

# Archiereis and Asiarchs: A Gladiatorial Perspective

Michael Carter

THE RELATIONSHIP between the provincial *archierosyne* of Asia (the office of ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς Ἀσίας) and the *asiarchia* (the office of ἀσιάρχης) has long been the subject of debate by scholars concerned with the imperial cult in the province of Asia.<sup>1</sup> Some argue that these two titles designated two different offices: two titles for two distinct positions. Others hold that they were virtually synonymous and referred to the same office: two titles for one position.<sup>2</sup> While the preponderance of the arguments now points to the latter alternative, the debate has become especially polarized in recent years.<sup>3</sup> These scholars have arrived at their divergent opinions after examining the same evidence—differences arise only from interpretation of that evidence. The connection between asiarchs, *archiereis*, and the presentation of gladiatorial spectacles in the

<sup>1</sup>The following are cited by authors' names:

M. D. Campanile, *I sacerdoti del Koinon d'Asia* (Pisa 1994)

J. Deininger, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Munich 1965)

S. Friesen, "Asiarchs," *ZPE* 126 (1999) 275–290

L. Robert, *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec* (Limoges 1940)

M. Rossner, "Asiarchen und Archiereis Asias," *StClas* 16 (1974) 101–142

P. Weiß, "Asiarchen sind Archiereis Asias: Eine Antwort auf S. J. Friesen," in N. Ehrhardt and L. M. Günther, edd., *Widerstand-Anpassung-Integration: die griechischen Staatenwelt in Rom: Festschrift für Jürgen Deininger* (Stuttgart 2002) 241–254

<sup>2</sup>Friesen provides a useful survey of much of the key bibliography (to 1999). Most recent is Weiß in 2002.

<sup>3</sup>Consider recent titles: S. J. Friesen, "Highpriests of Asia and Asiachs: Farewell to the Identification Theory," in P. Scherrer, H. Taeuber, H. Thür, edd., *Stein und Wege: Festschrift für D. Knibbe* (Vienna 1999) 303–307; Weiß, "Asiarchen sind Archiereis Asias: Eine Antwort auf S. J. Friesen."

province is a prime example. Because this connection has been employed—often superficially—by those on both sides of the debate, it is the purpose of this paper to investigate in greater depth the relationship between gladiatorial spectacles and asiarchs or *archiereis*. Both asiarchs and *archiereis* are attested as owners of gladiatorial troupes and presenters of gladiatorial spectacles. The gladiatorial perspective supports the argument that the two offices were identical.

### *Ownership*

Both asiarchs and *archiereis* are associated with the ownership of gladiatorial troupes. As one might expect, few ancient authors overtly discuss the ownership of troupes of gladiators by the local and provincial leaders in the province of Asia. Greek writers and thinkers typically raise the issue only in disdain. For example, the moralist Epictetus does expect us to be aware that the *archiereis* owned and maintained gladiators, but he only mentions this in order to rebuke extravagant persons such as those *archiereis* who doted excessively on their gladiators (2.24.23). The physician Galen, however, was not too proud to recall his own years of service with a gladiatorial troupe. As a young man just returned from Alexandria, he was hired by the *archiereus* in his native Pergamum (τῷ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν ἀρχιερεῖ) to minister to the medical needs of his gladiators and was subsequently retained by the next four *archiereis*:<sup>4</sup>

κατὰ τύχην δὲ πολλῶν τεθνεώτων ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν ἔτεσιν, ἐμοῦ δὲ οὔτε τῶν ὡς εἴρηται τετρωμένων ἀποθανόντος τινὸς οὔτ' ἐξ ἄλλου τραύματος, ὁ μετὰ τὸν ἐγχειρίσαντά μοι τότε τὴν θεραπείαν δεύτερος ἀρχιερεύς, ὁμοίως καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίστευσε τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῶν μονομάχων μετὰ μῆνας ἑπτὰ μέσους. ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτος περὶ τὴν φθινοπωρινὴν ἰσημερίαν, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος ἀκμάζοντος τοῦ ἥρος ἠρχιερεύσατο. πάλιν δ' ἐπὶ τούτῳ σωθέντων ἀπάντων ὁ τρίτος

<sup>4</sup>*Comp.med.* 3.2 (XIII 599–600 Kühn), also quoted by Robert 285 n.1.

καὶ ὁ τέταρτος καὶ πέμπτος ὡσαύτως ἐνεχείρισάν μοι τὴν θεραπείαν τῶν μονομάχων, ὥστε πολλὴν βάσανον ἔχειν τῆς ἀγωγῆς.

Fortunately, while many (gladiators) died in the previous years, under me neither did any of the wounded die, as was said (above), nor (did any die) from any other wound, and the second *archiereus*—after the medical treatment had been entrusted to me (by the first)—did likewise and also entrusted the care of the gladiators to me seven and a half months later. For the first served as *archiereus* around the autumnal equinox, and the second in high spring. Again, with all saved, after him the third and the fourth and fifth likewise entrusted the medical treatment of the gladiators to me, so that I had abundant testing of my training.

The scheme to which Galen alludes, whereby successive *archiereis* actually owned rather than leased a troupe of gladiators, is described more clearly in the *Senatus Consultum de Pretiis Gladiatorum Minuendis* (A.D. 177) which attempted to reduce and to regulate the costs of gladiators throughout the Empire.<sup>5</sup> In most regions priests of the imperial cult (*sacerdotes*) obtained gladiators from a *lanista* in order to provide gladiatorial *munera*. But in some provinces the priests had no need to deal with a *lanista*, since they themselves owned the gladiators.<sup>6</sup> It seems probable that the successive *archiereis* who employed Galen had each purchased the *familia* from his predecessor in office, then

<sup>5</sup>CIL II 6278 [ILS 5163]; J. H. Oliver and R. E. A. Palmer, "Minutes of an Act of the Roman Senate," *Hesperia* 24 (1955) 320–349, with bibliography at 327–328 n.11. *I.Sardis* 16 is a fragment of the emperors' speech. Cf. *SHA Marc.* 9.4, 27.6.

<sup>6</sup>Lines 59–61: *sacerdotes quoque provinciarum, quibus nullu[m cum lanisti]s negoti[u]m e[ri]t, gladiatores a priorib[us] sacerdotib[us] su[s]ceptos, vel si pla<c>et auctoratos, recipiunt, at post editio[n]e[m] pl[u]re ex p[re]l[ati]o in succedentes transferunt. Ne quis singulatim aliquem rei gladiatoriae causa vendat quam lanistis est pretium perscriptum* ("There are also priests of provinces who will have no business with the *lanistae*; these priests take over the gladiators supported by the previous priests, or *auctorati*, but after giving their spectacle they pass them on at a higher price to the next priest. Let no one sell anyone for gladiatorial service at a price per individual higher than that to which *lanistae* are limited").

sold it to his successor in much the same fashion as outlined in the *Senatus Consultum*.

Although Galen and others mention the ownership of *familiae* by *archiereis* only, a number of inscriptions from Asia Minor identify owners of gladiatorial *familiae* as either *archiereis* or asiarchs. These “ownership” inscriptions typically are quite straightforward: either μονομάχοι or φαμίλια μονομάχων is followed by the name of the owner in the genitive and one title, usually *archiereus* or asiarch. At times, an official’s wife as *archiereia* is also mentioned in the genitive. At present count, twenty-five inscriptions from Asia clearly or probably refer to a gladiatorial *familia*.<sup>7</sup> Twenty-three of these attest ownership by imperial cult officials in Asia; these are given in the Appendix below.<sup>8</sup> At first sight, many of these inscriptions appear to be little more than simple statements of ownership. Nine (1, 4, 15, 17–22) identify the owner as an *archiereus* (or curiously an *archiereia* only in 1) and another nine (2, 3, 5, 6, 7/8 identically worded, 9, 10, 11) identify the owner as an asiarch. The remaining five do not reveal the office of the owner, either because it was not written (16) or because the inscription is incomplete (12–14, 23). None of the *archiereis* advertises his office as provincial, and it is probable that they are all local *archiereis*. Two of these asiarchs are co-owners with their wives (2 and 3), both of whom are given the title of *archiereia*.

