in the case of Berenike II and Ptolemy III the court's intervention in certain.[47] The affair of the 'Lock of Berenike' was described by Kallimachos in a poem. Most of it is now lost, except for two partly overlapping papyrus fragments.[48] A Latin version, that probably closely follows Kallimachos' poem, survives in Catullus' *Carmen* 66.[49] At the beginning of Ptolemy's campaign in the Third Syrian War (246 BC), the young bride vowed to Aphrodite to offer her long blonde hair, if she would protect the king and bring him back. Ptolemy returned safely and, in fulfilment of her vow, Berenike placed her hair in the temple of Aphrodite/Arsinoe at Zephyrion. When on the next day it was nowhere to be seen, the court astronomer Konon offered an explanation. He identified the hair with a constellation, claiming that the goddess of love had taken such great pleasure in the offering that she had placed the hair in the firmament between Virgo and Leo, where the *Coma Berenices* can still be seen. As Kathryn Gutzwiller has convincingly argued, the court portrayed a public image of a harmonious royal marriage that based on earlier practices «in which the romantic lives of Ptolemaic queens were openly celebrated in order to legitimize their joint rule with their husbands».[50]

---

[44] Plut. *Demetr.* 38.11.

[45] Kuhrt, Sherwin-White 1991, 83-85; Ager 2017, 172.

[46] Further examples of the efforts of Hellenistic kings to appear affable and close to the 'ordinary people' in Chaniotis 1997, 239-242, and 2009a, 103-139.

[47] Main sources: *Schol. ad Arat. Phaen.* 146; Hyg. *Astr.* 2.24; Nonn. *Ad Greg. Or. contra Iulian.* 2.2 (= *PG* 36.1037).

[48] *PSI* 1092 and *P.Oxy.* 2258C.

[49] For a discussion see Gutzwiller 1992.

[50] Gutzwiller 1992, 362-363.

Another example of propaganda through emotions in Hellenistic courts is provided by the Attalids. In c. 185 BC, two of the sons of King Attalos I – the later Attalos II and either Philetairos or Athenaios – visited Kyzikos, the native city of their mother Apollonis. Their visit was staged as a display of affection and gratitude (χάρις) towards their mother, whom Polybios praises for her affection toward her children (φιλοστοργία) until her old age.[51] The sons placed Apollonis between them, and holding both her hands they walked all around the sanctuaries of the city followed by their servants:

> All who witnessed it applauded and honored the young men for this, and, mindful of the story of Kleobis and Biton, compared their conduct to this, and were thought to have made up for the splendor of the devotion of those with their exalted and royal status.[52]

The two Attalids were compared with the best sons in Greek history. The staged appearance of Eumenes' sons achieved its aim.

The theatricality of courts did not escape the notice of contemporaries. During a symposion, king Antigonos Gonatas tried to break the cooperation between Aratos of Sikyon and Ptolemy II by spreading 'fake news'; he claimed that Aratos

> seems to be capable to judge the lives and affairs of kings. For in the past he overlooked us, fixing his hopes elsewhere, and he admired the wealth of Egypt, hearing about their elephants, their fleet, and their court. But now that he has seen behind the scene and recognized that everything there is dramaturgy (τραγῳδία) and scenery (σκηνογραφία), he has come over entirely to us.[53]

The fiction of affection also characterized the relations between emperor and subjects. In AD 125, the federation of the Greeks who celebrated the festival of the Eleutheria in Plataiai honored Emperor Hadrian with a statue in Delphi:

> The Greeks who gather in Plataiai dedicated this to Emperor Hadrian, the rescuer, who saved and nourished his very own Greece, in expression of their gratitude.[54]

The language of this text is emotional. χαριστήριον directly refers to the feeling of gratitude. The words σωτήρ and ῥυσαμένῳ express relief from fears and anxiety. The use of τρέφω (θρέψαντι) constructs a strong bond between the emperor and the Greeks and alludes to Hadrian's material benefactions. Finally, and more importantly, the possesive pronoun ἑαυτοῦ («his Greece»), often used as an expression of affection,[55] constructs a bond of affection and mutual loyalty between Hadrian and the Greeks, despite the clear hierarchical relationship that exists between the ruler and his subjects.

