

Asiarchs, *Archiereis*, and the *Archiereiai* of Asia

R. A. Kearsley

THE EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE for the *archiereiai* of Asia is rarely discussed as a whole except as it is thought to throw light on the relationship of the asiarch and the *archiereus* of Asia.¹ Since many *archiereiai* were wives of one or the other of these male functionaries, it is generally assumed that the women bore their titles in an honorary capacity.² In effect a distinction is made between the title of the male, which denoted the holding of the office concerned (along with its constituent powers and privileges), and the title of the female, the chief entitlement to which, it is implied, was her marriage to an asiarch or *archiereus* of Asia. This interpretation is an implicit element in the notion that the titles asiarch and *archiereus* of Asia were synonymous.³ Otherwise, the hypothesis that the *archiereiai* of Asia received their title by marriage to an asiarch would be untenable. The efforts of scholars to prove this very fact by drawing attention to the number of *archiereiai* of Asia who were wives of asiarchs as well as of *archiereis* of Asia reveal a circularity of argument.

Further, it has been established that the imperial cult in Asia, although centered on a Roman emperor, remained essentially Greek in character.⁴ But proponents of honorary *archiereiai* have not at-

¹ The following will be cited by author's name: E. BEURLIER, *Essai sur le culte rendu aux empereurs romains* (Paris 1890); V. CHAPOT, *La province romaine proconsulaire d'Asie* (Paris 1904); J. DEININGER, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Munich 1965); D. MAGIE, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton 1950); S. R. PRICE, *Rituals and Power* (Cambridge 1984); M. ROSSNER, "Asiarchen und Archiereis Asias," *StudClas* 16 (1974) 101-42; J. M. I. WEST, *Asiarchs* (B.Litt. thesis, Oxford 1975).

² See in particular Rossner 102. The discussions of Beurlier (125, 127, 152f), and Deininger (41, 154) are more equivocal; in both cases, however, the ultimate conclusions are that the high priestess was merely dependent on the high priest for her title, that she was most probably his wife, and that she probably had no independent function.

³ Rossner 106f; A. D. Macro, "A Confirmed Asiarch," *AJP* 100 (1979) 94-98; cf. Beurlier and Deininger (n.12 *infra*). Magie (1300 n.61), alone among those who hold that the title of the *archiereiai* of Asia was honorary, does not make the further assumption that asiarchs and *archiereis* of Asia were identical. Others have suggested that some at least of the *archiereiai* of Asia earned their title independently: Brandis, *RE* 2 (1895) 483 s.v. "Archiereus"; Chapot 470; West 57f.

⁴ Price 77, 88f, 227.

tempted to justify the apparent incongruity of their theory with evidence for priestesses of other Greek cults,⁵ where their independence of a male consort has been freely acknowledged.⁶ That the object of the imperial cult was a male in the person of the emperor does not justify such an unusual interpretation: it is clear that the women of Asia, as in Greece, were not confined to serving goddesses;⁷ in addition, many other women are attested throughout the province as city *archieieiai* of the imperial cult.⁸ Epigraphical references to *archieieiai* of the city imperial cults differ from those of the province only in the absence of the phrase τῆς Ἀσίας,⁹ and the independent position of the civic *archieieis* is assured by an inscription from Aphrodisias in which an *archieieia* specifically claims to have performed all the requisite sacrifices throughout her years in office.¹⁰ It is clear that she was not dependent in any way on a complementary *archieieus* during her term as *archieieia*; and this inscription shows that the attitude of the Greeks of Asia towards the imperial cult can have been no different from that towards the many other cults in which women played a full and independent rôle.¹¹

⁵ The primary evidence cited by Beurlier and Deininger derives from the imperial cult in the West, and no attempt is made to examine the inscriptions from Asia in detail. The weakness of such a comparison for understanding the imperial cult in Asia becomes clear once the fundamentally Greek character of the imperial cult there is appreciated (*supra* n.4). The rôle of women as priestesses among the Greeks was a more independent and vital one than in Roman religion.