<sup>7</sup>While gladiators were generally organized into *familiae*, not all *familiae* were necessarily gladiatorial. Cf. A. Cameron, “Latin Words in the Greek Inscriptions of Asia Minor,” *AJP* 52 (1931) 232–262, at 245–246. An unqualified φαμίλια may not be gladiatorial: e.g., *IGR* IV 759 and 1377. Robert did not include these inscriptions in his catalogue probably because there was no reason to believe that they referred to gladiatorial troupes. Friesen (281), however, did cite them in his discussion of gladiatorial families, though he did not justify their definition as such. A recently published inscription from Miletus (*AEpigr* 1996, 1473) similarly refers to a φαμίλια, but there is no reason to think it is gladiatorial either.

<sup>8</sup>The two omitted are Robert no. 241 = *I.Smyrna* 409, an epitaph for a deceased gladiator erected by the *familia* to which he belonged, and Robert no. 240 = *I.Smyrna* 416. In the latter, the owner Apellicon is in my view probably a *lanista*. I intend to discuss this possibility elsewhere.

Robert (55–64) long ago demonstrated that these φαμιλία μονομάχων documents are evidence not simply of ownership but also of the fact that these men and women had presented gladiatorial spectacles. He also argued that these documents were associated with reliefs depicting gladiatorial combat or victorious gladiators. Such commemorative monuments presenting the portraits of gladiators who fought in a *munus* are attested elsewhere. Pliny the Elder, for example, discussing famous painters, tells us of the great interest in displaying the pictures of gladiators, and though he does not say so, it is reasonable to assume that these pictures would have been accompanied in some way by an inscription explaining who presented the *munus* depicted.<sup>9</sup> By depicting the gladiators whom he had presented, the *munerarius* ensured that the honour and fame which he had received during the *munus* continued to live on in the public imagination away from the arena and long afterward.

#### *Archiereis*

Numerous inscriptions from the cities of Asia attest the office of those who provided gladiatorial and related spectacles, and in many cases this office was the local *archierosyne*. Almost half of the φαμιλία μονομάχων inscriptions discussed above identify the owner as a local *archiereus*. In a number of honorific inscriptions the presentation of gladiatorial combats and wild beast hunts was simply listed along side the fact that the honoree had served as *archiereus*. For example, the woolworkers of Philadelphia honoured M. Aurelius Manilius Hermippus, ἀρχιερασάμενον ἐνδόξως μετὰ μεγάλων ἀναλωμάτων καὶ δόντα

<sup>9</sup>Plin. *HN* 35.52. K. Coleman, “*Missio* at Halicarnassus,” *HSCP* 100 (2000) 487–500, at 496, suggests that these paintings were “action-shots” rather than “studio-portraits,” depictions of the gladiators in combat. Cf. *CIL* IX 1666 [ILS 5068] from Beneventum (I A.D.): *idem basilicam, in qua tabul(ae) muneris ab eo editi posit(ae), consummavit* (“likewise he completed the basilica, in which were placed placards of the *munus* given by him”); similarly *CIL* IX 1705.

κοντροκυνηγέσιον ἐν ᾧ ζυγὸν ἀπότομον ἐκ θείας φιλοδορίας.<sup>10</sup> The provision of the bloody spectacles was not simply another benefaction, but was a part of his *archierosyne*. Hermippus' many other accomplishments are itemized in the inscription without conjunctions such as καί to connect them. Moreover, these spectacles were especially extravagant: they cost a great deal, were unusual, probably extremely dangerous, and had even received special permission from the emperor. They were deemed worthy of special mention, both because they were presented as part of his *archierosyne* and because they were extraordinary. Combats qualified as *apotomos* were especially bloody and so probably reflect more dangerous or fatal (and so expensive) shows.<sup>11</sup> In other instances, however, the spectacles are simply listed as having occurred in the course of the office. Thus a second-century inscription from Stratonicea honours T. Flavius Aeneas ἀρχιερατεύσαντος μεγαλοπρεπῶς, ἐν ᾗ ἀρχιερωσύνη κ[αὶ] μονομαχίας καὶ κυνήγια σ[υ]νετέλεσεν.<sup>12</sup> Though gladiators and beasts were expensive to acquire, there is little to suggest here that there was anything extraordinary about Aeneas' shows. Other inscriptions similarly attest the relationship between the *archierosyne* and the presentation of gladiatorial combats and wild beast hunts. A late-second-century inscription from Stratonicea honours Ti. Claudius Aristetas Menander and Aelia Glycinna for, among their other services, their *archierosyne*: ἐτέλεσαν ἀρχιερωσύνην ἐπὶ φιλοδορίαις καὶ

<sup>10</sup>Robert no. 139.5–9 = IGR IV 1632 (“who has served honorably as *archiereus* with the greatest expenditures and gave a *kontrokunegesion* in which a pair fought *apotomos* according to imperial *indulgentia*”). For the *kontrokunegesion* see Robert 324, for *apotomos* 259–261, and *infra*.

<sup>11</sup>Artemidorus *Oneir.* 5.58 describes the dream of a man in which he was carried around in a trough full of blood; in waking life he enrolled as a gladiator and fought *apotomos*.

<sup>12</sup>Robert no. 164.9–13 = I.Stratonikeia 1025 (“who served as *archiereus* with distinction, during which *archierosyne* he provided both gladiators and wild beast hunts”). Cf. I.Stratonikeia 210.15, also for T. Flavius Aeneas, restored by M. Sahin: - - καὶ κυνήγια? - -. This may be another reference to Aeneas' presentation of wild beast hunts and gladiatorial combats.

κυνηγεσίους.<sup>13</sup> That is, they fulfilled the *archirosyne* at their *philodoriai* (= *philotimiai* or *munera*) and wild beast hunts. The presentation of spectacles was the way in which their *archirosyne* was carried out. There is no need to quote the many examples. As Robert observed, throughout the province spectacles were often presented by the local *archiereus*.

While abundant evidence associates the local *archiereus* with gladiatorial spectacles, some also ties the provincial *archiereis* to the shows. Galen does not care to tell us whether his *archiereis* were local or provincial officials. It is clear enough that they held office in Pergamum: Galen calls them “the *archiereis* in our city.” But it is certainly possible that they were in fact provincial rather than local officials, since Pergamum had been a provincial centre of the imperial cult from the very beginning. It was hardly Galen’s concern to differentiate between local *archiereis* and provincial *archiereis* and so we cannot expect him to have written out ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς Ἀσίας ναῶν τῶν ἐν Περγᾶμῳ or something similarly lengthy each time he mentioned one of his *archiereis*.<sup>14</sup> Given the hundreds of inscriptions from Asia which honour someone as a provincial *archiereus*, very few also describe the presentation of gladiatorial combats or similar spectacles as an aspect of the office. One, an inscription from Ephesus dated to the reign of Commodus, honours M. Aurelius Mindus Matidianus Pollio, who was, in addition to his impressive equestrian posts, ἀρχιερέα Ἀσίας ναῶν τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ κατὰ τὸ ἑξῆς ἡμερῶν πέντε, ἐν αἷς καὶ ἀνεῖλε ζῶα Λιβυκὰ εἰκοσιπέντε.<sup>15</sup> That is, he held *κυνηγέσια* lasting five days as

<sup>13</sup>Robert no. 163.4–5 = *I.Stratonikeia* 701.

<sup>14</sup>The *Senatus Consultum*, of course, offers no help in defining the specific status of those *sacerdotes* whom it was meant to aid, though it does pointedly concern itself with the priests of provinces (*sacerdotes provinciarum*, 59).

<sup>15</sup>Robert no. 198.14–16 = *I.Ephesos* 627 (“*archiereus* of Asia for the temples in Ephesus for five days in a row, during which days he killed twenty-five Libyan animals”). Cf. Rossner 119; Campanile no. 52; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 1559. He is discussed by H.-G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres* I (Paris 1960) 523–531 no. 193.