---

[51] Polyb. 22.20.3-7.

[52] Polyb. 22.20.6-7: ἐφ' οἷς οἱ θεώμενοι μεγάλως τοὺς νεανίσκους ἀπεδέχοντο καὶ κατηξίουν καὶ μνημονεύοντες τῶν περὶ τὸν Κλέοβιν καὶ Βίτωνα συνέκρινον τὰς αἱρέσεις αὐτῶν, καὶ τὸ τῆς προθυμίας τῆς ἐκείνων λαμπρὸν τῷ τῆς ὑπεροχῆς τῶν βασιλέων ἀξιώματι συναναπληροῦντες (trans. by W.R. Paton, revised by F.W. Walbank, C. Habicht); Walbank 1979, 211-212; Chaniotis 2021b, 87.

[53] Plut. *Arat.* 15.2.

[54] *Syll.*^{3} 835 A: Αὐτοκράτορι Ἀδριανῷ σωτῆρι, | ῥυσαμένῳ καὶ θρέψαντι τὴν | ἑαυτοῦ Ἑλλάδα, οἱ ἰς Πλαταιὰς συνιόντες Ἕλληνες χαρι|στήριον ἀνέθηκαν.

Anger and hierarchical relations

One of the longest Hellenistic honorific decrees for benefactors is the one for Protogenes of Olbia (late third century BC).[56] The proposer of the decree repeatedly used an emotional vocabulary, reminding the citizens of Olbia how terrified they were on several occasions, when Protogenes saved the city. In a fragmentary passage that refers to an embassy to a foreign (Skythian?) dynast:

> When king Saitaphernes came along to the other side of the river to receive favours (ἐπὶ θεραπείαν), and the magistrates called an assembly and reported on the presence of the king and on the fact that the city's revenues were exhausted, Protogenes came forward and gave 900 gold pieces. When the ambassadors, Protogenes and Aristokrates, took the money and met the king, and the king took the presents but flew into a rage (εἰς ὀργὴν δὲ καταστάντος) and broke up his quarters [... treated?] the magistrates [unworthily? and so] the people met together and [were] terrified (περίφ[οβος])…

No matter what the king felt, when he received the tribute of Olbia, that he decided to display his anger was part of negotiations between unequal partners in an asymmetrical relationship. We may recognize such displays of anger in the documentary sources through the choice of vocabulary, as the following examples demonstrate.

In the the aftermath of the Third Macedonian War (167 BCE), a certain Demophilos, a supporter of the Romans, was given confiscated land belonging to supporters of Perseus. When some citizens of Gonnoi had prevented Demophilos from taking possession of the land, he complained to Aemilius Paullus. Thereupon, the Roman consul sent a letter to the authorities of Gonnoi asking them to ensure that Demophilos got the land. Apparently, the opposition continued and Paullus had to send a second letter; both letters are preserved in an inscription.[57] Unlike the first letter, in the second letter Paullus omits the customary greeting χαίρειν. Without any effort to be polite, he immediately addresses the issue with a sharp tone that verbaly shows his indignation:

---

[55] Examples in Chaniotis 2021b, 89.

[56] *IOSPE*^{2} I 32. Its rhetorical aspects and the use of an emotional appeal are discussed in Chaniotis 2013a.

[57] *SEG* 66.400; commentaries: Bouchon 2014; Batziou, Pikoulas 2014-2019; Chaniotis 2021b, 78-82.

> On the matter of Demophilos [...] He has come twice to you, in order that he receives the plots and the house granted to him. You appear to be completely ill-judged for not taking any action when Philinias and Aischylos present obstacles in this matter. All of you should have shown greater steadfastness, not looking at your own advantage and following other malevolent people.