⁶ For an historical perspective on the importance of priestesses in performing the ritual of Greek cults see J. Gould, "Women in Classical Athens," *JHS* 100 (1980) 50f, and A. J. Graham, *Religion, Women and Greek Colonization* (= *Atti, Centro ricerche e documentazione sull' antichità classica* 11 [Milan 1980–81]) 302–14. Cf. R. MacMullen, "Woman in Public in the Roman Empire," *Historia* 29 (1980) 214, where the usual method of interpreting the *archieieiai* of Asia is contrasted with that applied to other sacred and civil offices.

⁷ Graham (*supra* n.6) 304. Two of the *archieieiai* of Asia were also priestesses of male deities: *IGR* IV 1571=#5 in the table *infra*; *I.Ephesos* III 814=#11. In addition, men and women sharing the priesthoods of a male deity are documented at Ephesus (*I.Ephesos* III 689) and Carian Stratonicea (*I.Stratonikeia* I 107ff).

⁸ The following may be cited from Ephesus alone: *I.Ephesos* II 424–424a; III 643c, 810, 933, 980; IV 1030, 1060.

⁹ L. Robert, *Les gladiateurs dans l'orient grec* (Limoges 1940) 271; Magie 1297 n.59. The difference is not always easy to discern. According to the above definition, two *archieieiai* do not belong in the list *infra* (#13, 15); but the phrase "of the temples in Ephesus" attached to their title has led others to classify them as provincial *archieieiai* (Rossner 140, West 85). These could, nonetheless, have been omitted without materially affecting the interpretation advanced here.

¹⁰ *MAMA* VIII 492b. See also the discussion in Price 211.

¹¹ Strangely, in view of the general interpretation of provincial priestesses, the rôle of women in the imperial cults of the cities appears never to have been challenged. See, for example, Price 211 and R. Mellor, *Θεὰ Πάμνη* (Göttingen 1975) 181f. The frequent appearance of priestesses after the amalgamation of the cult of Roma with that of the

Given the usefulness of the *archiereiai* of Asia for supporting the hypothetical identity of the asiarch and *archiereus* of Asia, any reassessment of the *archiereiai* will have ramifications beyond the immediate problem of the rôle of the *archiereiai* of Asia themselves. Whether the titles *archiereus* of Asia and asiarch were two different designations for the same office has been debated for over a century and a half.¹² The most recent extensive treatment of the subject is that of Deininger (36–50), who argues that although the two titles were used to refer to two separate offices during the late Republic and early imperial period, they had become synonymous at least by the beginning of the second century and probably before. He suggests that after the construction of the second and subsequent temples of the imperial cult of the province in cities such as Smyrna and Ephesus, it became practice to appoint several equal-ranking *archiereis* of Asia each year, instead of only one. Even then there was never more than one *archiereus* of Asia officiating in any city at one time.¹³ Deininger thus departs from earlier views that the provincial cult in Asia had either a sole high priest for the whole province at its head, or a supreme high priest assisted by deputies in the various cities of Asia where provincial temples of the imperial cult had been built. He nevertheless maintains the traditional view that the *archierosyne* was held by males only and that in any given city there was never more than one officiating high priest of the imperial cult of the province, namely an *archiereus* of Asia.¹⁴

emperor offers a striking contrast to the general lack of priestesses of Rome (*cf.* Mellor 181ff). In the author's opinion it is one further indication of the genuine rôle played by women in the imperial cult: such a marked break with custom is much more likely to represent a genuine alteration in the structure and ritual of the cult, rather than merely a shift in social mores that henceforth included wives in the priestly honours of their husbands.

¹² The situation is succinctly summarized by G. Mihailov: "quot capita, tot sententiae" ("The Western Pontic Koinon," *Epigraphica* 41 [1979] 39). See the summary discussions in C. Babington, "On an Unpublished Coin of Laodicea bearing the Name of an Asiarch," *NC* n.s. 6 (1866) 93–127; Beurlier 120–47; Chapot 470–80; Magie 1298–1300; Deininger 43–50.

¹³ Deininger 38, 49. His view has been widely endorsed: G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1969) 26; Mellor (*supra* n.11) 192; West 1; G. P. Burton, "The *Curator Rei Publicae*: Towards a Reappraisal," *Chiron* 9 (1979) 471; D. Knibbe and W. Alzinger, *Ephesos von Beginn der römischen Herrschaft in Kleinasien bis zum Ende der Principatszeit*, *ANRW* II 7.2 (Berlin 1980) 773; F. Quass, "Zur politischen Tätigkeit der municipalen Aristokratie des griechischen Ostens," *Historia* 31 (1982) 193; Price 62f.

