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This doctoral thesis examines the social classes in Lydia and Phrygia during the first three centuries AD. The research was equally dedicated to urban and rural population and includes all social strata that have left their mark in the narrative and documentary sources, from senators to the stock of slaves. Given the information provided by the sources the thesis is dealing with the social status and the rise of the richest families in these areas, the legal status of members of the local and immigrant population and the effects of the Constitutio Antoniniana and granting Roman citizenship to all free inhabitants of the Empire, professional craftsmen associations, family structure and family life, cult personnel and the role of religion in private and social life, literacy and level of cultural development. The aim of the research was to study in detail a large and significant part of the province of Asia at the time of its greatest economic and cultural prosperity. The regions were compared with each other and at times with other parts of ancient Asia Minor.

One of the main topics of this thesis is social dynamics, intra- and inter-generational mobility. This interaction can include family ties, household, marital ties, and other interactions. In all these ways individuals are linked into classes that create a system of social stratification. Demography of Lydia and Phrygia presented a special challenge. The research method is primarily based on a comprehensive study of historical sources, both documentary and narrative, although epigraphic material largely prevails (there are about 4500 published inscriptions from Lydia and Phrygia so far).

Changes emerging at the end of the rule of the Attalid dynasty and the arrival of the Romans in Asia Minor affected the local residents in different ways. New political and economic conditions enabled the creation of a new social organization. Roman power in Asia Minor brought significant changes to the social hierarchy. The prosperous period in the history of the province of Asia, during the 2nd century AD, is marked by the growing number of new senators from the East (homines novi). There were several senatorial
families in Lydia and Phrygia, primarily from Sardeis, Thyateira, Tralleis, Akmoneia, Attouda, Aizanoi and Laodikeia on Lykos. Education and origin were the best recommendation for new senators. Most of them build a career long and carefully, like Tiberius Claudius Celsus Polemaeanus from Sardeis and Marcus Gnaeus Licinius Rufinus from Thyateira. All originated from Asia Minor, and most of them married daughters from the families of the same or similar status. Sons usually continued their careers in urban centers such as Ephesos, Pergamon and Rome. Nevertheless, epigraphic evidence clearly shows that the connections with their homeland, cities from which they originated remained strong. Only senators and members of the equestrian order were "Romanized" in the true sense of the word. Apart from the descendants of Roman colonists in the East, something like this could not be said for members of the municipal elite, and even less for the lower social groups.

Asia Minor has produced ample evidence for studying the origin and influence of wealthy families in the Greco-Roman cities, as well as their mutual relationships. Epigraphic monuments, such as honorary inscriptions, dedications and tombstones, yield most information about the prominent families in the areas of Lydia and Phrygia. Abundant information indicates how complex relationships among different families were and how their influence was widespread. Based on the sources we can discern the outlines of the network of dominant families that spawned the ruling elite in the cities, and later the senators and consuls that were building their careers in the eastern provinces in accordance with the existing tradition of the Roman Empire. One gets the impression that prominent families of Lydia and Phrygia inclined toward larger centers, especially coastal, Ionian cities. Generally speaking, families have experienced their rise over three generations, and offices they held in this period are repeated in the history of each of them. The study of prominent families within wider social and economic context and the study of social mobility lead to a better understanding of general historical circumstances. I believe that members of the urban elite were the initiators of social mobility.

Professional associations had an important role in the social life of Phrygia and Lydia. A large number of honorary and funerary inscriptions provide information about the internal organization of these associations and their position in the economic life of the
cities. Slaves certainly form a significant social group, but unfortunately, the ancient sources, especially narrative ones, do not focus on them. Using mainly epigraphic evidence, I have attempted to study their position in households, including the formation of slave families, as well as their role in economic life of Lydia and Phrygia.
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Društvo Lidije i Frigije od I do III veka n.e.

Tema ove doktorske teze su društveni slojevi u maloazijskim oblastima Lidiji i Frigiji tokom prva tri veka n. e. Istraživanje je podjednako posvećeno gradskom i seoskom stanovništvu i obuhvata sve društvene slojeve koji su ostavili trag u narativnim i dokumentarnim izvorima, od pripadnika senatskog staleža do robova. U skladu sa podacima koje pružaju izvori razmatran je društveni status i uspon najbogatijih porodica u ovim oblastima, pravni status pripadnika domaćeg i pridošlog stanovništva i posledice Karakalinog Edikta o davanju rimskog gradjanskog prava svim slobodnim stanovnicima Carstva, profesionalna zanatlijska udruženja, porodična struktura i porodični život, zanimanja, kultni personal i uloga religije u privatnom i društvenom zivotu, pismenost i stepen kulturnog razvoja. Čilj istraživanja je bio da se detaljno prouči društvo jednog velikog i značajnog dela provincije Azije u vreme njegovog najvećeg ekonomskog i kulturnog uspona. Deskripcija nije bila dovoljna, stoga neće biti prezentovani samo opis i analiza situacije u ovim izuzetno važnim oblastima, nego su upoređivane i međusobno, a na nekim mestima i sa ostalim delovima antičke Male Azije.

Jedan od fokusa ove teze je socijalna dinamika, intra- i inter- generacijska mobilnost. Ova interakcija može upućivati i na porodične veze, domaćinstva, bračne i rođačke veze, kao i druge interakcije. Na sve ove načine pojedinci su povezani u slojeve koji stvaraju sistem društvene stratifikacije. Poseban istraživački izazov je pitanje istraživanja demografije u Lidiji i Frigiji. Metod istraživanja se prvenstveno zasniva na sveobuhvatnom proučavanju istorijskih izvora, kako dokumentarnih tako i narativnih, mada najviše na analizi epigrafskog materijala (korpus natpisa u Lidiji i Frigiji ima oko 4500 natpisa).

Promene koje su nastale padom dinastije Atalida i dolaskom Rimljana na prostor Male Azije, uticale su i na stanovnike tamošnjih provincija na različite načine. Novi politički i ekonomski uslovi omogućili su stvaranje nove društvene organizacije. Rimska vlast u Maloj Aziji je donela mnoge promene, pa i u društvenoj hijerarhiji. Procvat
provincije Azije u drugom veku n. e, ogleda se i u sve većem broju novih senatora sa Istoka (*homines novi*). Bilo je nekoliko senatorskih porodica u Lidiji i Frigiji, prvenstveno u Sardu, Tijateri, Tralu, Akmoneji, Atudi, Aizanoi i Laodikeji na Likosu. Obrazovanje i poreklo su bili najbolja preporuka za nove senatore. Većina ih je dugo i pažljivo gradila karijeru, poput Tiberija Klaudija Celza Polemaeana iz Sarda i Marka Gneja Licinija Rufina iz Tijatere. Svi su poreklom iz Male Azije, a većinom su se ženili čerkama porodica istog ili sličnog statusa. Sinovi su uglavnom nastavljali karijeru u velikim centrima poput Efesa, Pergama i Rima. I pored toga, veze sa oblastima, gradovima iz kojih su potekli su ostale čvrste, što se vidi iz sačuvanih natpisa. Samo su sensori i pripadnici konjičkog staleža bili „romanizovani“ u pravom smislu te reči i samo se među njima može pratiti rasprostranjenost latinskog jezika. Osim potomaka rimskih kolonista na Istoku, ovako nešto ne bi moglo da se kaže ni za pripadnike gradske elite, a još manje za niže društvene grupe.

Mala Azija je oduvek bila pogodno tle za proučavanje porekla i uticaja bogatih porodica u grčko-romskim gradovima, kao i njihovih međusobnih veza. Epigrafski spomenici, poput počasnih natpisa, dedikacija i nadgrobnih spomenika, donose najviše informacija o istaknutim porodicama u oblastima Lidije i Frigije. Obilje podataka ukazuje na to koliko su bili složeni odnosi među različitim porodicama i koliko je njihov uticaj bio rasprostranjen. Na osnovu izvora mogu se nazreti obrisi dominantnih porodica koje su iznedrile vladajuću elitu u gradovima, a kasnije i senatore i konzule koju su stvarali svoju karijeru u istočnim provincijama u skladu sa postojećom tradicijom Rimskog carstva. Stiče se utisak da su ugledne porodice Lidije i Frigije težile ka većim centrima, pogotovo primorskim, jonskim gradovima. U proseku, porodice su svoj uspon doživljavale tokom tri generacije, a funkcije koje su vršili u tom periodu se ponavljaju u istoriji svake od njih. Proučavanje istaknutih porodica u sklopu šireg društvenog i ekonomskog konteksta i proučavanje društvene mobilnosti vodi ka boljem razumevanju opštih istorijskih prilika. Posebno pitanje u radu je pitanje identifikacije titule i položaja arhijereja Azije i azijarha. Smatram da su pripadnici gradske elite bili pokretači društvene mobilnosti.

Važnu ulogu u društvenom životu Lidije i Frigije imaju i profesionalna udruženja. Veliki broj počasnih i nadgrobnih natpisa pruža nam podatke o unutrašnjoj organizaciji tih udruženja i njihovom položaju u ekonomskom životu gradova.
Robovi svakako čine veliku društvenu grupu, no na žalost, antički izvori se ne fokusiraju na njih. U okviru ove teze, prikazan je njihov položaj kroz ekonomske relacije stanovništva; rad robova u domaćinstvu, zanatstvu, kao i formiranje robovskih porodica.
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1. INTRODUCTION

This thesis represents an attempt to provide a historical survey and analysis of the society in Lydia and Phrygia during the first three centuries of the Roman Empire. Society can be broadly described as the collective of people living together in a more or less ordered community. Human societies are characterized by patterns of relationships (social relations) between individuals who share a distinctive culture and institutions. A larger society often reveals stratification and/or dominance patterns in subgroups. Social class refers to a stratification system that divides a society into a hierarchy of social positions. It is a method of social ranking that involves money, power, culture, taste, identity, access, and exclusion.\textsuperscript{1} Social classes are demographically formed wherever patterns of mobility, interaction and association tie the occupants of class situations together.

In the beginning of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century Weber introduced three independent factors that form his theory of stratification hierarchy: class, status and power. Class represented a person’s economic position in a society; status was seen as a person’s prestige, social honor or popularity in the society and power as person’s ability to get their way despite the resistance of the others.\textsuperscript{2} This stratification can be applied almost universally. The term social structure denotes a more or less enduring pattern of social arrangements within a particular society, group, or social organization. An early attempt to theorize the notion of social structure was seen in the work of Lévi-Strauss, the French social anthropologist, who

\textsuperscript{1} G. Ritzer, J. M. Ryan, \textit{The Concise Encyclopedia of Sociology}, Oxford 2011, 65 s.v. class.
attempted to discover the universal rules that strengthen everyday activities and custom through cultural systems.³

Most ancient historians are likely to deal at some point with the interrelation of political power, social status, material assets and literary tradition. The aim of this research is to study the society of one large and significant part of the province of Asia during its greatest economic and cultural flowering. In this thesis we will attempt to analyze the society and social classes in two provinces of Asia Minor in the Roman period, Lydia and Phrygia. How was the society divided? One analyzes the population by these questions: where did the people live – in towns or in the villages? What were their occupations, divided by gender, age, family relations? What was the basis for all those divisions?