Paullus accused all the magistrates for ill-judgment (ἀγνώμωνες), neglect of duties, self-interest, and following malevolent people (μοχθηροί). The adjective μοχθηρός often appears in Hellenistic public documents, as an 'acoustic signal' of indignation.[58] His wording is the equivalent of a raised, angry voice. Paullus' display of indignation aiming at fear, humiliation, and demonstration of superior position followed up on the display of indignation by the Roman senate a few years earlier. The senate published a letter summarizing the grievances of the Romans against Perseus in the sanctuary of Apollo in Delphi.[59] The impact of these emotional displays is seen in contemporary documents. In the same year in which Paullus was dealing with Gonnoi, ambassadors of Teos to Rome experienced such a humiliation that they describe it using the the unique expression ψυχικὴ κακαπάθεια. Having to perform the daily rituals of the *clientes* in the *atria* of the houses of influential senator, in the very year that the Achaean League had sent to Rome 1000 hostages, these envoys had the impression that they were hostages themselves, and no longer free men.[60] And a few years later, Attalos II sent a letter to the priest of Pessinous explaining why he was hesitant in starting a war against the Galatians, because of fear of the Romans:

> [...] to launch an undertaking without their participation seemed connected with great danger; if we were successful, the success would cause envy and detraction and baneful suspicion – which they [the Romans] also felt toward my brother; if we failed, our destruction is undeniably clear. For they would not regard our disaster with sympathy but with delight, because we had undertaken such projects without them.[61]

These examples, along with numerous passages in Polybios,[62] show the importance of the display of Roman indignation during a turning point of Roman imperialism in the East.

---

[58] Chaniotis 2013b, 346-350.

[59] Bagnall, Derow 2004, no. 44; Austin 2006, no. 93.

[60] *I.Thrake Aeg.* no. E5, lines 19-26: εἴς τε̣ [Ῥώμην π]ρεσβεύσαντες ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου ψυχικὴν ἅμα καὶ σω[ματικὴν] ὑπέμειναν κ[α]κοπαθίαν ἐντυγχάνοντες μὲν τοῖ[ς ἡγουμένοι]ς Ῥωμαίων καὶ ἐξομηρευόμενοι διὰ τῆς καθ' ἡμέρα[ν καρ]τερήσεως («when they went to Rome as ambassadors, they patiently endured psychic and bodily stress, appealing to the Roman magistrates and, with their perseverance, offering themselves as hostages»).

[61] *I.Pessinous* 7 (c. 158-156 BC; inscribed in the late first century BC/early first century AD): [...] τὸ προπεσεῖν ἄνευ 'κείνων μέγαν ἐδόκει κίνδυνον ἔχειν· καὶ γὰρ ἐπιτυχοῦσιν φθόνον καὶ ἀφαίρεσιν καὶ ὑφοψίαν μοχθηράν, ἣν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ἔσχοσαν, καὶ ἀποτυχοῦσιν ἄρσιν πρόδηλον. οὐ γὰρ ἐπιστραφήσεσθ' ἐκείνους, ἀλλ' ἡδέως ὄψεσθαι, ὅτι ἄνευ ἑαυτῶν τηλικαῦτ' ἐκινούμεθα.

[62] Erskine 2015.

Another example of verbal expression of indignation by a higher authority is a letter of Augustus to Knidos (6 BC) containing his verdict in a complicated homicide case.[63] A certain Phileinos gathered some friends and attacked the house of a personal (or political?) enemy, Euboulos, for a full three nights. No longer tolerating the harassment, in the third night Euboulos ordered one of his slaves to take a chamber pot and empty its content on the assailants' heads. Unfortunately, the pot fell out of the slave's hands, killing one of the assailants. As a consequence, Euboulos faced charges for murder. The wording of Augustus' verdict reveals his indignation:

> I am amazed that you do not show indignation against those who deserved to suffer every punishment, since they attacked another's house three times at night with violence and force and were destroying the common security of all.