¹⁴ It has not yet been resolved whether the high priesthood of the imperial cult of Asia took the form of a hierarchy with a sole high priest for the entire province assisted by deputies in the various cities where there were temples of the provincial cult (Chapot 470), simply a sole high priest of the province (Magie 1297f), or a board of several

I propose to re-examine here a group of inscriptions with two purposes in mind: first, to establish whether the *archieieiai* of Asia constituted an exception to the normal Greek practice and were indeed dependent on a male consort for their title;¹⁵ and second, to apply the answer to the problem of the relationship of the asiarch to the *archieieus* of Asia. Our main body of evidence concerns the *archieieiai* of Asia from Ephesus. This group, the largest presently known from any single city, comprises fifteen *archieieiai* of Asia who are either documented at Ephesus itself, or can with a high degree of probability be associated with it:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Husband's Title</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Reference</i>
1. Flavia Ammion Aristion	<i>Arch. of Asia</i> ¹⁶	Late I/early II	<i>IGR IV 1325 (Phocaea)</i>
2. Stratoneike	<i>Arch. of Asia</i>	Late I/early II	<i>IGR IV 1571 (Teos)</i>
3. Vedia Marcia	—	Late I/early II	<i>I.Ephesos IV 1017</i>
4. Claudia Ammion	<i>Archiereus</i>	Early II	<i>I.Ephesos III 681</i>
5. Claudia Tryphaena	— ¹⁷	Early II	<i>IGR IV 1571 (Teos)</i>
6. Saptia Firmilla	Asiarch	130/1	<i>I.Ephesos II 430</i>
7. Anon. mother of the Vetulenii	—	Hadrian	<i>I.Ephesos V 1553</i>
8. Flavia Papiane	Asiarch(?)	mid II	<i>I.Ephesos III 729</i>

equal-ranking high priests as Deininger proposes; but the available evidence from Ephesus is entirely consistent with the view that only a single person officiated in the city at any one time; see, for example, the dedicatory inscriptions *I.Ephesos II 232–35, 237–41; V 1498*. Brandis, Chapot, and West (*supra* n.3) have been prepared to accept that this official could on occasion be a woman. On the rare occasion when a man and woman did share the office, a specific terminology was employed (n.24 *infra*).

¹⁵ According to the usual view of honorary titles for *archieieiai* of Asia, a husband is the only male consort that comes into consideration (*supra* n.2). Macro (*supra* n.3: 95) suggests that a father-in-law may have been involved in one instance, but considers this unlikely. It is quite possible, in any case, that the status and rank of a woman's father and her family were in general more influential than those of her husband in determining her own position in society; see, for example, *I.Ephesos III 729; IV 1017; and IGR IV 1571*, where stress is laid on the parents rather than the husband. So too *MAMA VIII 517b*, where Flavia Appia of Aphrodisias appears alone as *archieieia* of Asia in a dedication honoring her father. In *I.Ephesos III 714, CIG 2782 (Aphrodisias)*, and *IGR IV 1233 (Thyateira)* the relationship of the woman to senatorials is emphasized even at the expense of the husband's status, to whom that honour is not accorded. The greater importance of the father in the epithets of moral quality applied to a woman of Roman citizenship in both the republican and imperial periods has been pointed out by J. Le Gall, "Un critère de différenciation sociale," in C. Nicolet, ed., *Recherches sur les structures sociales dans l'antiquité classique* (Paris 1970) 279–81.

¹⁶ Known from *IGR IV 1323*.