*archiereus* of Asia. It is true that Pollio here presented only *κωνηέσια* and not gladiatorial combats, but the two spectacles were related and though they were often found together, in many other cases one or the other was presented.<sup>16</sup> Since the *archierosyne* is here described as lasting for only the five consecutive days during which the wild beast hunts took place, it must be that the primary—or the only—function of this office was the production of this show. Importing animals from Africa was an expensive undertaking and the fact that he killed them all testifies not to his cruelty (however much it may appear to us) but to his generosity. A mosaic from Smirat in North Africa depicts a number of leopards being killed, and, in the centre of the scene, a man holding a tray with bags of money. Alongside the man with the money are two inscriptions, the first recording the words of the herald and the second the acclamations of the people for a certain Magerius, who presumably was the *editor*. Magerius paid a group of *venatores* 1,000 *denarii* for each leopard killed—twice as much as the people had asked. The acclamation leaves no doubt about both the power of Magerius and the popularity he won: *de re tua munus edes ... hoc est habere, hoc est posse*.<sup>17</sup> Notably, Pollio's five-day *archierosyne* was considered important enough to appear on an honorific inscription among the distinguished offices and positions of his lengthy career in imperial service. The spectacles were clearly a significant benefaction.

An especially important inscription from Thyatira honours M. Aurelius Diadochus, who served (among other positions) both

<sup>16</sup>E.g. Robert no. 86 = IGR IV 157 from Ancyra, an important inscription dated to the reign of Tiberius which lists the contributions of *archiereis* of Augustus.

<sup>17</sup>"You will present a *munus* from your own funds ... this is what it means to be rich, this is what it means to have power." See A. Beschtaouch, "La mosaïque de chasse à l'amphithéâtre découverte à Smirat en Tunisie," CRAI (1966) 134–157, at 139.



as local *archiereus* in Thyatira and as provincial *archiereus* in Pergamum:<sup>18</sup>

ἡ πατρίς  
 Μ. Αὐρ. Διάδοχον ἰππικόν, τὸν  
 ἀρχιερέα τῆς Ἀσίας ναῶν τῶν  
 4 ἐν Περγάμῳ καὶ ἀρχιερέα κατὰ  
 τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν τῆς πατρί-  
 δος καὶ διὰ βίου βούλαρχον, τι-  
 μηθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ θειοτάτου  
 8 Αὐτοκράτορος Μ. Αὐρ. Σεουήρου  
 Ἀλεξάνδρου Σεβαστοῦ συνά-  
 ψαι τὰς ἀρχιερεωσύνας τοῖς  
 ὀξέσιν ἐν ἑκατέραις ταῖς πό-  
 12 λεσιν, φιλοτιμησάμενον  
 ἐνδόξως καὶ μεγαλοφρόνως,  
 ἄνδρα ἐπὶ ἤθεσι καὶ ἐπιεικείαι  
 καὶ τῆι πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα  
 16 εὐνοίαι διαπρέποντα.

The fatherland honours Marcus Aurelius Diadochus, *eques*, *archiereus* of Asia for the temples in Pergamum and at the same time *archiereus* of his fatherland, and boularch for life, who was honoured by the most sacred emperor M. Aurelius Severus Alexander Augustus to combine the *archierosynai* with sharp (weapons) in each city; he presented the *philotimia* honourably and generously, a man outstanding for his character and his ability and his goodwill towards his fatherland.

Diadochus simultaneously (κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν) held the local *archierosyne* in Thyatira and the provincial *archierosyne* in Pergamum. He also seems to have held two shows: one in Pergamum and one in Thyatira. That much seems clear. But further interpretation of this inscription varies.

Friesen (287) understood it to imply that Diadochus “re-

<sup>18</sup>Robert no. 266 = TAM V.2 950.

ceived special permission from the emperor to add gladiatorial games to his provincial highpriesthood both in Pergamon and in his native city of Thyatira." Friesen then suggested that if Diadochus required authorization from the highest level to add gladiatorial games, then such spectacles could not be a typical feature of the *archierosyne*. Thus, he believed that this inscription supports distinguishing the provincial *archierosyne*, an office which he generally dissociates from gladiatorial spectacles, and the *asiarchia*, which he does connect to gladiators. Engelmann instead suggested that the imperial *indulgentia* was meant to permit the extraordinary gladiatorial shows "with sharp weapons."<sup>19</sup> Such bloody and dangerous shows were especially costly, since the risk of death or serious injury was so much greater. There is some evidence to suggest that the provision of these shows generally required imperial authorization, though this evidence is not conclusive since not all such shows also advertise imperial *indulgentia*.<sup>20</sup> If the *indulgentia* was indeed meant to sanction these more dangerous shows, it suggests that what was unusual about Diadochus' spectacles was not that they were connected to his *archierosynai*, but that they were so dangerous and costly. It is hard to imagine that the emperor would have cared whether gladiatorial games were put on by a provincial *archiereus*, or whether Diadochus wished to hold a

<sup>19</sup>H. Engelmann, "Asiarchs," *ZPE* 132 (2000) 174; cf. Weiß 243–244. Robert (258) showed that τοῖς ὀξεσίῃσιν should be understood as τοῖς σιδήροις, and refers to gladiatorial combats with sharp weapons.

<sup>20</sup>For imperial authorization given, see for example *SEG* XXXV 1132 from Miletus and Robert no. 63 = *I.Cret.* IV 305 from Gortyn. Gladiatorial pairs characterized as *apotomos* could also require imperial authorization, e.g. Robert no. 139 (discussed above). Moreover, some gladiators were intentionally made to fight "for their lives," and this too required authorization: L. Goumaropoulou and M. B. Hatzopoulos. *Inscriptiones Beroeae* I (Athens 1998) 69. This authorization was no doubt meant to ensure that the *editor* had the financial means necessary to pay for such spectacles. It also ensured that the emperor's name would be prominently attached to the show. Other inscriptions mention sharp weapons without any imperial authorization: e.g. *I.Smyrna* 637, *I.Ephesos* 810 (cf. *infra* for these), and Robert no. 97 = *IGR* III 360 (from Sagalassus).

provincial and a local office simultaneously. But what would have concerned the imperial administration is the extravagant nature of Diadochus' shows.

Thus τοῖς ὀξεσίῃσιν does not reflect the means by which the two *archierosynai* were joined together, nor should it be taken that the *archierosynai* were joined to gladiatorial combats with sharp weapons, but rather should be understood to explain the nature of the *archierosynai*. The object of συνάψαι is the phrase τὰς ἀρχιερωσύνωνας τοῖς ὀξεσίῃσιν. Sharp weapons are mentioned because they provided an unusual, dangerous, and expensive show—expensive enough to warrant imperial authorization. It begs the question: if not τοῖς ὀξεσίῃσιν, would he even have mentioned them? Boasting of gladiatorial spectacles “with sharp weapons” and of “imperial *indulgentia*” permitting their presentation implies that these shows were extraordinary. If sharp weapons at a gladiatorial presentation are worth mentioning, then ordinary shows must have employed dulled or blunted weapons. We may draw two conclusions: first, that ordinary shows were not typically fought with sharp weapons and, second, that these ordinary shows were less worth advertising.

#### *Asiarchs*

In the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, the governor announced to the people that Polycarp had confessed to being a Christian, at which news the people became enraged, shouted accusations against Polycarp, and asked that “the asiarch Philip” let loose a lion on him. Philip refused, explaining that the κυνηγέσια were over. The governor and the crowd settled for fire instead.<sup>21</sup> Although it is possible that this Philip owned some lions and just happened to be an asiarch too, it seems most likely that it

<sup>21</sup> *Mart. Polycarpi* 12.2: ταῦτα λέγοντες ἐπεβόων καὶ ἡρώτων τὸν ἀσιάρχην Φίλιππον ἵνα ἐπαφῇ τῷ Πολυκάρπῳ λέοντα. ὁ δὲ ἔφη μὴ εἶναι ἐξὸν αὐτῷ ἐπειδὴ πεπληρώκει τὰ κυνηγέσια (“Saying these things they shouted and asked the asiarch Philip to release a lion against Polycarp. But he said that it was not permitted him since the wild beast fights were completed”).

was because Philip was an asiarch that he could be expected by the people to be able to produce a hungry lion. Indeed, the people address him specifically as “asiarch” when they want a lion from him. It is probably that because Philip had just presented κυνηγέσια the people knew he had lions—he says that the show has been completed. They addressed him as asiarch, presumably because it was as asiarch that he presented the shows.