Simply by expressing his amazement (ἐθαύμαζον) at the Knidians' wrong approach to the matter, Augustus indicated his indignation and thus expressed not only his superiority with regard to power but also with regard to morality.

Hope and pity and relations of dependence

Elpis (expectation, hope) creates a very powerful bond between partners in asymmetrical relations: gods and humans, elites and masses, rulers and subjects. In this bond, the superior partners – gods, benefactors, or emperors – are the givers of hope – or they *are* hope –,[64] and their gift is rewarded by the inferior partners with faith in the case of religion, acceptance of authority in the case of the civic elites, and loyalty in the case of imperial rule. A few selected examples demonstrate this.[65]

The discourse of *elpis* as we find it in documents concerning the relations between the emperor and Greek communities constructed a relationship of reciprocity. It promoted the image of the powerful ruler, in whose hands the hopes of subordinate communities lie, but at the same time it reminded the ruler of his obligation to act in order to fulfil these expectations. This is clearly expressed in a document concerning Augustus. A decree of the cities of Asia in honor of his grandson Caius Caesar describes the emperor with a phraseology of hope (1 BC):

---

[63] *I.Knidos* 34: ἐθαύμαζον δ' ἄν, πῶς [...] μὴ κατὰ τῶν ἀξίων πᾶν ὁτιοῦν παθεῖν, ἐπ' ἀλλο[τρίαν] οἰκίαν νύκτωρ μεθ' ὕβρεως καὶ βίας τρὶς ἐπεληλυ[θό]των καὶ τὴν κοινὴν ἁπάντων ὑμῶν ἀσφάλειαν [ἀναι]ρούντων ἀγανακτοῦντες.

[64] E.g. *I.Ancyra* 8 (honorific inscription for Tiberius Claudius Procillianus, Ankyra, c. AD 150: νέαν ἐλπίδα τῆς πατρίδος («the new hope of the fatherland»); *SEG* 39.1243 (honorific decree for a benefactor, Kolophon, second century BC): ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος φαίνηται τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας καὶ πολλὰ δείγματα τῆς ἀρετῆς τεθικότας καὶ εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα χρόνον τὰς ἀρίστας ἐλπίδας διδόντας καὶ ἀξίως τειμῶντες («the council and the people visibly honor the virtuous men and those who have shown many specimens of their virtue and have given the best hopes for the future time»); *IG* 7.2711, lines 68–69 (Boiotian decree for Caligula, AD 37): ἤνεν{εν}κεν ἀπόκριμα πρὸς τὸ ἔθνος πάσης [φιλαν]θρωπίας καὶ ἐλπίδων ἀγαθῶν πλῆρες («he brought to the federation a response which is full of benevolence and good hopes»).

[65] For a more detailed treatment see Chaniotis 2021b, 88–93.

> his providence has not only fulfilled the hopes of all people but has also surpassed them. [...] And men are full of good hopes for the future and good spirit in the present.[66]

In order to see the fulfilment of their hopes, Greek communities appealed to the pity of emperors. A decree of Messene concerning the cult of Tiberius describes the city's relationship to the emperor in emotional terms, combining the theatrical display of sorrow, affection, joy, and distress with a plea for pity:

> We should also send an embassy to Rome, to the Emperor Tiberius Caesar, which will express our sorrow (λυπηθησομέναν) for the fact that the god is no longer apparent to us, will embrace (ἀσπασομέναν) the Emperor Tiberius and share the joy (συνχαρησομέναν) for the fact that he has become our ruler of the entire world, worthy and corresponding to our prayers, and will lament (ἀποδυρουμέναν) the misfortunes that have befallen our city, and beg him that we may receive some pity (ἐλέου).[67]

With the use of emotional terms and emotional language, this text represented the relation between the Roman emperor and a community of subjects as an emotional transaction between asymmetrical partners. In this transactional relationship, the partners display distinct emotions and fulfill distinct tasks. The subjects have hopes; the emperors fulfill them. The subjects join the emperor and his family in their joy or grief, expecting their loyalty to be rewarded. The subjects display sorrow and distress; the emperor shows pity. The imperial ἔλεος is not the empathy of the audience in a dramatic performance that fears that it might be subject to a fate similar to that of the tragic heroes; it is the pity that a superior power shows to those who depend on its goodwill and generosity. In this way, ἐλπίς and ἔλεος construct relations of power.