¹⁷ The husband of Claudia Tryphaena may be Claudius Italicus who is documented at Teos (*IGR IV 1567; CIG 3093*), at Ephesus (*I.Ephesos II 266, 280; III 643c*), and at Aspendus (*IGR III 804*). The only position he is known to have held in the imperial cult is *archieieus* of the city cult at Aspendus.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Husband's Title</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Reference</i>
9. Amphilla	<i>Arch. of Asia</i>	ca 160–180	<i>I.Ephesos</i> III 721
10. Anon. grand-mother of Aelia Procle	—	Hadrian–mid III	<i>I.Ephesos</i> III 994
11. Anon.	—	Hadrian–mid III	<i>I.Ephesos</i> III 814
12. Mindia Stratonike Hegumene	—	Hadrian–mid III	<i>JÖAI</i> 55 (1984) 125
13. Aufidia Quintilia	Asiarch	Late II–Caracalla	<i>I.Ephesos</i> III 637
14. Iulia Atticilla	Asiarch ¹⁸	217/8	<i>I.Ephesos</i> III 617
15. Anon. wife of Rupilius Alexander	Asiarch	ca 253	<i>I.Ephesos</i> III 714

Of the fifteen provincial *archieieiai*, three (1, 2, 9) are married to an *archieieus* of Asia, while four (6, 13, 14, 15) are definitely, and one (8) possibly, married to an asiarch. One *archieieia* (4) is married only to an *archieieus* of the imperial cult of the *polis*; that is, to a man who did not, according to this inscription, hold the priesthood of the imperial cult of the province even though his wife had done so. For the remaining six *archieieiai* of Asia (3, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12), there is either no evidence of a husband, or, if a husband is known, some doubt as to his title. Therefore, on the available evidence, at least eight of the *archieieiai* may have obtained their title from their husbands—provided, of course, that the *archieieus* of Asia and asiarch are identical. For the rest of the *archieieiai* the situation remains in doubt.

Closer inspection of those eight reveals some indications that the wife's title was not solely dependent on that of her husband. Flavia Papiane (8), for example, is named as *archieieia* of Asia, but her husband, P. Vedius Antoninus, who is also mentioned in the inscription, bears no title at all (*I.Ephesos* III 729): Φλαουίαν Παπιανήν ἀρχιέρειαν τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ ἀρχιερέων θυγατέρα, γυναῖκα δὲ Πο. Ὀνηδίου Ἀντωνείνου. While Vedius has been accorded the asiarchy by some scholars on the basis of two other inscriptions,¹⁹ here, where

¹⁸ Known from *I.Ephesos* III 616.

¹⁹ *I.Ephesos* VI 2065: here however the abbreviated form of the tria nomina could equally well apply to the father, grandfather, or son of Vedius. Indeed the inscription has been attributed to each of these at one time or another: H. Halfmann, *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen 1979) 169 no. 84a (grandfather or father); J. Keil, *RE* VIII.A.1 (1955) 566 s.v. "Vedius (2)" (father); R. Heberdey, *Forsch.Eph.* II no. 65 (son). Certainly the content of the inscription itself is of no assistance in ascertaining which is correct. *I.Ephesos* III 728 (see the stemma, *I.Ephesos* VII.1 p.89) has been convincingly assigned to the father by M. Wörrle, "Zur Datierung des Hadrianstempels an der 'Kuretenstrasse' in Ephesos," *AA* 88 (1973) 470–77. Certainly, despite the wealth of epigraphical material documenting the activity of Vedius in Ephesus (a summary in the

one would expect to see his title if that of his wife were dependent upon it, his name is not qualified in any way. Similarly the wife of Rupillius Alexander (15) is described as twice *archieirea* of Asia, but there is no sign that her husband ever repeated his term of office. He bears only the simple title, asiarch (*I.Ephesos* III 714).

Conversely, in some inscriptions from Ephesus the husband bears a provincial title but his wife does not. Such is the case of Iulia Lydia Laterane, the wife of Tiberius Claudius Aristio. In two inscriptions where their names appear together, Aristio bears a provincial title, but Iulia is described only as *archieirea*.²⁰ Likewise, in the two inscriptions recording the statues he and his family erected to the proconsul of Asia and his sister in 109/110, T. Flavius Pythio is designated asiarch, but Flavia Myrton, his wife, bears no title at all.²¹

Such inscriptions, in which the differences in the titles of husband and wife suggest that the one was not derived from the other, are not confined to Ephesus. They are found, for example, in Thyateira, Aphrodisias, and elsewhere.²² Therefore the cases cited from Ephesus may not in any way be discounted as unusual or aberrant examples. In themselves, they strongly suggest that the wife's title was not entirely dependent on her husband's; but a far stronger indication of this independence of title is the case of Claudia Ammion (4), whose

stemma mentioned above), none unequivocally designates him as asiarch, and from the evidence presently available this view seems most likely to be correct. On the other hand, both his father and grandfather are documented as asiarchs elsewhere (*I.Ephesos* II 429, VII.2 4110).