Greek social perception was aware of inequalities and embraced them, so they divided people on free and slaves (by legal and social criteria), or citizens and non-citizens (by political criteria). The presented division on social classes, based on Roman social stratification, is perhaps inadequate or incomplete, but generally accepted. This research will equally involve both town and village population and include all the strata that left some evidence in literary and documentary sources, beginning with the upper classes: senators, equestrians and urban elite, citizens and villagers, foreigners and slaves. One of the main focuses will be on social dynamics, intra- and inter-generational mobility. This interaction might involve links of family and household, bonds of marriage, partnership, parenting, kinship, friendship and similar forms of intimate interaction, such as association membership. In all of these ways individuals may be tied into the larger and more organized structures that are layered on top of each other to form a system of social stratification in which the members of a particular social class share crucial experiences and life chances in common.⁴ Certain parallels on social relations between people can be made, even though they are sometimes not so noticeable in the sources. Making that link is the part of the historical process where we have to construct, show and make something to explain from the sources.

Some of the hypothesis are that professional and cult associations played a significant role in social and economic life of Lydia and Phrygia, that notable population growth contributed to the development of these areas, to recognize where the Romanization was most noticeable, and if the Hellenistic and the older traditions still shaped everyday life.

The differences between Lydia and Phrygia are visible and important. Apart from the common social features shared by the ruling elites of these two regions, which were part of the wider phenomenon, there is hardly any feature that could be described as identical for both of them. Lydia remained a more densely populated and more urbanized area, closely connected to the western parts of Asia Minor and the administrative center of the province. Phrygia, covering a much larger area than its western neighbor, even under Roman rule remained less populated, with much more scattered network of cities and probably significantly larger proportion of the rural population. Differences in their cultural traditions are also still visible during the first centuries of the Roman Empire. The Phrygian ‘doorstones’ are an excellent example of a regionally distinctive artifact-type – found throughout Phrygia and almost nowhere else – which nonetheless shows extreme local variation. The separate historical experience influenced the ways the societies of these regions managed with realities of the Roman Empire.

Asia Minor was and is one of the most interesting and most dynamic areas. It sits at a critical junction between the continents of Europe and Asia. For this reason, it has often been seen as a land-bridge through which cultural developments were transmitted. Many researchers are interested in Asia Minor because of its geographical diversity, distinctive historical background in different regions and abundance of sources. The importance of this region in the history of Greco-Roman civilization is immense; it is hard to overestimate it. It could be also seen in the amount of energy and means foreign invaders invested in conquering and expanding in Asia Minor.

---


Asia Minor has always served as a principal link between Europe and Asia. It was almost never united except under the pressure of foreign conquerors, as though its political division was a natural result of its geographical incoherence, manifested in a seclusion of midland highlands from the coastal areas in the north and south. Some compensation for the relative infertility of the central Asia Minor was provided by its mineral wealth.\(^7\) One of the advantages of the mountainous nature of Asia Minor is the availability of a large quantity of minerals and ores, such as obsidian, copper, silver, and gold, many of which were exploited throughout history.

The physical structure of Asia Minor has a clear influence in terms of transport and travel, climate and vegetation and each of the regions had different benefits for their inhabitants from the beginning. The environmental conditions and natural geography of Asia Minor have not changed much: the soil, climate, plants and animals are more or less the same as they were in Roman times.\(^8\) In the Phrygian plateau the famous Synnadic or Dokimeian marble, a white stone streaked with purple, was quarried and extensively used by the Romans, especially for great columns.\(^9\) The hinterland of Sardeis contained a volcanic region with parts of very productive soil, known as Katakekaumenē.\(^10\) Lydia was a transitional area between the Ionian coast and the higher lands of Phrygia, so it profited from both. In the Hellenistic and Roman period Laodikeia on the Lycos in Phrygia was known for its soft “raven-black” wool.\(^11\) Perhaps the most significant natural resources of western Asia Minor were its communications – roads and rivers.

Lydia contained much natural wealth, and situated on two main routes from the coast to the interior of Anatolia, it was the center of trade and lay open to Greek and Anatolian influences, which are reflected in its civilization, art, and cults. The historical boundaries of Lydia varied, but it was surrounded by Mysia, Caria, Phrygia and coastal


\(^10\) In Roman period volcanoes were extinct, nevertheless a great earthquake in 17 AD showed tectonic activity of the area, cf. Tac. Ann. 2. 47.1.

\(^11\) Strabo, 12. 8. 16.
Ionia. In Roman times the river Meander was usually regarded as its southern boundary.\textsuperscript{12} That is the main reason why I included the inscriptions from Tralleis into this thesis, although Strabo describes this city as part of Caria.\textsuperscript{13} Tralleis lost its status as a \textit{conventus} centre under Tiberius, after the devastating earthquake and became part of the \textit{conventus} in Ephesus.

The region of the Hermus River and its tributaries, the most fertile of all the river-basins of Asia Minor, was dominated by the grand city of Sardeis, the ancient Lydian capital. The city of Sardeis is located at the foot of the Tmolos mountain range, where the Pactolus River runs through the Hermus plain. It has a long history, extending well before the eighth century BC. Its situation on the Royal Road (βασιλικὴ ὁδὸς), near the junction of roads from Ephesos to Smyrna, made it a great commercial centre. From Sardeis the road leads eastwards through the valley of the Hermus. The city itself was positioned west of the acropolis and built around the temple of Artemis. In the course of time the city extended northward, into the valley.\textsuperscript{14} The city finally passed into the hands of the Romans in 133 BC when the Pergamene king Attalus III bequeathed it to them, and thus became a part of the newly formed province of Asia, together with Phrygia and other Attalid domains. In 17 AD city suffered a devastating earthquake. Tiberius gave it generous aid in the form of direct payment of 10 million sesterces and exemption from taxes for five years. The city was soon revived with new Roman buildings and it became part of a strategic network of highways that connected it with all parts of the province of Asia. West of Sardeis, the plain of the lower Hermus was dominated by the strong fortress of Magnesia ad Sipylum.\textsuperscript{15} The place was of importance both strategically and commercially. Across the river from Magnesia, the plain widens out far to the north in a valley of great fertility, where the Phrygius and its tributaries flow. Near one of them is the city of Thyateira, as Strabo puts it “a settlement of Macedonians, which by some is called the farthermost city of

\textsuperscript{12} Diodorus, XIV 36, 2: he puts Tralleis in Ionia.
\textsuperscript{13} Strabo, 14. 1, 42 states that the plain of the Meander River is occupied by Lydians and Carians, and by Ionians; and after Strabo Ruge, RE, \textit{sv. Tralleis 2}, editions of SEG and many others; however, Head in \textit{Historia Numorum} place Tralleis in Lydia.
\textsuperscript{14} Magie, \textit{Roman Rule}, 121.
\textsuperscript{15} Livy 37. 56, 3; πρὸς Συπόλι in \textit{TAM V2} 1342.
the Mysians.” In 281 BC, after the battle of Kourupedion it was selected by Seleucus Nicator for a colony of veteran soldiers. The sites of these veteran settlements in the valley were chosen partly because of the fertility of the soil, but also because of the strategic position of the region. Nearby Attaleia stood on a hill overlooking the plain along the upper Lycus, and Apollonis was on the western side of a group of hills above the narrow valley of a tributary of the Phrygius. The most important Attalid foundation was Philadelphia, named after its founder Attalus II Philadelphus. Its position corresponds with the city of Callatebus mentioned by Herodotus. The land around the city was fertile and connections were great, but because of the proximity of the volcanic region of Katakekaumenē it was in constant danger from numerous earthquakes. Nevertheless, it prospered greatly and in Roman times it was a place of great wealth. Tralleis was the city on the border of Lydia and Caria and it occupied a very strong position on the flattened part of the Messogis range looking towards the plain of the Meander. It was famous for commerce and as a seat of the cult of Zeus Larasios. According to a late, Hellenistic, legend, Tralleis was founded by immigrants from Argos and by members of a Thracian tribe named Tralleis. Both traditions were fictitious and farfetched. Under the Seleucids, the city was renamed Seleukeia, but under the Attalid kingdom it resumed its previous name and continued to prosper. In the Roman period it was also a centre of wealth and culture, well known for its schools of oratory.

During the Roman imperial period, the cities in which the proconsul held his courts were all either in the western coastal district: Adramyttium, Pergamon, Smyrna, Sardeis, Ephesos, Tralleis, Magnesia on the Maeander, Mylasa, and Alabanda, or on the main road to central Asia Minor: Laodikeia on the Lycus, Apameia, and Synnada. Litigants in eastern Mysia and northern Phrygia were expected to present themselves before the proconsul at Adramyttium and Synnada: the proconsul himself did not visit these remote regions. The conventus of Laodikeia, Apameia, and Synnada were for a few years in the mid-1st

---

16 Strabo, 13. 4, 4: Θυάτειρα, κατοικία Μακεδόνων, ἢν Μυσῶν ἐσχάτην τινές φασίν.
17 Magie, Roman Rule 1, 123; TAM V2, p. 309; the inscription TAM V2 901 is commemorating the occasion; cf. also A. H. M. Jones, Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces, Oxford 1937, 44.
18 Jones, Cities, 54; G. Petzl, TAM V3, ix-xi.
19 For earthquakes see Strabo, 12. 8, 18 and 13. 8, 16.
century BC attached to Cilicia instead of Asia. The reason for this change was that the governor of Cilicia normally came ashore at Ephesos and proceeded by land to his province: if he dealt with the *conventus* on the main road from Ephesos to Iconium while travelling, the governor of Asia was saved the trouble of travelling inland.\(^{21}\)

Phrygia was a large and ill-defined geographical region that stretched across much of west central Anatolia. It was high up on the central plateau and separated from the western districts by the rough mountainous country. During the Roman period the region extended north to Bithynia, west to the upper valley of the Hermus and Lydia, south to Pisidia and to Lycaonia, and east to the Salt Lake. The river Tembris adjoins the Sangarius near the ancient city of Gordion. Along the course of upper Tembris lay the region of Phrygia Epictetus. The arid plain of Dorylaion, close to the ancient river Tembris, is a different world from the fertile woods and valleys to the north and west. There are no trees, little shade, and for much of its history the plain has been largely dedicated to cattle breeding rather than agriculture.\(^{22}\) The climate is severe throughout this region, with very cold winters and harsh summers: nowhere in upland Phrygia can olives be grown without extreme difficulty, and the relative shortness of the growing season seems to have led the inhabitants of northern and eastern Phrygia to cultivate barley in preference to wheat, due to its faster growth and relative resistance to drought. The Upper Tembris valley was in the Roman Imperial period organized as a combination of senatorial and imperial estates and, just as in the Phrygian Highlands, no real urban centres ever developed in this region. However, the prosperity of the village communities is vividly attested by the hundreds of richly decorated funerary and votive monuments surviving from the district. In Roman times Phrygia was divided between the provinces of Asia and Galatia. The most important town in the valley of the Meander and its main tributary Lycos was Apameia, named by Antiochus I after his mother. It was close to the site of an older settlement, Kelaneia, and served as a gateway to the East. Apameia owed its importance chiefly to its trade. Strabo informs us that it was a great emporium of Asia, second only to Ephesos.\(^{23}\) Dio Chrysostom