Conclusions

The epigraphic sources on which this paper was based reveal in a direct manner how various agents used emotional displays, an emotional vocabulary, or the arousal of emotions in order to create fictions of great significance for Greek society, political life, and culture, as well as for the transmission of values. Disgust was used to enhance moral norms and stigmatize those who did not follow them. Fear and love contributed to the construction of divine power and divine justice. The theatrical display of affection between slaves and masters, among the members of the court, and between the elite and the people created fictions of social, dynastic, and civic harmony. The display of anger, the expression of hope, and the plea for pity constructed hierarchical relations. As much as society and culture shape certain manifestations of emotions, emotions are used by social and cultural agents to represent social and cultural institutions, to enhance values, and to establish hierarchies.

---

[66] *GIBM* 894 + *SEG* 4.201, lines 7-14: οὗ ἡ πρόνοια τὰς πάντων [ἐλπί|δ]ας οὐκ ἐπλήρωσε μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπερῆρεν· [...] ἐλπίδων μὲν χρηστῶν πρὸς τὸ μέλλον, εὐθυμία[ς | δ]ὲ εἰς τ[ὸ] παρὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐνπεπλησμένων.

[67] *SEG* 41.328: ἀποστεῖλαι δὲ καὶ | πρεσβείαν εἰς Ῥώμαν ποτὶ τὸν αὐτοκ̣[ρά]τορα Τιβέριον Καίσαρα, τὰν λυπηθησο|μέναν μὲν ἐπὶ τῷ μηκέτι ἁμεῖν ἦμεν ἐ[μ]φανῆ τὸν θεόν, ἀσπασομέναν δὲ Τιβέρι|ον τὸν αὐτοκράτορα καὶ συνχαρησομέναν ἐπὶ τῷ τὸν ἄξιον καὶ κατ᾽ εὐχὰν ἁμεῖν ἁγ|εμόνα γεγενῆσθαι τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου, ἀποδυρουμέναν δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν κατεσχη|κότων τὰν πόλιν ἀτόπων καὶ ἱκετεύσουσαν ὅπως τύχωμες ἐλέου τινός.

Bibliography

Ager S.L. (2017), *Symbol and ceremony: royal weddings in the Hellenistic Age*, in *The Hellenistic Court. Monarchic Power and Elite Society from Alexander to Cleopatra*, ed. by A. Erskine, L. Llewellyn-Jones, S. Wallace, Swansea, 165-188.

Almagor E. (2016), *Seleukid love and power: Stratonike I*, in *Seleukid Royal Women*, 67-86.

Ameling W. (2004), *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis*, II. *Kleinasien*, Tübingen.

Austin C., Bastianini G. (2002), *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia*, Milano.

Austin M.M. (2006^2), *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest. A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*, Cambridge.

Bagnall R., Derow P. (2004^2), *Historical Sources in Translation. The Hellenistic Period*, Oxford.

Batziou A., Pikoulas Y.A. (2014-2019), Πρόσταγμα καὶ ἐπιστολὲς Λευκίου Αἰμυλίου Λευκίου (Παύλου Μακεδονικοῦ), «Horos» 26-31, 281-302.

Bouchon R. (2014), *Démophilos de Doliché, Paul-Émile et les conséquences de la troisième guerre de Macédoine à Gonnoi*, «Topoi» 19, 486-513.

Bryen A.Z. (2008), *Visibility and violence in petitions from Roman Egypt*, «GRBS» 48, 181-200.

Canali De Rossi F. (2007), *Filius publicus.* υἱὸς τῆς πόλεως *e titoli affini in iscrizioni greche di età imperiale*, Roma.