The φαμιλία μονομάχων inscriptions show several asiarchs from Smyrna and especially Ephesus owning gladiatorial troupes, and it was argued above that ownership of gladiators implied sponsorship of the spectacles. These “ownership” inscriptions provide most of the evidence for asiarchs’ involvement with these spectacles; otherwise, there are few inscriptions in which asiarchs are identified as the sponsors of gladiatorial and similar spectacles. In one, a member of the Ephesian elite, probably M. Aurelius Daphnus in the third century, was honoured by the *philovedii philoploi* as, among other things, “thrice asiarch of the temples in Ephesus.” He also gave gladiatorial games and wild beast hunts:<sup>22</sup>

ἀσιάρχην ναῶν τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τρίς,  
 φιλοτειμησάμενον ἐν τῇ πατρίδι  
 ἡμερῶν δεκατριῶν ζυγοῖς ἀποτό-  
 12 μοις τριακονταεννέα, ἀποσφάξαν-  
 τα δὲ καὶ Λιβυκὰ ζῶα, εὐτυχήσαντα δὲ  
 καὶ παρὰ τῶν Σεβαστῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ  
 πρώτη προόδῳ τὸν χρυσοῦν στέφανον  
 16 ἅμα τῇ πορφύρᾳ·  
 οἱ ἐπὶ τῷ τόπῳ φιλοβήδιοι φίλοπλοι  
 τὸν ἑαυτῶν εὐεργέτην.

thrice asiarch of the temples in Ephesus, who held a *munus* in

<sup>22</sup>Robert no. 200 = *I.Ephesos* 3070.

his fatherland with thirty-nine pairs (of gladiators) fighting *apotomos* for thirteen days, and who killed Libyan beasts, and who was favoured by the emperors and wore at the front of the procession the golden crown as well as the purple robe: those in this place who follow the Vedii, who love arms, honour him as their own *euergetes*.

As with the local *archiereus* M. Aurelius Manilius Hermippus in Philadelphia, discussed above, Daphnus' spectacles are listed after the office, in this case the *asiarchia*, presumably because it was in this capacity that he presided over the shows. After stating that he was thrice asiarch (of the temples in Ephesus), three participial phrases list particular benefactions or honours (φιλοτειμησάμενον, ἀποσφάξαντα, εὐτυχήσαντα). All of these were probably associated with his *asiarchia*. As with Hermippus and Diadochus, Daphnus' shows were also extraordinary, and these extraordinary spectacles may have been what attracted the attention and the loyalty of the *philovedii philoploi*. Robert identified the *philoploi* as associations of young men who followed gladiatorial combat, perhaps practicing it themselves in the gymnasium as amateurs. They were aficionados of the spectacle. The *philovedii philoploi* would seem to have supported in particular the gladiatorial family owned by the Vedii in Ephesus.<sup>23</sup> We may speculate that the gladiators who fought in his shows were from the *familia* owned, at least originally, by the Vedii.

The other key inscription attesting the sponsorship of extraordinary spectacles by an asiarch is a statue-base from Smyrna honouring Julius Meneclis Diophantus: ἀσιάρχην ἐνδόξως φιλοτειμησάμενον ἑξῆς ἡμερῶν πέντε τοῖς ὀξέσιν.<sup>24</sup> In this case, it is

<sup>23</sup>Robert 24–27. For other inscriptions see Robert no. 201 = *I.Ephesos* 3055, no. 202 = 2226, and now also *I.Ephesos* 2905. Cf. recently C. P. Jones, "A Statuette of Nemesis," *EpigrAnat* 33 (2001) 45–47.

<sup>24</sup>L. Robert, "Monuments de gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec," *Hellenica* 5 (1948) 81–82 no. 318.7–12 = *I.Smyrna* 637 ("the asiarch who held a *munus* for five days in a row with gladiators fighting with sharpened arms").

clear that Diophantus presented gladiatorial combats in his capacity as asiarch, although his *asiarchia* was not necessarily defined by these five days, that is, it does not appear to have been limited to five days like the provincial *archierosyne* of Matidianus Pollio from Ephesus (above). Nevertheless, it was as “asiarch” that Diophantus was honoured. But the honour seems to have been earned especially for the dangerous and costly combats τοῖς ὀξέσιν that he provided in the city. We saw above that such spectacles were extraordinary and especially worthy of mention. A similar inscription from Ephesus from the early third century honours M. Fulvius Publicianus Nicephorus, noting that he was asiarch for four days: ἀσιάρχην ἔνδοξον ἡμερῶν τεσσάρων; but unlike Diophantus, Nicephorus does not explain what happened during these four days.<sup>25</sup> These four days ought to be considered the duration of a *philotimia*, possibly of gladiators or wild beasts, given by Nicephorus specifically as asiarch.<sup>26</sup> If so, then this four-day spectacle would appear to define the purpose of the office in the same way that Pollio’s *archierosyne* was defined as existing for the presentation of the spectacles. The nature of these four days, however, is uncertain and so no solid conclusions are possible.

The latest extant evidence possibly connecting the *asiarchia* to gladiatorial spectacles is from the late fourth century, between 372 and 378. A letter of the emperors Valentinian I, Valens, and Gratian to the proconsul of Asia, inscribed at Ephesus, allowed men from outside of the four main cities of the province to give shows—*munera* in Latin—and they did so as “asiarchs” or

<sup>25</sup>Nicephorus is well attested in Ephesus: *I.Ephesos* 444, 445, 632, 679, 679a, 739, 1080, 1087a, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2082, 3049, 3063, 3086. Cf. D. Knibbe, “Der Asiarch M. Fulvius Publicianus Nicephorus, die Ephesischen Handwerkerzünfte und die Stoa des Servilius,” *JÖAI* 56 (1985) 71–77, and R. A. Kearsley, “Asiarchs: Titulature and Function. A Reappraisal,” *StClas* 26 (1989) 57–65.

<sup>26</sup>So also Kearsley (*supra* n.25), with reference especially to *I.Smyrna* 637 (for Julius Diophantus, quoted above). She follows Deininger 46 and Rossner 103 n.11. Cf. Campanile 135.

“alytarchs.” The Latin version, presumably the original, is followed by a Greek translation (*I.Ephesos* 43.4–8, 17–23):

*ex sententia denique factum est, quod divisio officii per quattuor civitates, quae metropolis apud Asiam nominantur, lustralis cernitur editio constituta, ut, dum a singulis exhibitio postulat, non desit provinciae coronatus nec gravis cuiquam erogatio sit futura, cum servatis vicibus quinquies in anno civitas praebeat editorem. nam et illud quoque libenter admisimus, quod in minoribus municipiis generatis, quos popularis animi gloria maior attollit, facultatem tribui edendi mun[er]is postulasti, videlicet ut in metropoli Efesena a[li]a e civitate asiarchae sive alytarchae procedant ac sic officiis melioribus contend[an]t.*

ἀκολούθως τοίνυν γεγένηται ἐπιμε(ρ)ισθῆναι τοὺς χρόνους εἰς τὰς τέσσαρας πόλεις, αἵτινες μητροπόλεις ἐν Ἀσίᾳ ψηφίζονται, ὡς τὴν τῆς πενταετηρίδος ἔκδοσιν τοιαύτην ἔχειν τὴν κατάστασιν καὶ μηδεπώποτε δύνασθαι λείπειν τὸν κοσμούμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς Ἀσίας στεφάνου. ἀλλ’ οὔτε ἐπιφορτίζεσθαι τις δύναται ὑπὸ τοῦ δαπανήματος, ἐπὰν μάλιστα ἀμοιβαδὸν τρεχόντων τῶν χρόνων ἐκάστη τῶν μητροπόλεων μετὰ πενταετῆ τὸν χρόνον δίδωσι τὸν λιτουργή[σ]οντα. καίτοι ἡδέως προσηκάμεθα, ἐπίπερ τοὺς τεχθέντας ἐν ταῖς μικραῖς πόλεσιν, ἐπὰν δημοτικωτέρας γενάμενοι ψυχῆς τὸν ἔπαινον τὸν ἐκ τοῦ δήμου φαντάζωντε, ἐξουσίαν αὐτοῖς παρέχεσθαι τοῦ ἐν τῇ Ἐφεσίῳ μητροπόλει μόνη τὴν ἀσιαρχίαν ἢ τὴν ἀλυταρχίαν αὐτὸν ἀνύειν καὶ τοῖς καθήκο(υ)σ(ιν) τοῖς καλλίοσιν ἐκ τῆς ἐπιφανοῦς λειτουργίας φαίνεσθαι.