\(^{21}\) Jones, *Cities*, 61.
\(^{23}\) Strabo 12. 8, 15: Ἀπάκεια δ᾽ ἐζηὶλ ἐκπφξηνλ ὑἠὰο ἑδίσο ἑιγνκέλεο Ἀζίαο, δεπηεξεῦνλ ἑηὴλ Ἐθεζολ
describes it as the market of Phrygia, Lydia, Caria, Cappadocia, Pamphylia, and Pisidia.\textsuperscript{24} He also congratulated the inhabitants of the city and praised the Meander as “by far the most divine and wisest of all rivers, which, turning through a myriad bends, visits, as it were, the best part of Asia.”\textsuperscript{25} The city owed much to its position as an administrative center. Northwest from Apameia was Eumeneia, founded by Attalus II and named after his brother Eumenes. Nearby Colossae was once a flourishing city, later rivaled by Laodikeia. Laodikeia was founded by Antiochus II and named in honor of his wife. It was situated on the southern bank of the Lykos and on the road to Pisidia and to the Pamphylian coast. Hierapolis was in the north, Attouda and Trapezopolis in the west, and Herakleia Salbake and Themisonioum in the south. Magie noticed that the textile industries of the latter city brought its great wealth and that it seemed a rich and prosperous place and “so thoroughly Romanized that the citizens enjoyed gladiatorial combats.”\textsuperscript{26} Nearby Attouda was positioned on a very high cliff and was very well connected with Aphrodisias. As previously said, north of Laodikeia, on the other bank of the Lykos, was the city of Hierapolis. The surroundings of the city, the magnificent cascades of white-lime “pools”, are breathtaking even today. Certain springs had asphyxiating fatal vapour, according to Strabo and only the eunuchs, presumably priests of the Mother of Gods, knew how to survive.\textsuperscript{27} Nevertheless, the water supply was so abundant that there were natural baths everywhere in the city. The name suggests it grew up around a temple. It owed its importance principally to the wool industry. The associations connected with this industry feature prominently in inscriptions.\textsuperscript{28}

In the northeast part of Phrygia, Aizanoi was a major urban centre in the early Roman Imperial period, situated on a high plateau surrounded by mountains, with cities of Kotyaion and Kadoi close by. It was part of Phrygia Epictetus, an area even Strabo had difficulties defining. This region was mainly agrarian with cereal production and local villages depended on marketing their produce in the cities. Aizanoi grew in Roman times,

\textsuperscript{24} Dio Chr. Or. 35. 14.  
\textsuperscript{25} Dio Chr. Or. 35.13.  
\textsuperscript{26} Magie, Roman Rule I, 127.  
\textsuperscript{27} Strabo, 13. 4. 14.  
\textsuperscript{28} Jones, Cities, 73.
and it seems that it had closer links with western and southern than its eastern neighbours and belonged to the district of Sardeis, even though Synnada was physically closer.\textsuperscript{29} South of Aizanoi, the western and south-western foothills of Mt Dindymos formed the cultural border with Lydia to the west. Communication with Sardeis went through the Hermus valley and the route went from Sardeis, through Kadoi, Aizanoi and Kotyaion, to Dorylaion. The most important town of central Phrygia in antiquity was Akmoneia controlling a crucial point on the main west–east road through central Phrygia, running from Sardeis up the Hermos valley to Temenouthyrai.

The ancient town of Synnada, in its circle of mountains, was the administrative centre of eastern Phrygia in the Roman Imperial period. The \textit{conventus} of Synnada was very large. It stretched right up to the borders of Bithynia on the north and comprised twenty-two communities. Its quarries and marble were known throughout the Empire.\textsuperscript{30}

The question of historical geography of Phrygia is also defined by archaeology. Archaeological work in Roman Phrygia over the past century has concentrated on few of remarkable but highly exceptional urban centers on the outer periphery of the region, in the far south (such as Laodikeia or Hierapolis) and north-west (Aizanoi). But it is important to distinguish that these ‘middle-range’ cities (in the view of entire Roman Empire) were larger in every aspect than the overwhelming majority of \textit{poleis} in Roman Phrygia (Dionysopolis, Eumeneia, Sebastae, Akmoneia, Temenouthyrai, Appia).

\textsuperscript{29} MAMA IX, xx.
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Drawn by the author.
The crucial changes in the region under Roman rule were the new administrative structure, as well as distinctive hierarchization. The province grew even more to be an elaborate system of self-governing cities, each responsible for its own economics, taxes and law in their territory. Under the Principate, the number of cities rose, the size of cities grew and there is modest demographic growth leading to an increase in property and perhaps labour productivity. Commercial and industrial life became dominant in Roman times. The creation of an all-embracing road network, the universal ruler-cult, the founding of cities to act as administrative centers, a permanent military presence, and the creation of far-reaching systems of taxation forged a new society in Asia Minor, which was, as Mitchell stated, “as much Roman as it was Anatolian”.\(^{31}\) Diversified system of cities already existed in Asia Minor at the beginning of the imperial period. In that way Roman Asia Minor could be seen as a world of civic communities.\(^{32}\) Sardes had well over 100000 the population during the Roman Empire,\(^{33}\) while middle range cities like Thyateira, Tralleis or Philadelphia had between 5000 and 15000 inhabitants. Relatively few Roman colonies were founded in western Asia Minor, and none in Lydia and Phrygia, but under Roman rule new cities emerged. Smaller cities inland profited from the growth of the coastal centers as local markets developed. From the time of Vespasian, new roads were made or repaired, partly as a plan to strengthen borders in the East. The progress made in Asia Minor was due to its fertility and agricultural productivity, but not only in the function as a “feeder” of Rome. There is also one opinion that during that “Golden age”, from 1\(^{st}\) to 3\(^{rd}\) century, Asia Minor was structurally unable to feed its inhabitants implying persistently bleak prospect for the mass of the population,\(^{34}\) although it seems improbable.

---

31 S. Mitchell, OCD\(^{3}\), sv Asia Minor, Classical.
This thesis starts examining social conditions in Lydia and Phrygia from the first century AD, although earlier sources are also considered. The actions of Octavian after the battle of Actium (31 BC) had large consequences on the history of the province of Asia. He ended the period of wars and irregularities in the everyday life of every Roman province. This new political system also changed the method of governing the provinces. As one of the wealthiest Roman provinces, Asia was previously constantly robbed and extorted. The era of economic growth and social stability in Asian cities started with the *Pax Augusta* and was continued under Augustus’ successors. The end of the old political system was perhaps challenging for the elite in Rome, but it seems that the inhabitants of *provincia Asia* did not have such a dilemma. For them, the improvement was visible. During the first three centuries the changes were just in nuances, although one can distinguish different periods (Julio-Claudian, Flavian or Antonine). Crucial changes came in the period of Septimius Severus (193-211) and Marcus Aurelius Caracalla (211-217). The Empire’s population grew, slowly but consistently, from the Late Republic/early first century AD onwards, until population growth was checked by the onset of the long series of smallpox epidemics known as the Antonine Plague in the 160s AD, after which the population never reached early imperial levels again, despite a modest revival during the fourth century. The demographic reduction led to increased central government intervention in civic and provincial affairs in the late 2nd and 3rd century AD. The sharp reduction in the number of people who could work and pay rents and taxes posed a direct threat to the government revenues and elite incomes. This resulted in the central government’s attempts at direct control of local surpluses and increased exploitation of non-elite population.

The civil wars that started in the first half of the 3rd century AD, between the so-called military emperors, endangered the structure of the Roman state as well as the well-being and stability of autonomous cities throughout the Empire. Granting Roman citizenship to all inhabitants (Caracalla’s Edict of 212), ignoring civic autonomy by imposing imperial authority, as well as devastation, great losses and depopulation are just some of the consequences of the “crisis of the third century”. In most accounts, this crisis is presented as a rather confusing mixture of growing threats along the Empire’s borders, a rapid turnover of emperors, civil war, inflation, increasing brigandage, and general, but
rather unspecified, economic decline. Also, with the advent of the third century, the picture concerning our primary sources for this subject changes radically. The total number of surviving inscriptions is drastically reduced, and, if the epigraphic record is any guide, public benefactions by private individuals almost cease, public building comes to a near standstill, and both honorific inscriptions for emperors and members of the imperial family and votive inscriptions become increasingly rare.

The end of the third century AD brought many changes into the Roman Empire. Wars and anarchy eliminated much of the common characteristics of civic life and the emperor Gaius Valerius Diocletian (284-305) merely finished the crucial transformation. A new system was made and the Roman Empire ceased to be a loose federation of city-states and turned into a centralized bureaucratic Empire, so that would be the chronological end of this thesis.
2. SOURCES

2.1 Narrative sources

On this subject we have two different narrative traditions in two different languages, Greek and Latin. As expected in the case of Asia Minor, Greek sources are more numerous and Latin sources are more focused on the relations between central Roman government and some Asian cities, Sardeis for example. Abilities and interest differ from author to author and that, of course, reflect on the type, quality, scope and reliability of their information. Generally, ancient authors are much more interested in military or political history then social issues.