²⁰ Iulia has been taken as *archieirea* of Asia on the basis of *I.Ephesos* II 424 by Rossner (131). But an inscription discovered subsequently (II 424a) proves beyond doubt that the correct reading of Iulia's titles is "daughter of Asia, *archieirea*"; she is not so far known to have been an *archieirea* of Asia.

²¹ *I.Ephesos* VII.1 3033-34.

²² **THYATEIRA:** Flavia Priscilla is twice *archieirea* of Asia in *IGR* IV 1233, and her husband is simply asiarch. The next generation of the family is represented in the same inscription, where the situation is repeated. **APHRODISIAS:** in *CIG* 2782 Flavia Appia is *archieirea* of Asia, although her husband, Claudianus, in whose honor the inscription was decreed, is not an *archieirus* either of the province or of the city. Macro (*supra* n.3) unconvincingly restores the inscription with Claudianus as *archieirus* of Asia. His attempt to draw in as evidence coins from Attuda on which Claudianus appears as asiarch (*cf.* Halfmann [*supra* n.19] no. 144a for details) is useless because the coins cannot be dated relative to this inscription; moreover, his supposition that they are relevant assumes that the terms asiarch and *archieirus* were identical, a fact not proven. See further Macro, *AJP* 106 (1985) 118f, refuted by T. Drew-Bear, *GRBM* 10 (1984) 67-69. For a second example at Aphrodisias see *CIG* 2823. **CYZICUS:** the difference in rank between Vibia Polla and her husband, who was *archieirus* of Asia, has led to confusion. Vibia Polla herself was *archieirea* only of the city cult (*IGR* IV 155), but she is included as *archieirea* of Asia by E. de Ruggiero, *DizEpig* 1 (1895) 731; Chapot 489; Magie 1604; Rossner 138 (the latter two with incorrect references).

husband was quite definitely neither *asiarch* nor *archiereus* of Asia:²³ Κλαυδίαν Ἀμμιον τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν Πουπλίου Γαυρίου Καπίτωνος τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, γενομένην ἀρχιέρειαν τῆς Ἀσίας. But another *archiereia* of Asia, this time from Aphrodisias, was also honoured as *archiereia* of Asia when her husband bore only the title of municipal *archiereus* (CIG 2823). In this instance, in fact, it appears from the text that her husband was already dead. Therefore the possibility that her husband could have been a former *archiereus* of Asia, as in the case of Claudia Ammion of Ephesus, is here precluded: it is reasonable to assume that the dead husband is described by the highest title he earned during his lifetime.

The inscriptions concerning the three *archiereiai* of Asia who were definitely married to provincial *archiereis* (1, 2, 9) also suggest that two of these, at least, were regarded as playing an important rôle alongside their husbands. Amphilla (9) is specifically named as *co-archiereia*: the use of a term such as *συν[αρχ]ιερασ[αμ]ένην* certainly denotes an equality of rank.²⁴ The inscription concerning Stratonike (2), on the other hand, refers to her husband and herself in the plural as “*archiereis* of Asia.” This usage, also found in other cities of Asia, would surely be unnecessary if only the man actually held office.²⁵

The use of the plural for husband and wife as *archiereis* of Asia is also found in an inscription from Cibyra (IGR IV 908):

οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἕλληνας ἐτείμησαν Τιβέριον Κλαύδιον Κλαυδίου Πολέμωνος υἱὸν Κυρεῖνα Κέλσον Ὀρεστιανόν, φιλόπατριν, κοσμοπολιν, καὶ Φλαουίαν Φλαουίου Ἰέρωνος θυγατέρα Λυκίαν, θυγατέρα πόλεως, τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, ἀρχιερατεύσαντας τῆς Ἀσίας τῶν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ δις νεωκόρω Περγάμω ναῶν.