The two versions are close but not identical. The following is generally a translation of the Latin, with the Greek versions given where significant differences occur:

And so in accord with our opinion it is decided, because the established quadrennial *editio* is determined by distribution of duties through the four cities that are named “metropoleis” in Asia, that, while an exhibition is demanded by each city, the province should not lack a crowned man (*Greek*: one decorated by the crown of Asia) and future apportionment should not be burdensome to anyone since, with the rotation maintained, a city provides an *editor* (*Greek*: one who provides a liturgy) in the fourth year. For this too we willingly grant, what you

requested for those born in smaller states, whom the greater glory of popular affection exalts, that the opportunity to present a *munus* for the masses shall be granted (to them), namely, that in the metropolis of Ephesus asiarchs or alytarchs from another city may come forward (*Greek*: to complete the *asiarchia* or the *alytarchia*) and so contend for better offices.

The imperial rescript seems to have been in response to provincial proposals aimed at rejuvenating the provincial festivals, particularly those in the four metropoleis of late-fourth-century Asia, though this particular version was directed to Ephesus. Apparently, these cities were to be able to allow ambitious men from other, smaller centres to hold the office of asiarch (or alytarch), provided that they had first completed the responsibilities in their native city. The particular means here envisioned for these men to win fame was through the provision of a spectacle (*munus/editio/exhibitio*), though the Greek version uses the less specific *λειτουργία*. By this late date, it is doubtful that the reference to *munus* envisaged the production of gladiatorial combats, which had been officially banned earlier in the fourth century and appear to have slowly come to an end during the course of the century, though similar spectacles, such as wild beast hunts, continued after the end of gladiatorial shows.<sup>27</sup> Magie supposed that the title “asiarch” was bestowed on those who performed certain benefactions—usually, he believed, spectacles—and that this function distinguished the *asiarchia* from the *archierosyne*. But, while the letter does focus on the provision of festivals, that may only reflect the specific problem here addressed by the emperors. Rossner argued that *provinciae coronatus* pointed to the *archierosyne* and that the subsequent reference to the officials in question simply as

<sup>27</sup>In 325 Constantine banned gladiators, ostensibly as an offence to God (*Cod.Theod.* 15.12.1; Euseb. *Vit.Const.* 4.25). For discussion see T. Wiedemann, “Das Ende der römischen Gladiatorenspele,” *Nikephoros* 8 (1995) 145–159. To the extent that the edict reflects the situation in earlier periods, it may also reflect what had earlier pertained to gladiatorial *munera*. Cf. Friesen 286 n.77.



“asiarchs” supports equating the two titles. Kearsley and Friesen preferred Magie’s interpretation and rejected that of Rossner, though with little explanation.<sup>28</sup> Yet Rossner is right to draw attention to “the crowned man of the province,” where the Greek is more specific in identifying who this might be. While the Latin version speaks vaguely of a *coronatus* for the province, the Greek describes him as “decorated with the crown of Asia” (τὸν κοσμοῦμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς Ἀσίας στεφάνου). The most logical identity of such a person is the *archiereus* of Asia. Much evidence identifies the crown as one of the symbols of the *archiereus*: Epictetus, for example, censures a man who anticipated wearing the crown as a priest of Augustus, and Dio Chrysostom describes a wealthy magnate who parades with his crown and purple of office, followed by a train of long-haired boys carrying frankincense.<sup>29</sup> If the one who wore the crown of Asia was indeed the *archiereus* of the province, then the equivalence of the provincial *archiereus* and asiarch seems clear.<sup>30</sup>

#### *Expenses and expectations*

The acquisition of gladiators, by leasing them from a *lanista* or contracting with free gladiators (*auctorati*) or purchasing an entire *familia*, and the sponsorship of gladiatorial spectacles

<sup>28</sup>D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor I* (Princeton 1950) 450; Rossner 102, 104; R. A. Kearsley, “M. Ulpius Appuleius Eurykles of Aezani: Panhellene, Asiarch and Archiereus of Asia,” *Antichthon* 21 (1987) 49–56, at 51 n.15 (stating simply that Magie’s explanation is preferable to Rossner’s); Friesen 286, cf. S. Friesen, *Twice Neokoros. Ephesus, Asia and the Cult of the Flavian Imperial Family* (New York 1993) 105–106, for a fuller discussion, where he notes that others besides *archiereis* could wear crowns.

<sup>29</sup>Epict. 1.19.26–29; Dio Chrys. 35.10, cf. 34.29–30. The agonothete of the Demostheneia at Oenoanda was also to wear a golden crown and purple robe like the *archiereus*: M. Wörle, *Stadt und Fest in kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien* (Munich 1988) 10, lines 52 and 56–57.

<sup>30</sup>An inscription from Adramyttium (*I. Adramytteion* 1 = IGR IV 263, perhaps late second or early third century) also refers to the presentation of spectacles by the asiarch, though the nature of these spectacles is uncertain: Εὐνοῦς ἀσιάρχης ὑπὲρ ὑοῦ [Ε]ὐφροσύνου τὰς θεὰς φιλοτιμησάμενος ἀνέθηκεν. The use of θεὰι to refer to gladiatorial combats is rare.

were expensive undertakings.<sup>31</sup> A new inscription from Aphrodisias reveals that by the early second century the financial burden upon even a local *archiereus* was great enough that some either avoided the office or appealed for release:

τοὺς πόρους οὓς ἀπετάξατε εἰς τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος καταγωγὴν βεβαιῶ. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἦσαν τινες πολεῖται ὑμέτεροι λέγοντες εἰς ἀρχιερωσύνην ἀδύνατοι ὄντες προβεβλησθαι, ἀνέπεμψα αὐτοῖς ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ΕΞΕΤΑΣΑΝΤΑΣ ΠΡΟΤΕΡΟΝ δύνατοι ὄντες λειτουργεῖν διαδύονται, ἢ ἀληθῆ λέγουσιν. εἰ μέντοι φαίνονται τινες αὐτῶν εὐπορώτεροι, προτέρους ἐκείνους ἀρχιερᾶσθαι δίκαιον. συνχωρῶ ὑμῖν παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων ἀντὶ μονομαχιῶν ἀργύριον λαμβάνειν, καὶ οὐ συνχωρῶ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπαινῶ τὴν γνώμην.

The funds which you have reserved for the aqueduct I confirm. And since there are certain of your citizens who say that they have been nominated for the high priesthood when they are incapable, I have referred them to you to examine whether they are able to undertake the liturgy and are evading it, or are telling the truth; if, however, some of them were to appear to be better off, it is fair that they should hold the high priesthood first. I concede that you should take money from the high priests instead of gladiatorial shows; not only do I concede but I praise your proposal.<sup>32</sup>

These *archiereis* claimed to be unable to fulfill the costly obligations of the position, especially, it seems, the responsibility to present *μονομαχίαι*, gladiatorial spectacles. Their exemption, however, was on condition that their finances upon investigation were indeed found to be insufficient. Apparently, the funds

<sup>31</sup>Echion at Trimalchio's dinner party claims that Titus planned to spend an incredible 400,000 sesterces on a *munus* (Petron. *Sat.* 45). Some idea of the sums involved in the presentation of gladiatorial combats and wild beast hunts may be gleaned from an inscription from Oenoanda (A.D. 115): Licinius Longus gave 110,000 *denarii* to the Lycian *koinon*, 40,000 to the city of Myra, 50,000 to Tlos, and to his native Oenoanda he gave wild beast hunts and gladiatorial combats (Robert no. 113 = *IGR* III 492). Surely his munificence in his home town would have at least matched in expense his gifts to Myra or Tlos, and probably surpassed them.