Narrative sources in Greek are numerous and diverse. The key geographical description of Asia Minor and, of course, Lydia and Phrygia, can be found in the work Γεωγραφικά of the geographer and historian Strabo of Amaseia (63 BC-23 AD). Strabo’s family was prominent in the politics of Pontus since before the time of Mithridates VI. He studied grammar under Aristodemus of Nysa and philosophy under Xenarchus of Seleuceia. Strabo came to Rome in 29 BC, but he had been there before. Already before the murder of Caesar he had left his native Asia Minor to visit Rome; and for him, as for other Augustan Greek men of letters, Romans were to become the principal patrons. He travelled extensively from the Black Sea to Ethiopia and from Armenia to Etruria; he visited Egypt while his patron Aelius Gallus was praefectus there. However, it appears that he did little more than get from one place to another without inspecting much on the way. Strabo was a
scholar at heart, and he worked from books. It is thought he has returned to Amaseia and remained there until his death, sometimes after 21 AD.35

Strabo’s first publication was a work of history, the “Historical commentaries” (Historika hypomnemata), which are now lost. The commentaries were an unbalanced kind of universal history. They contained forty-seven books, of which all but the first four were concerned with the post-Polybian period. One of Strabo’s sources was none other than his own contemporary, Timagenes of Alexandria, who must have just barely completed his own history. It looks as if Strabo was taking advantage of the Augustan peace to write history for the new generation of Greeks. Like Dionysius, Strabo had educated Roman readers in mind as much as Greeks. In the preface to his Geography he notes that the new work is based on principles comparable to those of his Commentaries - moral and political usefulness - and addressed to the same class of readers, particularly those in high positions. Strabo calls his Geography a κολοσσουργία a ‘colossal work’ but it is essentially a compilation of details and lacks any noticeable harmony of structure, with abundant citation of literature (especially Homer) polemic (especially against Eratosthenes). Strabo evidently worked on the project over a long stretch of time, perhaps from the middle twenties down to about 2 BC. Then, mysteriously, he stopped work, leaving untouched observations that were no longer true after that date. A group of references to the early years of Tiberius’ reign suggests a renewal of writing under the inspiration of the new regime. Substantial ambitions of Strabo’s preface slipped away somehow. Although Homer could scarcely be considered a reliable source for geography, Strabo's reliance on him is characteristic of his general predilection for written testimony. This is even the case for regions he had actually seen himself. Such a method is not, however, unusual in antiquity. Strabo's wide reading and his deep interest in history, as well as his glancing allusions to contemporary people and events, make his Geography a much more valuable record of Greek culture under the early Principate than might at first be imagined. His reading ranged

far beyond the writings of geographers; he had important friends. Strabo emphasizes the usefulness of geography for statesmen and generals, as he is speaking from and about the center of imperial power. Strabo’s *Geography* reflects an entire geographical, historiographical, and ethnographical tradition. His world is a world of cities rather than of peoples.

For this thesis the most useful passages on Lydia are to be found in book 13.4, 3-17 and Phrygia in 12.8, 1-21. His information on the society in these regions is scattered, for example, there is just one mention of asiarchs.\(^{36}\) We are firstly introduced to the problem of ill-defined Phrygian borders: τοῖς δὲ Βιθυνοῖς ὀμορούσι πρὸς νότον, ὡς ἔφην, οἱ περὶ τὸν Ὁλυμπὸν τὸν Μύσιον προσαγορευόμενον Μυσοί τε καὶ Φρύγες: ἐκάτερον δὲ τὸ ἔθνος διίτον ἐστὶ. Φρυγία τε γὰρ ἢ μὲν καλεῖται μεγάλη, ἢς ὁ Μίδας ἐβασίλευσε καὶ ἢς μέρος οἱ Γαλάται κατέσχον, ἢ δὲ μικρὰ ἢ ἐφ’ Ἐλλησπόντῳ καὶ ἢ περὶ τὸν Ὁλυμπὸν ἢ καὶ Ἐπίκτητος λεγομένη. Μυσία τε ὁμοίως ἢ τὸ Ὁλυμπικὴ συνεχής οὖσα τῇ Βιθυνίᾳ καὶ τῇ Ἐπικτήτῳ, ἦν ἐφ’ Ἀρτεμίδωρος ἀπὸ τὸν πέραν Ἰστροῦ Μυσῶν ἀπωκίσθαι, καὶ ἢ περὶ τὸν Κάικον καὶ τὴν Περγαμηνῆν μέχρι Τευθρανίας καὶ τὸν ἐκβολῶν τοῦ ποταμοῦ. οὔτω δ’ ἐνηλικταί ταῦτα ἐν ἄλληλοι, ὡς πολλάκις λέγομεν, ὡστε καὶ τὴν περὶ Σίπυλον Φρυγίαν οἱ παλαιοὶ καλοῦσιν, ἀδηλὸν εἶτε τῆς μεγάλης εἴτε τῆς μικρᾶς μέρος οὖσαν, ἢ καὶ τὸν Τάνταλον Φρύγα καὶ τὸν Πέλοπα καὶ τὴν Νίοβην…\(^{37}\)

In a similar way Strabo presented Lydia and its capital Sardeis:

Προϊόντι δ’ ἀπὸ τοῦ πεδίου καὶ τῆς πόλεως ἐπὶ μὲν τὰ πρὸς ἔως μέρη πόλις ἐστὶν Απολλωνία, μετεώροις ἐπικειμένη τόποις: ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν νότον ὄρειν ῥάχης ἐστὶν, ἢν ὑπερβάσι καὶ βαδίζουσιν ἐπὶ Σάρδεων πόλις ἐστὶν ἐν ἀριστερᾷ Θωάτειρα, κατοικία Μακεδόνων, ἦν Μυσῶν ἐσχάτην τινὲς φασίν. ἐν δὲξιὰ δ’ Ἀπολλωνίας, διέχουσα Περγάμου τριακοσίως σταδίους, τοὺς δὲ ἱσοῦς καὶ τὸν Σάρδεων: ἐπώνυμος δ’ ἐστὶ τῆς Κυζικηνής Απολλωνίδος:

\(^{36}\) Strabo, 14. 1, 42: συνοικεῖται δὲ καλῶς εἰς τις ἄλλη τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν, ὡς εὐπόρων ἄνθρώπων, καὶ οἱ τινες ἢς αὐτῆς εἰσίν οἱ προτειόντες κατὰ τὴν ἐπαρχίαν, διὸς Ἀσιάρχας καλοῦσιν; ἢν Πυθόδωρος τε ἢν, ἀνὴρ Νυσαίως τὸ ἐξ ἄρχης, ἐκεῖσε δὲ μεταβεβηκὼς διὰ τὴν εἰρήνην καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Πομπήυν φιλίᾳ διαπρέπον μετ’ ὀλίγων.

\(^{37}\) Strabo, 12.8, 1-2.
He also gave some interesting remarks about the city of Philadelphia:

Strabo included insights on the economy of towns and regions. He made some passing remarks that the rise in number of sheep was important in increased production of textile and that the black wool of Laodikeia on the Lykos was much esteemed: φέρει δ’ ὁ περὶ τὴν Λαοδίκειαν τόπος προβάτων ἁρετὰς οὐκ εἰς μαλακότητα μόνον τῶν ἐρίων, ἤ καὶ τῶν Μυλησίων διαφέρει, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὴν κοραζῆν χρώαν, ώστε καὶ προσδεύονται

---

38 Strabo 13. 4, 4-5.
39 Strabo 13.4, 10.
Strabo also commented on the area of Hierapolis and the abundance of water that helped irrigation and washing, fulling and dying the linen: ἔστι δὲ καὶ πρὸς βαφὴν ἔριον θαυμαστῶς σύμμετρον τὸ κατὰ τὴν ᾿Ιερὰν πόλιν ὄνδωρ, ὡστε τὰ ἐκ τῶν ρίζῶν βαπτόμενα ἐνάμυλλα εἶναι τοῖς ἐκ τῆς κόκκου καὶ τοῖς ἀλουργέοις: οὕτω δ᾽ ἐστὶν ἀφθονον τὸ πλήθος τοῦ ὑδατος ὡστε ἡ πόλεις μεστή τῶν αὐτομάτον βαλανείων ἔστι.  

Some distinguished rhetors and sophists in the 1st and 2nd century, known throughout the Empire, were originally from Asia Minor. That is the reason why some references to their homeland can be found in their works. One of the most significant personalities was Dio from Prusa in Bithynia, famous orator and moralist. Dio of Prusa, later called Chrysostom was born around 40/50 AD in wealthy family in Prusa in Bithynia. He began a career as a rhetorician at Rome, but soon started studying under the Stoic philosopher C. Musonius Rufus. Involved in a political intrigue early in the reign of Domitian, in 82 AD, he was exiled from Rome and his native province. The details on this intrigue are not known, we know that an influential friend of his had fallen from grace, perhaps Flavius Sabinus. He spent many years travelling through Greece, the Balkans and Asia Minor. Rehabilitated by Nerva, he became a friend with Trajan. He later retired to his family estates in Bithynia and became notable in the province. He died probably around

---

40 Strabo 12. 8, 16: “The country round Laodiceia produces sheep that are excellent, not only for the softness of wool, in which they surpass even the Milesian wool, but also for its raven-black color, so that the Laodiceans derive splendid revenue from it, as do also the neighboring Colosseni from the color which bears the same name”; translation by H. L. Jones.

41 Strabo 13. 4, 14.

120 AD. The last we know about him is a judicial process about a public building contract in 111/112 AD held, before Pliny the Younger.

Two periods separated by his exile can be distinguished: before the exile, his sophistic career, and after, once his own experience of poverty had taught him the truth of Stoic-Cynic doctrines, his career as a moralizing philosopher and philosophizing politician. He was a man of all-round excellence who defied categorization. Dio’s virtuosity impressed his contemporaries and secured transmission of his works, albeit often incomplete, to admirers in late antiquity and Byzantium. Polemo travelled to Bithynia to hear him, Favorinus recognized him as his teacher. Even Trajan saw his distinction and allegedly had him with him in his chariot at his Dacian triumph (probably that of 102 AD).

Some eighty speeches are attributed to him, although at least two are the work of his pupil Favorinus. Many are display-speeches, but others, delivered before the boule and demos at Prusa deal with real situations. In any case, they differ greatly in subject, theme and length. Usually they are divided on political, ethic and sophistic discourses. His orations contain many useful remarks on the civic life and social history in many Asian cities, including a speech held in Kelainai (Apameia) in Phrygia. (Or. 35). Many other discourses, such as those on slavery (Or. 14 and 15) or municipal elites (Or. 31), reveal the attitudes and culture of the upper classes of the eastern part of the Empire and give a vivid and detailed picture of the life in his times. Dio is the one who provides us with a vibrant impression about everyday life, especially of urban elite: οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι δέονται καὶ στεφάνου καὶ εἰκόνος καὶ προεδρίας καὶ τοῦ μνεμονεύεσθαι καὶ πολλοὶ καὶ διὰ ταύτα ἢδη τεθνήκασιν, ὅπως ἄνθριάντος τύχωσι καὶ κηρύγματος ἢ τιμῆς ἔτέρας καὶ τοῖς αὐθίς καταλίπωσι δόξαν τινὰ ἐπιεικῆ καὶ μνήμην ἐσωτήν.