Caneva S. (2014), *Courtly love, stars, and power: the queen in third-century royal couples, through poetry and epigraphic texts*, in *Hellenistic Poetry in Context*, ed. by M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, G.C. Walker, Leuven, 25-57.

Chaniotis A. (1997), *Theatricality beyond the theater: staging public life in the Hellenistic World*, in *De la scène aux gradins. Théâtre et représentations dramatiques après Alexandre le Grand dans les cités hellénistiques*, éd. par B. Le Guen, Toulouse, 219-259.

— (2002), *Old wine in a new skin. Tradition and innovation in the cult foundation of Alexander of Abonouteichos*, in *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient World*, ed. by E. Dabrowa, Krakow, 67-85.

— (2006), *Rituals between norms and emotions: rituals as shared experience and memory*, in *Rituals and Communication in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. by E. Stavrianopoulou («Kernos» Suppl., 16), Liège, 211-238.

— (2009a), Θεατρικότητα και δημόσιος βίος στον ελληνιστικό κόσμο, Herakleion.

— (2009b), *Ritual Performances of Divine Justice: The Epigraphy of Confession, Atonement, and Exaltation in Roman Asia Minor*, in *From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East*, ed. by H.M. Cotton *et al.*, Cambridge, 115-153.

— (2010), *Graffiti in Aphrodisias: images - texts - contexts*, in *Ancient Graffiti in Context*, ed. by J.A. Baird, C. Taylor, London, 207-224.

— (2012), *Constructing the fear of gods: epigraphic evidence from sanctuaries of Greece and Asia Minor*, in *Unveiling Emotions*, 205-234.

— (2013a), Paradoxon*,* enargeia*, empathy: Hellenistic decrees and Hellenistic oratory*, in *Hellenistic Oratory. Continuity and Change*, ed. by C. Kremmydas, K. Tempest, Oxford, 201-216.

— (2013b), *Emotional language in Hellenistic decrees and Hellenistic histories*, in *Parole in movimento. Linguaggio politico e lessico storiografico nel mondo ellenistico*, a cura di M. Mari, J. Thornton (*Studi Ellenistici*, 27), Pisa - Roma, 339-352.

— (2018), *The social construction of emotion: a view from ancient Greece*, «Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences» 24, 56-61.

— (2020), *Too shameless, even for the gutter! Prostitutes in Tralleis*, «Eulimene» 21, 151-154.

— (2021a), *Display, arousal, and performance of emotions: introduction*, in *Unveiling Emotions III*, 9-30.

— (2021b), *Power relations as emotional relations: Hellenistic and Imperial realities and fictions*, in *Unveiling Emotions III*, 75-103.

Davies M. (1989), *Sisyphus and the invention of religion ('Critias'* TrGF *1 (43) F 19 = B 25 DK)*, «BICS» 36, 16-32.

Engels D., Erickson K. (2016), *Apama and Stratonike: marriage and legitimacy*, in *Seleukid Royal Women*, 41-67.

Erskine A. (2015), *Polybius and the anger of the Romans*, in *Emotions between Greece and Rome*, ed. by D. Cairns, L. Fulkerson («BICS» Suppl., 125), London, 105-127.

Guthrie W.K.C. (1971), *The Sophists*, Cambridge.

Gutzwiller C. (1992), *Callimachus'* Lock of Berenice*: Fantasy, Romance, and Propaganda*, «AJPh» 113, 359-385.

Jones C. (1999), *Interrupted funerals*, «PAPhS» 143, 588-600.

Kotsifou C. (2012), *Emotions and papyri: Insights into the theatre of human experience in Antiquity*, in *Unveiling Emotions*, 39-90.

Kuhrt A., Sherwin-White S. (1991), *Aspects of Seleucid royal ideology: the cylinder of Antiochus I from Borsippa*, «JHS» 111, 71-86.