<sup>32</sup>J. Reynolds "New Letters from Hadrian to Aphrodisias," *JRA* 13 (2000) 5–20 (lines 31–38, her translation). For the awkward ΕΞΕΤΑΣΑΝΤΑΣ ΠΡΟΤΕΡΟΝ she cautiously suggests ἐξετάσσοντας πρότερον.

involved in sponsoring gladiators were great enough to have a noticeable impact on financing something as large as the construction of an aqueduct if diverted to such spectacles. Little wonder that the *archiereis* balked. The very purpose of the *Senatus Consultum* of A.D. 177 was to control those costs, and other emperors made similar attempts. The legislation sought to reduce the financial burden which the acquisition of gladiators placed upon those elite men in the provinces who became priests.<sup>33</sup> The opening lines describe the dire financial predicament of those who became priests and were then faced with the costs of a *munus*.<sup>34</sup> Surely they only accepted the costly burden of owning gladiators in order to present the popular spectacles. One would not have assumed the great expense of purchasing and maintaining a gladiatorial *familia* without reaping the rewards in personal popularity engendered by the production of the spectacles. Indeed, it was argued above that the “ownership” inscriptions were actually commemorative and meant to prolong the popularity and fame created by the spectacles.

But more than simply a fashionable way to please the people and win popularity, the presentation of such spectacles (gladiators or wild beasts) had by the second century become expected of the officers of the imperial cult. It is notable that those nominated to a priesthood and faced with the unwelcome and costly responsibility to present spectacles sought release

<sup>33</sup>Others too speak about the enormous costs associated with the priesthoods. Epictetus scolded a man who desired the “priesthood of Augustus,” telling him that he would spend a great deal of money for no purpose (1.19.26–27). Some went into debt to pay for the shows: Plutarch (*Mor.* 823E) censures those foolish men who borrowed money to finance expensive public spectacles, such as gladiatorial combats. Writing about a century later, Dio Cassius (52.31) apocryphally has Maecenas advise Augustus to control the size of spectacles in the cities lest public treasuries and private fortunes be ruined.

<sup>34</sup>Lines 16–18: *erat aliquis qui deploraverat fortunas suas creatus sacerdos, qui auxilium sibi in provocatione ad principes facta constituerat. sed ibidem ipse primus et de consilio amicorum: “quid mihi iam cum appellatione? omne onus quod patrimonium meum opprimebat sanctissimi imp. remiserunt. iam sacerdos esse et cupio et opto et editionem muneris, quam olim detestabamur, amplector!”*

from the office altogether, rather than some sort of exemption from providing the show. The *Senatus Consultum* isolates the *editio muneris* as an inescapable burden facing a *sacerdos*, and the inscription from Aphrodisias likewise indicates that the provision of *μονομαχία* was the costliest expectation facing the *archiereus*. The costs were potentially greater than just those associated with the acquisition of gladiators, as expensive as they were, for the *munus* was often a multifaceted show with wild beasts and executions. Not only expected by the people, such shows might have been formally required. From the official's point of view, public expectation or official requirement imposed an identical burden.<sup>35</sup>

In at least two inscriptions discussed above, the office in which the spectacles were given is defined by those spectacles themselves. Pollio of Ephesus was *archiereus* for five days to present his extraordinary spectacles, and Nicephorus was *asiarch* for four days, surely to do the same. Similarly, a fragmentary inscription from Ephesus honours an unknown member of the Ephesian elite, *ἡμερῶν τεσσάρων ὀξέσι*, "for four days of gladiatorial combats with sharpened steel" (*I.Ephesos* 810). The honoree was a descendant of *archiereis* and of an *asiarch*. But it is not known what office he held when presenting these combats. He may have been a provincial *archiereus* like Pollio, or an *asiarch* like Nicephorus. The *archierosynai* of Galen's *archiereis* likewise appear defined by the provision of spectacles: the first *archiereus*, he says, held office in the spring, the second in the fall. Galen is describing the services he rendered for the *archiereis*, tending to their wounded gladiators, and this he did during and after their combat spectacles. The holding of the

<sup>35</sup>The issue of obligation versus expectation is controversial: see for example G. Ville, *La gladiature dans l'Occident* (Rome 1981) 213, and T. Ritti and S. Yilmaz, "Gladiatori e venationes a Hierapolis di Frigia," *MAL* ix 10 (1998) 445–543, at 454.

*archierosyne* came with the expectation to present spectacles for the people.

Yet, while some inscriptions attest a connection between *archiereis* or asiarchs and gladiatorial and similar spectacles, many more inscriptions honouring these officials make no mention of such shows. This may suggest that those who say nothing about these shows did not give them. But if indeed spectacles had become an expected or required duty of the *archierosyne* or *asiarchia*, then they would be assumed and no mention would be necessary. One would in general only declare the presentation of such spectacles if they were unique in some way.<sup>36</sup> Many of the spectacles mentioned in the inscriptions discussed above were somehow extraordinary: usually they were especially dangerous and bloody, which added greatly to the cost. The *Senatus Consultum* of 177 suggests that the cost of professional, ranked gladiators ranged from 3,000 sesterces to as much as 15,000. The death of or serious injury to several such gladiators could cost a small fortune.<sup>37</sup> The use of “sharp weapons” or gladiatorial shows fought *apotomos* could indeed be costly; some even required imperial authorization. Such expensive shows were considered an unusual and an especially generous benefaction to the people. As such, they would warrant special mention on an inscription. But if bloody shows or shows fought with sharp weapons were extraordinary, then ordinary shows were typically not overly bloody and may even have been fought with blunted weapons. If one did not give spectacles that were extraordinary in any way, then these ordinary shows were less worthy of mention. That the honoree had given them would be understood from the office held. Many scholars have noticed

<sup>36</sup>See F. Jacques, *Le privilège de liberté* (Rome 1984) 687–786, and the observations of G. Chamberland, “The Organization of Gladiatorial Games in Italy,” *JRA* 12 (1999) 613–616.

<sup>37</sup>For discussion of the costs of financing gladiatorial *munera*, see M. Carter, “Gladiatorial Ranking and the *SC de Pretiis Gladiatorum Minuendis* (CIL II 6278 = ILS 5163),” forthcoming in *Phoenix*.

this blurring between the duties of an office and the office itself.<sup>38</sup> One could imply the other.

*Archiereis and asiarchs*

What of the relationship between the *archierosyne* of Asia and the *asiarchia*? Many of those discussed above who gave gladiatorial shows as *archiereis* are also known by the other title. For example, the local *archiereus* Hermippus from Philadelphia is also attested as an asiarch.<sup>39</sup> Pollio, “*archiereus* of Asia of the temples in Ephesus for five days” during which time he killed twenty-five African animals, is elsewhere attested as an “asiarch of the temples in Ephesus.”<sup>40</sup> It is tempting to understand these two titles as referring to the same office. M. Aurelius Diadochus is also known to have been both a provincial *archiereus* and an asiarch. The case of Diadochus was unusual, it will be recalled, because he held both the provincial (in Pergamum) and the local (in Thyatira) *archierosynai* at the same time. Another inscription from Thyatira honours Aurelia Hermonassa, γυναῖκα Αὐρηλίου [Δι]αδόχου ἱππικοῦ, ἀσιάρχου καὶ ἀρχιερέως κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν τῆς πατρίδος καὶ διὰ βίου βουλάρχου.<sup>41</sup> Campanile, Engelmann, and Weiß have persuasively argued that since in one inscription he is said to have been provincial *archiereus* at the same time as local *archiereus* and in another inscription the asiarch at the same time as local *archiereus*, the provincial *archierosyne* and the *asiarchia* were the same office.<sup>42</sup> Friesen’s model fails here, since in other

<sup>38</sup> A. H. M. Jones, *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian* (Oxford 1940) 175–176 with 339–340 n.38; P. Veyne, *Le pain et la cirque* (Paris 1976) 271–274; cf. J. L. Rife, “Officials of the Roman Provinces in Xenophon’s *Ephesiaca*,” *ZPE* 138 (2002) 96–97.