Perhaps the most vivid description of urban life of artisans and others is the one in Dio Chrysostom’s discourse in Apamea in Phrygia: πρὸς δὲ τούτοις αἱ δίκαιαι παρ᾽ ἐτος ἄγονται παρ᾽ ὑμῖν καὶ ξυνάγεται πλῆθος ἄνθρωπον ἄπειρον δικαζομένων, δικαζόντων, ῥητόρων, ἡγεμόνων, ὑπηρετῶν, οἰκετῶν, μαστροπόν, ὀρεικόμων, καπήλων, ἐταιρῶν τε

43 Plin. Ep. X 81-82
44 Dio Chr. Or. 31, 16: “But when we come to men, they require crowns, images, the right of precedence, and being kept in remembrance; and many in times have even given up their lives just in order that they might get a statue and have their name announced by the herald or receive some other honor and leave to succeeding generations a fair name and remembrance of themselves”; an English translation by J. W. Cohoon.
καὶ βαναύσων: ὡστε τὰ τε ὅντα τοὺς ἐχοντας πλείστης ἀποδίδοσθαι τιμής καὶ μηδὲν ἄργον εἶναι τῆς πόλεως, μήτε τὰ ἐσύγη μήτε τὰς οἰκίας μήτε τὰς γυναίκας, τούτο δὲ οὐ σμικρόν ἐστι πρὸς ευδαιμονίαν.45

Another great orator of the second century AD was Publius Aelius Aristides (129-189 AD), disciple of Herod Atticus, originally from Hadrianoutheraie in Mysia. He spent most of his life in Smyrna and travelled to Pergamon, Alexandria and Rome.46 He was an influential figure and his contemporaries held him and his work in the highest esteem; when Marcus Aurelius visited Smyrna in later years, he came especially to hear Aristides. When Smyrna was levelled by an earthquake shortly thereafter, the emperor helped in rebuilding the city, partly out of kindness to the sophist.

His 55 orations on various subjects are preserved. They include addresses delivered on public and private occasions, declamations on historical themes, polemical essays, prose hymns to various gods and six books on Sacred discourses. They are a kind of spiritual autobiography, unparalleled in ancient literature. They recount the inner life of the author during the extended term of his residence at the Pergamene Asclepieum. Nonetheless, information on Lydia and Phrygia in his works is sparse. Some parallels can be found, for example, when he described public expectations of provincial and municipal officers. Aelius Aristides tells of his attempts to avoid the office of high priest of the provincial cult, and to maintain his health with the help of Asclepius. His city of Smyrna proposed him as candidate, but Aristides declined the honor. However, two months later the delegates of Smyrna succeeded in getting him elected, despite his attempts to prevent it. Aristides had to appeal to the governor, which resulted in his exemption from the election on grounds of ill

45 Dio Chr. Or. 35, 15: “And what is more, the courts are in the session every other year in Celaenae, and they bring together an unnumbered throng of people – litigants, jurymen, orators, princes, attendants, slaves, pimps, muleteers, hucksters, harlots and artisans. Consequently not only can those who have goods to sell obtain the highest prices, but also nothing in the city is out of work, neither the teams nor the houses nor the women. And this contributes not a little to prosperity; for wherever the greatest throng of people comes together, there necessarily we find money in greatest abundance, and it stands to reason that the place should thrive”; an English translation by J. W. Cohoon and H. Lamar Crosby.

health. The fact that Aristides had to fight off two more attempts to force him to hold other public offices demonstrates the strength of the public expectation of service for distinguished individuals.47

Another important work for our subject is the one by Flavius Philostratus, sophist and rhetor, who lived in Ephesos, Athens and Rome in the reign of the Severi. L. Flavius Philostratus, whose family came from the island of Lemnos, lived during the reign of Severus Alexander and wrote the biographies of principal representatives of the second sophistic. He enjoyed both a distinguished local career and a place at the imperial court. Born around 160 or 170 AD, he was a pupil of Aelius Antpater, who was the tutor of Caracalla and Geta and one of the senators from Phrygia. It seems that the biographer was not the only member of his family to have been active in the literary milieu of the Roman Empire. He wrote the Life of Apollonius of Tyana, and Lives of the sophists, and a number of minor pieces. Certainly his Lives of the sophists attest to a considerable first-hand knowledge of the society in which his subjects moved. At the end of his work he names three contemporary sophists who were close friends, including one Philostratus of Lemnos (presumably a relative); and from another of his writings we learn that he belonged to the salon of the Syrian empress, Iulia Domna. Although Philostratus’ account of the sophists is often inadequate, it is none the less a priceless record of the tastes of the Greek speaking aristocracy under Roman rule. After 217 AD our Philostratus probably went back to Athens and died, according to Suda, during the reign of Phillip the Arab (244-249).48

In his “Lives of Sophists” (Βίοι σοφιστῶν) many distinguished sophists are mentioned and one can notice that some of them were members of provincial elite.49 In his Lives he dealt not only with classical sophists, but also with several philosophers. This category allowed Philostratus to discuss several classical figures as well as two major figures in the cultural life of the Imperial age, Dio of Prusa and Favorinus. It is obvious that Philostratus’ concept of his subject was sadly deficient in theoretical precision; he was

47 C. A. Behr, Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales, Amsterdam 1968, 61-86.
more interested in people and style. But he successfully identified and recorded an important phenomenon in later Greek rhetoric. The structure of the Lives is peculiar, to say the least, but it may be explained by Philostratus’ judgment of who was significant.

For this thesis it is important that Philostratus is documenting the life of Aelius Antipater, a descendant of a wealthy Hierapolitan family (... Ἰεράπολις, ἐγκαταλεκτέα δὲ αὐτὴ ταῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν εὖ πραττούσας, πατὴρ δὲ Ζευξίδημος τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων ἐκείνη) and a senator from Phrygia (PhS 1):

...The political history of this period, including the region of Asia Minor, is analyzed in the “Roman history” by Cassius Dio (150-cca 230), relative of Dio of Prusa. Cassius Dio came from a distinguished Bithynian family that already possessed the Roman citizenship as well as good contacts with the Roman upper class. He entered the senate in the reign of Commodus. He won the esteem of Septimius Severus by the composition of a timely essay on the dreams and omens that foretold the accession of Severus. As Dio set about this gigantic project, he did not abandon his career as a senator. He was praetor in

---

50 Philostr. VS II, 24.
51 Philostr. VS II, 24.
194, and *consul suffectus* around 204 AD. From 218 to 228 he was successively curator of Pergamon, Smyrna, proconsul of Africa and legate first of Dalmatia and then of Upper Pannonia. In 229 AD, the date at which his history finally terminated, Dio held the consulate for the second time and afterwards retired in Bithynia. It is obvious that Dio chose to bring his narrative down to the point of his own most important success, the second consulate. Dio was a characteristic product of the eastern aristocracy, a man of letters naturally and easily absorbed into the Roman government. In writing about the history of Rome, he was writing about traditions and government to which he belonged. As a researcher Dio was careful and thorough. By his own account Dio spent ten years in assembling the material for his great history and another twelve in writing it. His work was in 80 books, but only books 36 through 60 are intact (describing the period from 68 BC to 47 AD). His work is focused on political history and imperial court, but he describes the foundation of the province of Asia, mentions all the *procurators* of the province, wars and earthquakes in Asia Minor and briefly discusses the Imperial cult. Cassius Dio also explains the reforms in the Senate during Augustus: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τιμητεύσας σὺν τῷ Ἀγρίππᾳ ἄλλα τέ τινα διώρθωσε καὶ τὴν βουλὴν ἐξήτασε πολλοί μὲν γὰρ ἔπησσε πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ πεζοὶ παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐκτὸς ἐμφυλίων πολέμων ἔβούλευσεν, ὡστε καὶ ἐς χίλιους τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς γερουσίας ἀνεξήθηναι.53

Another great Latin writer displayed his views on Lydians and Phrygians. Marcus Tullius Cicero was one of the most important political figures in Rome in the first half of the 1st century BC. He was born in 106 BC in Arpinum in an equestrian family. He had an excellent education in philosophy and oratory in both Rome and Greece. Cicero did military service in 90/89 BC under Pompey’s father and afterwards studied law, conducting his first case in 81 (*Pro Quinctio*). From 79 to 77 he studied in Athens and Rhodes and visited Smyrna. On his return to Rome he pursued a public career and was elected *quaestor* for 75, when he served for a year in western Sicily and *praetor* for 66. He was elected

53 Cass. Dio 52. 42, 1: After this he became a censor with Agrippa as his colleague, and as addition to his other reforms, he purged the senate. As a result of the civil wars a large number of knights and even of foot-soldiers were in the Senate without justification in merit, so that the membership of that body had been swollen to a thousand; English translation by E. Cary.
consul for 63, the first *homo novus* with no political background since 94 BC. Cicero’s decisive role in the reaction to the conspiracy of Catiline made him believe that he had acted rightly and saved Rome. Further political events eventually led him to exile to Macedonia in 58, but he returned to Rome in 57 BC. Cicero went on to govern Cilicia from summer 51 to summer 50 BC. He was a just governor, but he considered this appointment as a punishment. His position during the Civil Wars led to the end of his political life. He was not among those who participated in the conspiracy to kill Caesar, but he was openly against Mark Anthony. He delivered speech after speech, the *Philippics*, from September 44 to April 43 trying to induce the Senate to declare Anthony a public enemy. After the formation of the Second Triumvirate, Cicero was proscribed and died in 43 BC.\(^5^4\)

Cicero’s opus is vast, but for the subject of this thesis, two works are relevant. The first one are his letters to his friend T. Pomponius Atticus. They were not written for publication, as far as is known. Some of his other letters he did however expect to be read by more than the addressee. The present collection *Ad Atticum* consists of sixteen books. Several letters sent to Atticus were written on his way to Cilicia, from Tralleis, Laodikeia and in the vicinity of Synnada. One particular letter written to Atticus *en route*, between Synnada and Philomelium, on August (?) 14\(^{th}\), 51 BC documents his views on governing this region (Phrygian Apameia, Synnada and Laodikeia were part of his jurisdiction at the time) as well as the position of the inhabitants:

\[\text{maxima exspectatione in perditam et plane eversam in perpetuum provinciam nos venisse scito pridie Kal. Sextilis, moratos triduum Laodiceae, triduum Apameae, totidem dies Synnade. audivimus nihil aliud nisi imperata ἐπικεφάλαια solvere non posse, ὠνάς omnium venditas, civitatum gemitus, ploratus, monstra quaedam non hominis sed ferae nescio cuius immanis. quid quaeris? taedet omnino eos vitae.}\] \(^5^5\)


\(^{5^5}\) Cic. *Att.* 5.16, 2.
Another work offers some passing remarks, displaying standard prejudices towards the people of Asia Minor. In his speech, *Pro Flacco* held in 59 BC Cicero remarks: *Vtrum igitur nostrum est an vestrum hoc proverbium, ‘Phrygem plagis fieri solere meliorem’?*  
Here Cicero is making an allusion to a proverb *Φρύξ ἀνήρ πληγεῖς ἐμείνον καὶ διακονέστερος*, that a Phrygian is better and more obedient when beaten. Commenting Lydians he chooses another common stereotype: *Nam quid ego dicam de Lydia? quis umquam Graecus comoediam scripsit in qua servus primarum partium non Lydus esset?*  
All these observations probably reflect the views of elitist Romans towards the population in Asia Minor.