Here, significantly, we find the aorist participle, which in normal usage should indicate that the *archierosyne* of both husband and wife constituted a fixed term of office. It is especially noteworthy that this

²³ *I.Ephesos* III 681. Claudia Ammion proves an exception to the belief of Rossner (102) that no *archiereia* of Asia is known who was not the wife of an *archiereus* of Asia or an *asiarch*. Aelia Laevilla of Aphrodisias is a second exception (CIG 2823).

²⁴ *I.Ephesos* III 721. This formula appears to be rare. It does, however, occur in at least two inscriptions (CIG 4385 from Isaura in Lycaonia and 4363 from Termessus in Pamphylia), although both these refer to the city imperial cult and not to the provincial. Priesthoods shared between men and women are also known in other cults (see *supra* n.7).

²⁵ IGR IV 1571. This inscription has been restored at the crucial place, but the editor's suggestion is justified by three inscriptions from Thyateira (IGR IV 1229, 1238; CIG 3495). See also *I.Ephesos* III 729, where the parents of Flavia Papiane, *archiereia* of Asia, are *archiereis* of the city cult.

inscription was not engraved at the behest of a private individual, nor even by the city, but by the *koinon* of Asia itself; it therefore constitutes an official recognition of the woman's rôle by the body that controlled and administered cult at the provincial level.²⁶

Yet another group of inscriptions from Ephesus suggests that the title *archieieia* of Asia was not a purely honorary one. Six *archieieiai* of Asia (3, 5, 7, 10, 11, 12) were honoured without any reference to a husband, although some at least were, or had been, married. Claudia Tryphaena (5) and the anonymous *archieieia* (7) were both honoured alone by their sons; and as the reference to *archieieia* of Asia (10) occurs in a dedication to her daughter, she too was certainly married, although her husband is not mentioned. In the case of Vedia Marcia, *archieieia* (3), the inclusion of her patronymic in addition to the list of her offices suggests that she was not married.²⁷ Mindia Hegumene (12) may have been unmarried also, for when she appears as *archieieia* of Asia in an inscription honoring her father, her name is specifically linked only to that of her sister.²⁸ Thanks to the fragmentary state of the inscription no conclusions can be safely drawn about the remaining member of this group (11): as far as the text remains she appears alone. Thus of these six *archieieiai* of Asia, five were clearly honored alone when bearing the title, regardless of whether they were married or unmarried.

There is one final and conclusive proof that women could and did serve as *archieieiai* of Asia in their own right. The evidence comes not from Ephesus, but from Magnesia on the Maeander (*I.Magn.* 158), in a decree of the mid-first century honoring a certain Iuliane. As in other inscriptions, both husband and wife are named *archieieus* and *archieieia* of Asia respectively; but on this occasion there can be no doubt that they actually held office on separate occasions: the lapse of time between their terms of office is specified in lines 4–6. Moreover, that of Iuliane is indicated as having occurred before that of her husband:²⁹

²⁶ This appears to contradict the belief of Deininger (41) and Rossner (102) that *archieieiai* of Asia are never found as actual functionaries of the *koinon*.

²⁷ An unmarried status would not have prevented Vedia from being *prytanis*. *I.Ephesos* IV 1066 is a dedication by a former *prytanis* who was clearly unmarried: cf. R. Merkelbach, "Der Kult der Hestia im Prytaneion der griechischen Städte," *ZPE* 37 (1980) 85.

²⁸ The inscription is broken at the bottom, however, and the partially preserved name of a grandson of Mindia's father (lines 15f) leaves open the possibility that she was in fact married.

²⁹ This is the only case known to the author where the terms of office of husband and wife as *archieieis* of Asia are explicitly separated. That this is the correct interpretation of the text is supported by a comparison with *I.Ephesos* II 435. In this text two

ἡ βουλὴ [καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἐτείμησαν]
 Ἰουλιανῆ[ν Εὐσ?]τρά[του τοῦ Φα?]-
 νοστράτ[ου,] γυναι[ῖκα δὲ Ἄλ]-
 κίφρονο[ς τ]οῦ τῆς Ἀ[σίας ἀρχιε]-
 ρέως, ἀρ[χιέ]ρειαν γε[νομένην]
 τῆς Ἀσίας (κτλ.)