<sup>39</sup> *IGR* IV 1635; Campanile no. 49.

<sup>40</sup> *OGIS* 525; Campanile no. 52.

<sup>41</sup> *TAM* V.2 954.11–15 (“the wife of Aurelius Diadochus, *eques*, asiarch and *archiereus* at the same time of his fatherland and boularch for life”).

<sup>42</sup> Campanile no. 47c; Engelmann (*supra* n.19) 175; Weiß 244. Friesen (286–287) also discussed Diadochus and suggested that he may not have mentioned

places he claims that the gladiatorial shows were the responsibility of the asiarch, not the *archiereus*. If so, why did Diadochus not identify himself as asiarch when he mentioned his gladiatorial shows τοῖς ὀξέσι (*TAM* V.2 950)?

Similarly, several of the asiarchs who were discussed above as sponsors of gladiatorial and wild beast spectacles are also known as *archiereis*. The “asiarch Philip” who was asked to produce a lion to do away with Polycarp has usually been identified as C. Julius Philippus of Tralles; he is well attested epigraphically as a provincial *archiereus*.<sup>43</sup> But what has drawn much attention from scholars is that at the end of the martyr-act the date of Polycarp’s arrest and execution is given (21): ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Φιλίππου Τραλλιανοῦ, ἀνθυπατεύοντος Στατίου Κοδράτου (“when Philip of Tralles was *archiereus* and Statius Quadratus was governor”). It is tempting to believe that the two Philips are in fact the same person, and if this is so, we once again have an example of one man being both *archiereus* and asiarch.<sup>44</sup>

The example of Ti. Julius Reginus is perhaps more explicit. He is attested as an owner of a gladiatorial *familia* and identified

his *archierosyne* on his wife’s inscription (*TAM* V.2 954) “out of deference to his father-in-law who was also mentioned but who only served as Asiarch and not highpriest of Asia.”

<sup>43</sup>Campanile no. 100.

<sup>44</sup>This is controversial, of course. Campanile (102) and Rossner (105 n.22) both believed them to be the same man; Deininger (44) was more hesitant; Friesen (279) dismissed the possibility and referred to Magie. Magie (*supra* n.28: II 1300) pointed out many of the difficulties, especially the dates involved. The martyrdom of Polycarp is usually thought to have taken place in 155 or 156 (we have the date 23 February) and Philip is identified as the *archiereus* of Asia at the 53<sup>rd</sup> Tralleian Olympiad, perhaps in 149. Magie also objected to the fact that the eponymous Philip is identified as ἀρχιερέως only and not ἀρχιερέως τῆς Ἀσίας. Robert suggested that this Philip might have been only a local *archiereus* (*OMS* II 1134 n.4). The use of ἀρχιερέως alone, however, may be explained as little more than short-form practice (or indifference) on the part of the author. The name of the governor of Asia was also given succinctly and notably without *praenomen*. Why not assume the *archiereus* named (this time without *praenomen* or *nomen*) was also a provincial official? For the dating problems, see T. D. Barnes, “A Note on Polycarp,” *JThS* 18 (1967) 433–437.

as an asiarch (Appendix no. 9). Reginus is well known epigraphically and was in fact “twice asiarch of the temples in Ephesus” and “twice *archiereus* of the temples in Ephesus,” a striking similarity which has led scholars such as Deininger, Rossner, and Engelmann to see the equivalence of the two titles.<sup>45</sup> Friesen, on the contrary, suggests that Reginus was simply “an unusual example of a man who held two highpriesthoods and two Asiarchates.” He also notes that in Reginus’ only directly attested connection to gladiators he carries the title “asiarch.” For Friesen, this suggests that “when he is named as the patron of a *familia* the appropriate title is asiarch” (279, 282). But this suggestion does not accord with the nature and function of these “ownership” documents. As we have seen, these were not simple statements of ownership, but meant to recall the presentation of gladiatorial spectacles by the owner or owners listed. They are brief statements to connect the name of the owner of the gladiators with the more important presentation of the spectacles. They are by nature brief documents, most probably associated with depictions of gladiators or combats meant to recall the popularity engendered by the spectacles. There may have been several such inscriptions associated with these depictions, like the parallel inscriptions for Tiberius Claudius Tatianus Julianus (nos. 7 and 8). The texts were brief because they were meant to be read; the name of the owner/sponsor might be dangerously lost in a lengthy inscription which listed all his relevant offices and titles. So brief is one inscription in fact that the owner’s full name has not even been provided: Claudius Cleobulus’ full name is Tiberius Claudius Cleobulus (no. 6).<sup>46</sup> Presumably he was widely known just as Claudius Cleobulus.

<sup>45</sup>Twice asiarch: *I.Ephesos* 692, 692a, 1105a, 1130. Twice *archiereus*: 1105, 1605, 1611. Cf. Campanile no. 71a; Deininger 44; Engelmann (*supra* n.19) 173 (by lapsus “Tiberius Claudius Reginus”).

<sup>46</sup>See Campanile no. 65.



These “ownership” inscriptions were not intended to catalogue all the accomplishments of the individual named, but rather to identify succinctly that person who provided the gladiatorial *philotimia*, and to continue the association of his name with that popular event. In all probability, the office named was the one in which the owner presented the spectacles. Many of these owners were in fact asiarchs, but in two instances the asiarch was co-owner with his wife as *archieieia* (nos. 2 from Cos and 3 from Cyzicus). If as co-owner the *archieieia* partly sponsored the spectacles, then this suggests that the office of her husband—the *asiarchia*—was at least parallel to the *archierosyne*.<sup>47</sup> While it may be that the husband presented as asiarch and the wife as *archieieia*, the simplest explanation is that the two titles referred to the same office: the *archierosyne*. Moreover, a famous passage in the *Digest* defines the *asiarchia* as a *hierosyne*, a “priesthood.” The third-century jurist Modestinus discusses some of those who were exempt from liturgies: ἔθνους ἱερ(ωσύνη), οἷον ἀσιαρχία, βιθυνιαρχία, καππαδοκιαρχία, παρέχει ἀλειτουρησίαν ἀπὸ ἐπιτροπῶν, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν ἕως ἀν ἄρχῃ.<sup>48</sup> This passage seems to confirm the religious character of the office of the asiarchs and other *koinon-archs*, although it may reflect only the situation in the third century (and beyond) rather than that of earlier periods. Thus it was under the

<sup>47</sup>With respect to Asia P. Herz has argued that the *archieieia* was a functioning official and not simply an honorific title: “Asiarchen und Archiereiai,” *Tyche* 7 (1992) 93–115; cf. L. Robert, *Le martyre de Pionios prêtre de Smyrne* (Washington 1994) 102; R. A. Kearsley, “Asiarchs, Archiereis and the Archiereiai of Asia,” *GRBS* 27 (1986) 183–192. For the *archieieiai* see C. Hayward, “Les grandes-prêtresses du culte impérial provincial en Asie Mineure, état de la question,” *ÉL* (1998.1) 117–130.

<sup>48</sup>*Dig.* 27.1.6.14: “the priesthood of a province, such as an *asiarchia*, *bithyniarchia*, *cappadociarchia*, carries exemption from the role of tutor, that is, while one is in office.” Cf. Deininger 44 n.5 for reading ἱερ(ωσύνη) for ἱεραρχία. Friesen (286) argued that Modestinus called the *asiarchia* etc. a priesthood because his audience might not have understood what he meant by the phrase ἔθνους ἱερ(ωσύνη). It remains that Modestinus thought the *asiarchia* to be a priesthood. Cf. Weiß 249–251.

*archirosyne* that gladiatorial combats and similar spectacles were presented.