In Roman literature of the late Republic and early Empire ‘Phrygian’ is both a label for the Trojan origins of Rome and a term for the barbarian, pirate or brigand. Another reference for passing stereotypes was ancient Greek novels. The Greek novel as a genre began in the first century AD and flourished in the first four centuries. Although the plots of the surviving novels appear to be relatively conventional, based around the fulfilled heterosexual desire of a beautiful and usually virtuous young couple, this impression of uniformity and moralism is perhaps a misleading one. Many characters are defined by their social position. They are a part of a social system which appears not to be unlike the social reality of the Roman Empire. Nevertheless, certain *clichés*, as well as geographical distortions, appear frequently. The only remark on Phrygians is made in Chariton’s *Callirhoe* (mid-1st century AD) where they are portrayed as pirates and brigands.

A Roman equestrian and historian, Pliny the Elder (Gaius Plinius Secundus, 23-79 AD) left us his encyclopaedic work, History of nature (*Naturalis Historia* in 37 books). Pliny served as an equestrian in Germany, along with the future emperor Titus. He was active in legal practice during the reign of Nero and held important offices during the

---

60 Chariton, *Callirhoe* 8.8.
Flavian dynasty. He was in charge of the Misenum fleet at the moment of Vesuvius eruption and died leading a detachment to that area.\textsuperscript{61}

Pliny is one of the prodigies of Latin literature, boundlessly energetic and terribly indiscriminate; he offers details on everything he encounters. In a busy life, Pliny found time for many intellectual activities. Unfortunately, his historical writings on Roman campaigns against Germanic tribes and a history in thirty-one books continuing Aufidius Bassus are now lost. The Natural history, dedicated (77 or 78 AD) in an extensive preface to the heir apparent Titus, comprises a table of contents (Book 1), cosmology (2), geography (3-6), anthropology (7), zoology (8-11), botany (12-19), botany (20-27) and zoology (28-32) in relation to medicine, and mineralogy (33-37). Digressions, historical references, and elaborate descriptions vary and made his work more interesting. Many passages look like notes made during reading. Pliny lists the sources of each book (an unusual and noteworthy procedure), and often cites them for details. For all his faults of accuracy, selection and arrangement, Pliny achieved a real outline of universal knowledge at the time.

In book 5 of \textit{Naturalis historia} he offers certain remarks on the geography and nature of Lydia and Phrygia:

\begin{quote}
Lydia autem perfusa flexuosis Maeandri amnis recursibus super Ioniam proculuit, Phrygiae ab exortu solis vicina, ad septentrionem Mysiae, meridiana parte Cariam amplectens, Maeonia ante appellata. Celebratur maxime Sardibus in latere Tmoli montis, qui ante Timolus appellabatur, conditis; ex quo profluente Pactolo eodemque Chrysorroa ac fonte Tarni a Maeonis civitas ipsa Hyde vocitata est, clara stagno Gygaeo. Sardiana nunc appellatur ea iurisdictione, conviuntunque in eam extra praedictos Macedones Cadieni, Philadelphini et ipsi in radice Tmoli Cogamo flumini adpositi Maeonii, Tripolitani, iidem et Antoniopolitae - Maeandro adluuntur -, Apollonhieritaes, Mysotimolitae et alii ignobiles.\textsuperscript{62}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{62} Plin. \textit{NH} 5.30: Lydia, bathed by the sinuous and ever-recurring windings of the river Maeander, lies extended above Ionia; it is joined by Phrygia on the east and Mysia on the north, while on the south it runs up to Caria: it formerly had the name of Maeonia. Its place of the greatest celebrity is Sardes, which lies on the side of Mount Tmolus, formerly called Timolus. From this mountain, which is covered with vineyards, flows
Phrygia, Troadi superiecta populisque a promunturio Lecto ad flumen Echeleum praedictis, septentrionali sui parte Galatiae contermina, meridiana Lycaoniae, Pisidiae, Mygdoniae, ab oriente Cappadociam attingit. Oppida ibi celeberrima praeter iam dicta Ancyra, Andria, Celaenae, Colossae, Carina, Cotiaion, Ceraine, Conium, Midaium. sunt auctores transisse ex Europa Moesos et Brygos et Thynos, a quibus appellentur Mysi, Phryges, Bithyni.\(^63\)

His nephew, Pliny the Younger (Gaius Plinius Caecilius Secundus, 62-114 AD), studied rhetoric with Quintilian and Nicetes at Rome. He served a year with a legion in Syria and entered the Senate in the later 80ties. He practised in civil courts, specializing in cases relating to inheritance. He became a praetor in 93 and consul in 100 AD and held many imperial administrative offices. Pliny was the governor of Bithynia and Pontus in 113 AD. It seems he died there while in office. He published nine books of literary letters between 99 and 109 AD. Some of them comment on social, domestic, judicial and political events, others offer friends advice.\(^64\) Among Latin letters those of Pliny stand second only to Cicero's in interest and importance, though they are very different in character. Pliny's view of his times is shaded with complacency; only a few letters reveal that this is not the best of all possible worlds. He readily and unquestioningly adopts the attitudes and conventions of the affluent and leisured class which he belonged to. Social and cultural
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\(^63\) Plin. *NH* 5.41: Phrygia lies above Troas, and the peoples already mentioned as extending from the Promontory of Lectum to the river Ethelus. On its northern side it borders upon Galatia, on the south it joins Lycaonia, Pisidia, and Mygdonia, and, on the east, it touches upon Cappadocia. The more celebrated towns there, besides those already mentioned, are Ancyra, Andria, Celaenae, Colossae, Carina, Cotaiaion, Ceraine, Conium, and Midaium. There are authors who say that the Moesi, the Brygi, and the Thyni crossed over from Europe, and that from them are descended the peoples called the Mysi, Phryges, and Bithyni; an English translation by J. Bostock, H.T. Riley.

trivialities occupy him incredibly, and indeed his worst anxiety is that public duties should distract him from the pleasures of friendship and study.

In the tenth book of his Letters (Epistulae) there are 121 letters preserved, together with Trajan’s answers. He corresponded with the emperor Trajan, his personal friend, and asked him for advice and guidance on many topics concerning civic communities in Bithynia. Although they are not specifically connected with Lydia and Phrygia, or province of Asia, they are still relevant, as certain close parallels can be drawn with this neighbouring province. From Trajan’s answers one can see the attitude of the Roman emperor toward Greek provincial cities. An interesting example are the letters concerning authorization to form a guild of firemen in Nikomedeia (Bythinia). If used with caution, these letters could serve as comparative sources for civic life in other provinces of Asia Minor.

One of the greatest historians of the early Empire was Cornelius Tacitus (55-cca 120 AD). He was born in Narbonese or Cisalpine Gaul, but came to Rome no later than 75 AD. His career advanced during the Flavian dynasty, he was praetor in 88 and member of the quindecemviri sacris faciundis. In 97 AD he was consul suffectus and later on he was proconsul of Asia for 112/113. The date of his death is unknown.

In the Agricola, his earliest work, published in 98 AD, Tacitus combines biography of his father-in-law and historical monograph. He gives roughly two thirds of the work to Agricola’s governorship of Britain (from 77 to 84 AD), and treats the climax of Agricola’s
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66 Plin, Ep. X 19-121 are mostly about problems regarding the government of Bithynia.
campaigns at length. His hostilities toward Domitian develop throughout the chapters. The same year *Germania* came out. In chapters 1-27 Tacitus deals with the country and people generally, in 28-46 with the individual tribes. The title *De origine et situ Germanorum* is well attested and probably genuine, but he is just as interested in their character and way of life, *mores* and *instituta*. He shows that the Germans retain virtues which Rome once possessed, but does not idealize them or hide their weaknesses. His third book, the *Dialogues* (*Dialogus de oratoribus*) was perhaps written around 101/102 AD. It is a discussion about the causes of the contemporary decline in oratory.

In 98 AD Tacitus planned to write ‘a record of former servitude and acknowledgement of present blessings’, but the scheme partly aborted. He collected the material by about 105/106. He deferred Nerva and Trajan, a rich but delicate theme, limiting his *Histories* to 69-96 AD. This task occupied him for several years; when he completed this first part of his major work is uncertain, perhaps around 109/110 AD. Whether he proceeded immediately to the second, the Julio-Claudian period, it is not known. When completed *Histories* had twelve or fourteen books, but only four and a quarter books survived. The first three books are dealing with the civil wars of 69 and are predominately military. The *Annales* or *Ab excessu divi Augusti* originally had sixteen or eighteen books, but most of the book 5, all of 7 to 10, the first half of 11 and everything after the middle of 16 is now lost. It seems that the last books were written in the early days of Hadrian’s reign. For Tacitus a historian's first task is to collect and evaluate evidence. The obligation to compare and assess earlier writings was commonly recognized. Tacitus drew his material from general and special histories, memoirs, personal enquiry and the official report of senatorial proceedings, *acta senatus*. In his works he certainly shows interest in the influx of newcomers into the Senate, and considers that older and better standards were preserved in provincial Italy and beyond. He is not interested in Asia Minor, or Lydia and Phrygia *per se*, but for the subject of this thesis certain insights on Greek embassies to Tiberius’ court and notices on some significant events, such as earthquakes or governors in this region are relevant:
Eodem anno duodecim celebres Asiae urbes conlapsae nocturno motu terrae, quo
inprovisior graviorque pestis fuit. neque solitum in tali casu effugium subveniebat in aperta
prorumpendi, quia diductis terris hauriebantur. sedisse inmensos montis, visa in arduo quae
plana fuerint, effulsisse inter ruinam ignis memorant. asperrima in Sardianos lues plurimum
in eosdem misericordiae traxit: nam centies sestertium pollicitus Caesar, et quantum aerario
aut fisco pendebant in quinquennium remisit. Magnetes a Sipylo proximi damno ac
remedio habiti. Temnios, Philadelphenos, Aegeatas, Apollonidenses, quique Mosteni aut
Macedones Hycani vocantur, et Hierocæsariam, Myrinam, Cymen, Tmolum levari idem
in tempus tributis mittique ex senatu placuit, qui praesentia spectaret reforvetque. delectus
est M. Ateius e praetoriis, ne consulari obtinente Asiam aemulatio inter pares et ex eo
impedimentum oreretur.69

2.2 Documentary sources

This research is mostly founded on analysis of epigraphic material (epigraphic
corpus of Lydia and Phrygia comprises around some 4500 of inscriptions). Inscriptions are
special and very important group of sources. Funerary, votive and honorary inscriptions are
especially important for the analysis of social structure. Funerary inscriptions are the source
for all social groups and an essential tool for ancient demography. Honorary inscriptions
are the main source for the history of elites in Asia Minor, as it is possible to trace the
history of great families, ideology, social titles they had, public functions and expenses they
had or could have had.