Lateiner D., Spatharas D. (2017), *Introduction: ancient and modern modes of understanding and manipulating disgust*, in *The Ancient Emotion of Disgust*, ed. by D. Lateiner, D. Spatharas, Oxford, 23-35.

LiDonnici L.R. (1995), *The Epidaurian Miracle Inscriptions. Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Atlanta.

Malay H., Ricl M., Amendola D. (2018), *The city of Tralleis combats immorality: measures taken against* οἱ ἐν κιναιδείᾳ βιοῦντες *in a new civic decree*, «EA» 51, 91-97.

Martzavou P. (2012), *Dream, narrative, and the construction of hope in the 'healing miracles' of Epidauros*, in *Unveiling Emotions*, 177-204.

Mooren L. (1977), *La hiérarchie de cour ptolémaique. Contribution à l'étude des institutions et des classes dirigeantes à l'époque hellénistique*, Leuven.

Müller C.W. (2004), *Der König, der kranke Prinz und der kluge Arzt. Eine hellenistische Novelle in kaiserzeitlicher Brechung*, in *Iubilet cum Bonna Rhenus. Festschrift zum 150jährigen Bestehen des Bonner Kreises*, hrsg. v. J.P. Clausen, Berlin, 91-114.

Ogden D. (2017), *The Legend of Seleucus. Kingship, Narrative, and Mythmaking in the Ancient World*, Cambridge.

Parker R. (1998), *Pleasing thighs: reciprocity in Greek religion*, in *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*, ed. by C. Gill, N. Postlethwaite, R. Seaford, Oxford, 105-125.

— (2016), *Religion in the prose hymns*, in *In Praise of Asclepius. Aelius Aristides, Selected Prose Hymns*, ed. by D.A. Russell, M. Trapp, H.-G. Nesselrath, Tübingen, 67-88.

Rozin P., Lowery L., Ebert R. (1994), *Varieties of disgust faces and the structure of disgust*, «Journal of Personality and Social Psychology» 66, 870-881.

Savalli-Lestrade I. (1998), *Les philoi royaux dans l'Asie hellénistique*, Genève.

Seleukid Royal Women. Creation, Representation and Distortion of Hellenistic Queenship in the Seleukid Empire, ed. by A. Coşkun, A. McAuley, Stuttgart 2016.

Sfameni Gasparro G. (1996), *Alessandro di Abonutico, lo "pseudo-profeta" ovvero come construirsi un'identità religiosa. I. Il profeta, "eroe" e "uomo divino"*, «SMSR» 62, 565-590.

— (1999), *Alessandro di Abonutico, lo "pseudo-profeta" ovvero come construirsi un'identità religiosa. II. L'oracolo e i misteri*, in *Les syncrétismes religieux dans le monde méditérranéen antique* (Actes du colloque international en l'honneur de Franz Cumont à l'occasion du cinquantième anniversaire de sa mort. Rome, Academia Belgica, 25-27 septembre 1997), éd. par C. Bonnet, A. Motte, Bruxelles - Rome, 275-305.

Spatharas D. (2021), *Projective disgust and its uses in ancient Greece*, in *Unveiling Emotions III*, 33-73.

Strootman R. (2014), *Courts and Elites in the Hellenistic Empires. The Near East after the Achaemenids, c. 330 to 30 BCE*, Edinburgh.

Thonemann P. (2021), *Lucian. Alexander or the False Prophet*, Oxford.

Unveiling Emotions. Sources and Methods for the Study of Emotions in the Greek World, ed. by A. Chaniotis, Stuttgart 2012.

Unveiling Emotions II. Emotions in Greece and Rome. Texts, Images, Material Culture, ed. by A. Chaniotis, P. Ducrey, Stuttgart 2013.

Unveiling Emotions III. Arousal, Display, and Performance of Emotions in the Greek World, ed. by A. Chaniotis, Stuttgart 2021.

van Nijf O.M. (2013), *Affective politics: the emotional regime in the Imperial City*, in *Unveiling Emotions II*, 351-368.

Walbank F.W. (1979), *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, III, Oxford.