Why two titles? In a gladiatorial context, at least, the use of the title “asiarch” is often found in informal usage. When the people wanted a lion for Polycarp, they asked “the asiarch Philip.”<sup>49</sup> Similarly, the “ownership” inscriptions, which were directed at the people, often identified the owner simply as “asiarch.” The most widely attested of these asiarchs, Ti. Julius Reginus, was also a provincial *archiereus*; indeed Reginus is one of the best examples to demonstrate the equivalence of the two titles. “Asiarch” might have been used on these inscriptions to stand in place of the more cumbersome “*archiereus* of the temples in Ephesus” (*vel sim.*). From a gladiatorial perspective, the two titles appear synonymous.

#### APPENDIX: “Ownership” Inscriptions

1. Mytilene (Robert no. 273; *IGR* IV 103)  
 φαμιλία μονομάχων [Μ]άρ. Κλαυ. Τρυφωνιανου̅ νέου καὶ ἀρχιε-  
 ρείας Ὀρφίας Λαιλίας Σωτίου γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ.
2. Cos (Robert no. 185; *IGR* IV 1075)  
 φαμιλία μονομάχων καὶ ὑπόμνημα κυνηγεσίων Νεμερίου Καστρι-  
 κίου, Λευκίου, Πακωνιανου̅ ἀσιάρχου καὶ Αὐρηλίας Σαπφῶς, Πλά-  
 τωνος, Λικιννιανῆς ἀρχιερείης, γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ.
3. Cyzicus (Robert no. 290; *IGR* IV 156)  
 ἀγαθῆι τύχηι· φαμιλία μονομάχων φιλοτειμίας Πλω. Αὐρ. Γράτου  
 ἀσιάρχου καὶ Ἰουλίας Αὐρ. Ἀσκληπιοδώρας τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ  
 ἀρχιερείας.
4. Parium (Robert no. 289; *IGR* IV 175)  
 [φαμιλία μονομάχων καὶ ὑπόμνημα κυ]νηγεσ[ίων] [ἀ]ρχιερέως  
 Αἰλίου Ἰουλιαν[οῦ] καὶ ἀρχιερείας Ὀφιλλίας Ζωτικῆς, θυγατρὸς  
 Ὀφιλλίου Ζωτικοῦ.
5. Smyrna (Robert no. 225; *I.Smyrna* 842)  
 φαμιλία [μ]ονομάχων [Κ]λ. Τίμωνος ἀσιάρχου νεωτέρου.

<sup>49</sup>In Acts 19:31 a group of asiarchs come to Paul’s rescue in Ephesus. This probably does not mean that they were all in office together, but that they had once been and could retain the title “asiarch.”

6. Ephesus (SEG XLII 1036)  
μονόμαχοι Κλαυδίου Κλεοβούλου ἀσιάρχου.
7. Ephesus (Robert no. 204; *I.Ephesos* 1620)  
φαμιλίας μονομάχων Τι. Κλ. Τατιανού Ἰουλιανού ἀσιάρχου.
8. Ephesus (*I.Ephesos* 1182)  
φαμιλίας μονομάχων Τι. Κλ. Τατιανού Ἰουλιανού ἀσιά[ρ]χου.
9. Ephesus (Robert no. 205; *I.Ephesos* 1621)  
φαμιλία μονομάχων Τιβ. Ἰουλίου Ῥηγείνου ἀσιάρχου.
10. Ephesus (Robert no. 206; *I.Ephesos* 1171)  
μονόμαχοι Λουκίου Αὐφιδίου Εὐφήμου ἀσιάρχου.
11. Ephesus (*I.Ephesos* 4346)  
φαμιλία μονομάχων[ν] Τιβ. Κλαυδίου[ν] Πανκρατίδο[ν] Ἀττικῶ ἀσι-  
άρχου.
12. Ephesus (Robert no. 207; *I.Ephesos* 1173)  
φαμιλί[α] μονομάχ[ων] Α[- -]τι[- -]ν[- -]νο[- -]
13. Ephesus (Robert no. 208; *I.Ephesos* no. 1172)  
φαμιλία μονομάχ[ων] - -
14. Miletus (SEG XXXV 1140)  
ὑπόμνημα φιλοτιμιῶν φαμιλίας μονομάχ[ων].
15. Temenothyrai (Robert no. 127; *IGR* IV 617)<sup>50</sup>  
[- - φαμιλία?] μονομάχων [Τ.] Ἀρουντίου Νεικομάχου Τεβερεινια-  
νοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ ἐγγόνου, ἀρχιερέων Ἀσίας ἀπογόνου, πραιμιπειλαρίου,  
ὑπατικῶν ἀνεψιοῦ καὶ συγγενοῦς, ἀρχιερέως πρώτου τῆς πατρίδος,  
καὶ Τυλλίας Οὐαλερίας ἀρχιερείας γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ.
16. Tralles (Robert no. 147; *I.Tralleis* 100)  
μονομάχοι Ποπλίου Λουκιλίου Πεισωνίνου.
17. Hierapolis (Ritti/Υılmaz [*supra* n.35] 448)  
ἀγαθῆ τύχη· ὑπόμνημα φαμιλίας μονομάχων καὶ κυνηγεσίων καὶ  
ταυροκαθαψίων Γναίου Ἀρρίου Ἀπουληίου, Αὐρηλιανοῦ υἱοῦ  
χειλιάρχου καὶ ἀρχιερέως, καὶ Αὐρηλίας Μελιτίνης Ἀττικιανῆς  
ἀρχιερείας τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ.
18. Laodicea on the Lycus (Robert no. 117; *I.Laodikeia* 73)  
μνήμα μονομάχων τῶν δοθέντων ὑπὸ ἀρχιερέως καὶ στεφανηφόρου  
Διοκλέους τοῦ Μητροφίλου.

<sup>50</sup>Friesen (281) claimed that this inscription was an epitaph set up by the gladiators for (both!) the *archieus* and *archieia*. But this is certainly not the case. The genitive *μονομάχων* clearly presupposes a missing line above for the word *φαμιλία*, as Robert (157) argued was “très probable.” Moreover, the genitives of Aruntius Nicomachus and his wife indicate possession; we would expect the dative if this were an epitaph erected for them or the accusative if the gladiators had meant to honour them.

19. Aphrodisias (Robert no. 156; C. Roueché, *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias* [London 1993] no. 15)  
ἀγαθὴ τύχη· ὑπόμνημα φαμιλίας καὶ κνηγεσίων Μ. Ἀντωνίου Ἀπελλᾶ Σεουηρείνου ἀρχιερέως υἱοῦ Μ. Ἀντωνίου Ὑψικλέους ἀρχιερέως.
20. Aphrodisias (Robert 170 no. 157; Roueché no. 14)  
φαμιλία Ζήνων[ος] τοῦ Ὑψικλέους τοῦ Ὑψικλέους τοῦ φύσει Ζήνωνος Ὑψικλέους ἀρχιερέως, μονομάχων καὶ καταδίκων καὶ ταυροκα[θαπτῶν? - -
21. Aphrodisias (Roueché no. 13)  
φαμιλίας μονομάχων καὶ καταδίκων Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Παυλείνου ἀρχιερέως υἱοῦ Τι[β]ερίου Κλαυδίου - -
22. Stratonicea (Robert no. 168; *I.Stratonikeia* 1015)  
μνήμα μονομάχων τῶν δοθέντων ὑπὸ ἀρχιερέως καὶ στεφανηφόρου [Ο]ὐλιάδου τοῦ Μη[τρ]οδώρου {τοῦ} Ἱεροκωμήτου.
23. Halicarnassus (Robert 187 no. 181)  
μνήμα μονομάχων [τῶν δοθέντων?] ὑπὸ Ποπλίου Οὐηδίου Ἀσι[ατι]κοῦ ἀρχιερέως? - <sup>51</sup>

July, 2003

Department of Classics  
Brock University  
St. Catharines, Ontario  
Canada L2S 3A1  
mjcarter@spartan.ac.brocku.ca

<sup>51</sup>I would like to thank W. J. Slater, who read an earlier version of this paper, for his invaluable insights and suggestions, and the anonymous referees for *GRBS*. The paper is much improved because of their efforts. Nevertheless, the conclusions and any faults of the paper are my own.