69 Tac. Ann. 2.47: “That same year twelve famous cities of Asia fell by an earthquake in the night, so that the
destruction was all the more unforeseen and fearful. Nor were there the means of escape usual in such a
disaster, by rushing out into the open country, for there people were swallowed up by the yawning earth. Vast
mountains, it is said, collapsed: what had been level ground seemed to be raised aloft, and fires blazed out
amid the ruin. The calamity fell most fatally on the inhabitants of Sardis, and it attracted to them the largest
share of sympathy. The emperor promised ten million sesterces, and remitted for five years all they paid to the
exchequer or to the emperor's purse. Magnesia, under Mount Sipylus, was considered to come next in loss and
in need of help. The people of Temnus, Philadelphela, Aegae, Apollonis, the Mostenians, and Hycanian
Macedonians, as they were called, with the towns of Hierocæsarea, Myrina, Cyme, and Tmoulos, were, it was
decided, to be exempted from tribute for the same time, and someone was to be sent from the Senate to
examine their actual condition and to relieve them. Marcus Aletus, one of the ex-prætors, was chosen, from a
fear that, as an ex-consul was governor of Asia, there might be rivalry between men of equal rank, and
consequent embarrassment”; an English translation by A. J. Church, W. J. Brodribb and S. Bryant.
These documentary sources are contemporary to the described events and the question of authenticity is hardly an issue. Problems are different, almost all inscriptions are damaged, some of them reduced to fragments, so dating could be difficult and origin dubious. The epigraphic habit was important in Greek civilization, and finding a Greek inscription in certain Anatolian region could indicate some degree of Hellenization. Some settlements give us the opportunity to trace continued adaption to Greek culture and language.\textsuperscript{70}

Honorary inscriptions were frequent in the Hellenistic period and during the Roman Empire they were becoming even more significant. Epigraphic practice and the ideology of euergetism were strong indicators of the Hellenization of the society and these honorary texts tell us much about a person’s career and therefore introduce us to many institutions and magistracies of a city.

Of all the inscriptions mentioned in this work a vast majority are Greek, with the exception of a few bilingual ones, Greek and Latin. Epigraphic monuments in Anatolian languages are almost non-existent in Roman period with an exception of the Neo-Phrygian ones. During the Hellenistic and the early Roman periods, the Phrygian language was reduced to use within the family, but from the 1\textsuperscript{st} to 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD it turns up again in a written form, in the Greek alphabet. Today, we have over 100 short New Phrygian inscriptions, most of them consisting of curse formulae for desecrators of graves, but they are not incorporated in this thesis.

Researchers of ancient civilizations are usually confronted with one large problem, lack of sources, especially documentary ones. This is certainly not a case here. Asia Minor is one of the most productive regions of the ancient world, judging by the number of discovered and published inscriptions. Large provinces such as Lydia and Phrygia produced thousands of inscriptions relevant to all issues of social history. So far there are around 4500 published inscriptions from these regions. New discoveries are made every year.

\textsuperscript{70} Annual reports on archeological excavations in Asia Minor from 1955 to 1993 were compiled by M. J. Mellink in \textit{American Journal of Archaeology}. Reports on new discoveries in Anatolia can be found in \textit{Anatolian Studies} published by British Institute in Ankara as well as other publications like SEG, Bulletin épigraphique and Année épigraphique, and some journals; for the Hellenistic period cf. also J. Ma, The Epigraphy of Hellenistic Asia Minor: A Survey of Recent Research (1992-1999), \textit{AJA} 104-1 (2000), 95-99.
These huge corpuses of inscriptions are the foundation of this thesis and will be discussed at length throughout the text.

Most of the individual discoveries are first published in journals such as Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Epigraphica Anatolica, Chiron, Journal of Roman Studies and Journal of Hellenic Studies or Phoenix. Large number of epigraphic material (69 volumes until now) is published in the IGSK series (Inscriptions griechische Städte aus Kleinasien) in Bonn, although many of them do not pertain to Lydia or Phrygia. Somewhat different, but essential are Tituli Asiae Minoris (especially volumes V1, V2 and V3) and Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua (especially volumes IV, VI, IX, X and XI). Some new editions include P. Herrmann, H. Malay, New Documents from Lydia (Wien 2007), Malay’s Greek and Latin inscriptions in the Manisa Museum (Wien 1994), and Researches in Lydia, Mysia, and Aiolis (Wien 1999), T. Drew Bear, Chr. Thomas, M. Yildizturan, Phrygian Votive Steles (Ankara 1999). Most recently, new corpora can be found online, like inscriptions of Aphrodisias\textsuperscript{71} and MAMA XI.\textsuperscript{72}

Recent discoveries in Greek epigraphy are the main focus of two periodic publications Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum and Bulletin épigraphique, both edited by several experts from around the world.

Some of the very old publications are still in use, such as Dittenberger’s Sylloge Inscriptum Graecarum (Syll.).\textsuperscript{73} Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae (OGIS), or Cagnat’s Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes (IGR)\textsuperscript{74} and P. Le Bas and W. H. Waddington, Inscriptions grecques et latines recueillies en Asie Mineure (LBW).\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{71} http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/
\textsuperscript{72} http://mama.csad.ox.ac.uk/monuments/index.html
\textsuperscript{73} W. Dittenberger, Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, I-IV, Leipzig, 1915-24\textsuperscript{3}.
\textsuperscript{75} P. Le Bas, W. H. Waddington, Inscriptions grecques et latines recueillies en Asie Mineure I-II, Paris 1870.
2.3 Numismatic material

Coinage is also a very illustrative example telling us about city’s institutions and magistrates as well as city’s economy. Images and symbols on coins are important sources for studying local civic ideology, tradition and cult.

Cities in the province of Asia continued minting their coins after Octavian’s victory and furthermore, economic conditions made their coin issues more stable than in the period of the Late Republic. More than a hundred cities in this province minted their coins during 1st and 2nd century AD, but after 250 AD this practice ceased. Roman central government was responsible for minting golden and silver coins, so Asian cities minted bronze and copper series, intended for local use.

For all the cities, the bronze coinage can be divided into two further groups: those with portraits of the Imperial family on the obverse and those without, so called pseudo-autonomous coins. Portraits of the Imperial family naturally included depictions of the emperor but also heirs and empresses of the ruling house. Coins without portraits carried instead heads and busts of deities and also personifications such as the various civic institutions of the city or the city itself. Legends employed on the coins are also presenting the image of the city. They show which privileges and titles were sought and obtained by the cities and the citizens of Lydia and Phrygia. For example, the display of neocorate status and Roman nomenclature demonstrates, on a civic and individual level, how the cities and their citizens adapted to the Imperial order. The personification of the senate also shows the ways in which cities could emphasis their links with Roman institutions. The use of this particular type demonstrates that cities in Asia, viewed themselves as part of a “senatorial” province.

Coin series are informative as they give us the name of the city (often abbreviated), and often there was also a name of the official in charge of coin issues. Sometimes he had to cover the expenses of minting. Nevertheless, the information contained on coins is very limited and has to be used with caution. Certain images symbolically depict the city, its
sanctuaries, mythological or historic founders or some important event of the city’s history.\textsuperscript{76}

Sardeis, the ancient capital of the kingdom of Lydia was also the birthplace of coinage. The early electrum, gold, and silver coinage of the Lydian kings were issued from this mint. The autonomous bronze coins from Imperial period are numerous. Among the predominant types are heads of Apollo, bearded Herakles, Dionysos, and Artemis; Zeus Laodikeus standing; Apollo standing; horned Lion with spear in mouth; Pallas standing, Roma seated. ΣΑΡΔΙΣ, bust of City, head of Mount Tmolus, bust of Lydian Zeus, bust of Men, Silenos standing with infant Dionysos on his arm in the attitude of the Hermes of Praxiteles.\textsuperscript{77} Inscriptions document Roman officials, as well as local magistrates, grammateus, archon, strategos, archiereus megas, and asiarch. Municipal titles neokoros, metropolis and ΠΡΩΤΩΝ ΕΛΛΑΔΟΣ are also documented, as well as games KOINON ΑΣΙΑΣ, ΚΟΡΑΙΑ ΑΚΤΙΑ, ΧΡΥΣΑΝΘΕΙΝΑ. Sardeis also minted homonoia coins with Ephesos, Pergamon, Hierapolis, Hypaipa, Side and Smyrna.

Philadelphia, as one of the most important cities of Lydia, had autonomous bronze coins since the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 1\textsuperscript{st} centuries BC. On one side the bust of Artemis was represented, on the other Apollo seated or standing with lyre. The inscription is usually ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΕΩΝ, often with addition of ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ, with or without names of archon or strategos; and in one instance of ΕΠΙΜΕΛΗΘΕΝΤΩΝ on a coin from the time of Vespasian. The attested types in Philadelphia are ΖΕΥϹ ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙΟϹ; a Fountain nymph; coiled serpent on the back of a horse; Herakles and the Hydra; Amazon standing, holding image of Artemis; Isis standing or seated with infant Harpokrates on her arm; Hermes carrying infant Dionysos; Hermes dragging a ram; Aphrodite naked in temple, arranging her hair and holding a mirror before her and Agonistic table with urns.\textsuperscript{78} They also minted homonoia coins with Ephesos, Smyrna, and Oresteuim.\textsuperscript{79}

The earliest coins of Thyateira appear to be the cistophori of the usual types with an inscription ΘΥΑΤΕΙΠΑ. In the Imperial period the inscriptions documented Roman

\textsuperscript{76} Head, \textit{Historia Numorum}, 546-555 (Lydia) and 556-579 (Phrygia).
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid, 553.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid, 552.
\textsuperscript{79} This town is otherwise not known: ΟΡΕΣΤΕΙΝΩΝ ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦ ... ΟΜΟΝΟΙΑ; cf. Ibid, 552.
officials as well as local magistrates, such as strategos. Principal images on coins were the river Lykos; Selene holding two torches; Apollo; bust of Serapis, Serpent Agathodaemon; young male divinity naked, holding bipennis and branch; Hephaestos forging helmet, Pallas standing before him; Demeter standing, holding long torch, poppy, and corn; head of Artemis. Homonoia coins were minted with Smyrna.

Tralleis was one of the chief mints of the cistophori in western Asia Minor. In Imperial times local magistrates, grammateus and strategos, are attested. One of the main types of coins is referring to the cult of Zeus Larasios, the principal divinity of Tralleis. Other types include a bust of Helios, figures of the Pythian or Lydian Apollo; Dionysos and Ariadne, or Dionysos and Apollo playing lyre, Eros playing the double flute; Helios in a quadriga; rape of Persephone, infant Zeus sleeping on Mount Ida, above, an eagle with wings outspread. The city also minted homonoia coins with Pergamon, Ephesos, Laodikeia on the Lykos, Smyrna, Side and Synnada.

Aknoneia minted autonomous bronze during the 1st century BC with an inscription AKMONEΩN, with an eagle on fulmen, wings spread, between two stars. In the Imperial period we find inscriptions ΙΕΡΟΣ ΔΗΜΟΣ, ΙΕΡΑ ΒΟΥΛΗ with the name AKMONEΩN. Local magistrates are attested: archon, neokoros, grammateus. The prevailing types refer to the cult of Hermes, who is represented standing, holding purse and caduceus, with ram beside him; also Artemis as huntress, with stag and sometimes small figure of Nike, beside her; Zeus seated, with owl beside him. There is also a River-god, probably the Maeander; Kybele seated; Asklepios and Hygieia; Zeus seated, facing, with two giants before him.