This inscription confirms the indications from the evidence cited above: *archiereiai* of Asia were not dependent on their husbands for their title, because they could and did serve as *archiereiai* of Asia quite separately from their husband. The Ephesian *archiereiai* alone range in date from the late first century until the mid-third century, at which point epigraphical attestation of the imperial cult in Asia comes to a virtual end.³⁰ This conclusion may therefore be applied as a general principle for most of the imperial period in Asia.

While the evidence for an independent *archiereia* of Asia has intrinsic importance for the light it throws on the activity of prominent and wealthy women in the religious life of the province,³¹ its bearing on the relationship of the asiarch and *archiereus* of Asia is of even more far-reaching consequence. Evidence that the two titles were attached to different people in exactly the same year, even if they were man and woman, must mean that the asiarchy was not identical with provincial *archierosyne*. A functional *archiereia* of Asia excludes the possibility that an asiarch occupied the position of *archiereus* of Asia simultaneously. Thus, given that there was only one high priest of Asia in any single city at one time, inscriptions such as that from Ephesus in which C. Claudius Verulanus Marcellus is asiarch in 130/1 and his wife is *archiereia* of Asia in the same year³² must mean that

grammateis of the *demoi* are named. One is designated in line 3 as having previously held the position, while the name of the second is used in line 4 to date the dedication of the building.

³⁰ Deininger 59.

³¹ Their rôle as independent benefactors of the cities is well established: see, for example, the discussion of Claudia Metrodora's activities in Chios during the first century by L. Robert, *Études épigraphiques et philologiques* (Paris 1938) 128–34, and *Bull.épigr.* 1956, 213; also the discussion by R. van Bremen, "Women and Wealth," in *Images of Women in Antiquity*, A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt, edd. (London 1983) 223–25. A fairly comprehensive section is also devoted to women by Chapot (158–63), and public offices held by women are listed in Magie 1518 n.50 and MacMullen (*supra* n.6) 213–28.

³² *I.Ephesos* II 430. Another example is provided by Aurelius Daphnus and Iulia Atticilla, husband and wife, who bore the titles asiarch and *archiereia* of Asia in 217/8 when they erected statues to the procurator Appius Alexander and his wife (*I.Ephesos* III 616, 617). The fact that these office-bearers happen to have been husband and wife has here been shown to have no bearing on the wife's title. However, a plausible

the titles were not synonymous: Γάιος Κλαύδιος Βερουλανὸς Μάρκελλος ἀσιάρχης μετὰ Σκαπτίας Φιρμίλλης τῆς γυναικὸς ἀρχιερείας τῆς Ἀσίας, ἐπὶ ἀνθυπάτου Ἀφρανίου Φλαβιανοῦ.³³

MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY

May, 1986

reason has been advanced for the relative frequency with which husband and wives appear simultaneously in important positions such as these, namely the habit of intermarriage among those wealthy and distinguished families that dominated office-holding in the cities and provinces (J. Wiseman, "A Distinguished Macedonian Family of the Roman Imperial Period," *AJA* 88 [1984] 572). On the other hand, in light of this evidence for a distinction between the titles *asiarch* and *archieus* of Asia, the existence of L. Rupillius Alexander, *asiarch* in Ephesus (*I.Ephesos* III 698) and Domitius Rufus, *asiarch* in Sardis (*TAM* V.1 230, and J. Nollé, *Nundinas instituere et habere. Epigraphische Zeugnisse zur Einrichtung und Gestaltung von ländlichen Märkten in Afrika und in der Provinz Asia* [Hildesheim 1982] 60–86) in the same year, 253/4, assumes new importance. This information may now indicate, as Magie suggested over thirty years ago (449f), that the *asiarchs* were primarily concerned with the individual cities rather than of the province as a whole. I intend to return to this question later.

³³ I wish to acknowledge with gratitude suggestions made by Professors G. H. R. Horsley, E. A. Judge, C. E. V. Nixon, and M. J. Osborne during the preparation of this paper. Nevertheless, the views expressed and the remaining shortcomings are entirely my own.