The cistophori of Apameia are of the usual types, but distinguished by the letters ΑΠΑ, a magistrate’s name, and the double flute of Marsyas as a symbol. Roman, as well as local magistrates are documented; agonotethes, panegyiarch, archiereus, grammateus. Some types show the bust of Kelainos, probably the mythical oikistes of the city, whose old name was Kelainai. Other types include the river Maeander, into which the Marsyas flowed
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80 Ibid, 554.
81 Ibid, 554-55.
82 Ibid, 556.
in the suburbs of the city; Aphrodite naked facing; goddess, resembling Artemis Ephesia, surrounded by four river-gods. Apameia also minted *homonoia* coins with Ephesos.

In the Imperial period, the coinage of Hierapolis bore the name ΙΕΡΑΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ, with or without ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ, rarely ΙΕΡΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ. Local magistrates’ names are attested, without titles, or with those of archon and strategos, sometimes that of asiarch. Usual representation include Helios ΔΑΙΡΒΗΝΟΣ; Apollo Kitharoedos; Dionysos; Asklepios; Hades-Serapis with Kerberos; Nemesis; Men standing; Rape of Persephone; Zeus Laodikeus, with eagle and scepter; Asiatic Artemis with her stags, and many others. *Homonoia* coins were minted with Aphrodisias, Ceretapa, Kibyra, Ephesos, Laodikeia, Sardeis, Smyrna, and Synnada.

Earliest coins Laodikeia on the Lykos, are *cistophori*, dating from the first half of the 2nd century BC. During Imperial times Roman magistrates (proconsul of the province) as well as municipal are represented: *grammateus*, *strategos*, *asiarch*, *iereus*, *nomothetes*. The most common designs on the coins of Laodikeia are the boar and the wolf which are either depicted sitting alone or together back to back. These animals represented the Caprus and Lykos rivers which were important waterways to the city. One of the most interesting issues is the “ΟΜΗΡΩΣ” issue produced by Laodikeia during the reign of Nero. This shows how the city portrayed itself as an equal to Smyrna, one of the oldest cities of Asia. The issue highlights Laodikeia’s concern with its own status and how it presented itself to other cities in the province. Other principal legends and types were heads of City, ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΙΑ and *demos* and *boule*; also of ΖΕΥΣ ΛΑΟΔΙΚΕΥΣ; bust of Men; Aphrodite; Serapis; Cornucopiae, on the side of which is infant Dionysos or Plutos; Hades-Serapis with Kerberos; Hypnos winged, in sleeping attitude, with reversed torch; Aphrodite naked, lifting in either hand a long tress of her hair, standing between Eros and a dolphin. Many of the coins of Laodikeia are of large size, and are commonly called medallions. The city also minted *homonoia* coins with Adramyteum, Antiochia Cariae, Ephesos, Hierapolis, Nicomedia, Pergamon, Perinthos, Smyrna, Tralleis, and Tripolis.
Synnada, as a wealthy commercial city in Roman Phrygia, minted coins with heads of emperors as well as demos and boule. Municipal magistrates were documented, prytanis, logistes, archon, agonothetes and archiereus. Usual types of coinage representation included Amaltheia carrying infant Zeus, with a goat at her feet; Zeus Pandemos seated; Athena; Persephone; Artemis Ephesia; Kybele; Men; Nemesis and others. They also minted homonoia coins with Hierapolis.

Major editions dealing with the regions of Lydia and Phrygia, such as Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Imhoof-Blumer’s Kleinasiatische Münzen in two volumes, British Museum Catalogue, collection Waddington and Winterthur as well as the study of B. V. Head, Historia Numorum were used in this research.
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86 Ibid, 569.
89 A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum, London, 1873-; individual volumes identified by region, so BMC Phrygia.
3. HISTORIOGRAPHY

Up to now the society of Roman Lydia and Phrygia has not been studied and presented in the form of a monograph, although some aspects of the topic were studied in various monographs and articles by numerous researches. A still relevant synthesis dealing with the social and economic history of the Roman period is M. Rostovtzeff’s *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, 1926. Although still considered controversial in some conclusions, nevertheless it is the starting point for any serious study of Roman history. The issue of social structure was briefly mentioned in general studies such as D. Magie, *Roman rule in Asia Minor to the end of the third century after Christ I-II*, Princeton, 1950, S. Mitchell, *Anatolia: Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor*, Oxford, 1993, M. Sartre, *L’ Asie mineure et l’ Anatolie d’Alexandre à Dioclétien*, Paris 1995 and most recently C. Marek, *Geschichte Kleinasiens in der Antike*, München, 2010. A vast number of studies of varied scope and importance emerged after the Second World War and they cannot all be mentioned in a short review. For nearly half of a century, Jeanne and Louis Robert discovered monuments in Asia Minor from the Hellenistic and Roman period, and published numerous papers on all the topics of life in the eastern cities, which are partly collected in the *Hellenica* and reprinted in *Opera Minora Selecta*. Many issues on geography, history, society, language or culture are discussed in the on-going series of *Asia Minor Studien*, published by Westafälische Wilhelms-Universität in Münster since 1990.
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93 There are revised edition in German 1931, and further revised edition in Italian 1933; second English edition, revised by P.M. Fraser, was published in Oxford, 1957.

94 So far seventy-five volumes are published, the complete list can be found on http://www.uni-muenster.de/AsiaMinor/asia_minor_studien/titelliste/index.html (last accessed March 2015).
One of the first articles on the subject of eastern senators was C. S. Walden’s in The Journal of Roman Studies in 1929. Halfmann’s studies on Roman senators from the East later became the starting point in researching the Imperial élite. The meticulously collected prosopographical data can thus be further analysed and discussed. Another important study briefly dealing with Eastern senators is Zsuzsanna Várhelyi’s The Religion of Senators in the Roman Empire. Prosopographical data on senatorial women are given in several studies and papers by M-T. Raepsaet-Charlier, Prosopographie des femmes de l’ordre sénatorial (Ier-IIe s.), I-II, Louvain, 1987 and Les activités publiques des femmes sénatoriels et équestres, in W. Eck, M. Heil (Hg.), Senatores populi Romani. Realität und mediale Präsentation einer Führungsschicht, Stuttgart 2005. No serious research on senators in the Roman Empire would be complete without the works of Werner Eck and Geza Alföldy.

Major studies on the status of the equestrians and their roles during the Roman Empire are the ones of H. - G. Pflaum, Les procurateurs équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain; Les carrières procuratorielles équestres; Supplément aux carrières procuratorielles équestres and Devijver’s colossal project Prosopographia militarum equestrium quae fuerunt ab Augusto ad Gallienum (abbreviated as PME). Another detailed prosopographical study is by S. Demougin, Prosopographie des chevaliers romains julio-claudiens and her synthesis, L’ordre équestre sous les Julio-Claudiens. There is

100 H. Devijver, Prosopographia militarum equestrium quae fuerunt ab Augusto ad Gallienum, Louvain, 1976-1993.
also S. Demougin, H. Devijver, M. T. Raepsaet-Charlier (edd.): L’Ordre équestre. Histoire d’une aristocratie (IIe siècle av. J.-C.–IIe siècle ap. J.-C, Rome, 1999. Certain issues concerning equestrians are presented in papers of Werner Eck, Geza Alföldy and Richard Duncan-Jones.\(^\text{103}\) We should note that, as far as I know, there are no new studies on equestrians from the eastern provinces of the Empire.

One of the controversial questions about the members of the equestrian order in the province of Asia is the role of archiereus Asias and asiarchs. The question of the role and function of archiereus Asias and asiarchs was much debated since 1870-ies\(^\text{104}\) and D. Magie, L. Robert and J. Deininger all gave their opinion on the matter. It was the main subject of several papers and studies,\(^\text{105}\) but in recent years this debate has become especially polarized.\(^\text{106}\)

The subject of municipal élite was treated in many previous general monographs on Asia Minor, but is specifically studied in A. Zuiderhoek’s book *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire. Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor*.\(^\text{107}\) Other studies giving valuable insight into provincial and municipal privileged class is Price’s *Rituals and...*
Power. The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor108 and S. Cramme, Die Bedeutung des Euergetismus für die Finanzierung städtischer Aufgaben in der Provinz Asia109 among others. Internal organization, institutions and governance in Asia Minor cities is the subject of S. Dmitriev, City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor,110 especially useful and detailed for the Roman period. The list of eponymous officials in Asia Minor is provided in the articles by R. K. Sherk, The eponymous officials of Greek cities.111

The world of traders and craftsmen in the Roman Empire including Asia Minor (and therefore Lydia and Phrygia), was presented in four volumes by J. P. Waltzing at the end of the 19th century.112 Guilds and associations, both professional and religious, were especially prominent in Lydia and feature frequently in the works of D. Magie, A. H. M. Jones, L. Robert and others. Following the growing interest for the social and economic history of Asia Minor as well as new epigraphic discoveries in Saïttaï,113 several new and important studies emerged (with different approaches): O. van Nijf’s The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East,114 I. Dittmann-Schöne’s Die Berufsvereine in den Städten des kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasiens,115 and C. Zimmermann’s Handwerkervereine im griechischen Osten des Imperium Romanum.116 One should also mention a publication concerning textile industry in the Mediterranean and the contribution of G. Labarre and M. – Th. Le Dinahet on Asia Minor117 as well as several articles of Ilias Arnaoutoglou.118 The University of Copenhagen conducts a large project, The Copenhagen Associations Project (CAP), aiming to investigate the private associations of the Classical, Hellenistic and

114 O. van Nijf, The civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East, Amsterdam, 1997.
Roman worlds (c. 500 BC to c. 300 AD). At its completion, the CAP Inventory will become available in the form of an electronic database.

The question of ancient family and demography was discussed in several studies and articles. Works of W. Scheidel, D. Engels and B. D. Shaw are the most prominent; unfortunately all these papers are dealing with antiquity in general or Roman Empire as a whole. Only the article of Pierre Brulé deals with Asia Minor, but in the Hellenistic period. There is also, never published, but often cited master thesis of Marjorie R. Flood, *Epigraphic evidence for family structures and customs in Asia Minor during the early Roman Empire* presented at the Macquarie University in 1978. Most recent analysis on family and household in Phrygia was by Destephan and Thonemann. The important question about θρεπτοι was discussed in several articles by Marijana Ricl.

Religion played a major part in the life of ancient people and although the issue of religion and beliefs is not separately examined in this thesis, several important studies and articles were mentioned starting by Mária Paz de Hoz, *Die lydischen Kulte im Lichte der griechischen Inschriften*, Drew-Bear and Naour’s contribution on divinities in Phrygia in *ANRW*, Petzl’s and Ricl’s respective articles in *Forschungen in Lydien* and...
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120 http://copenhagenassociations.saxo.ku.dk/capinventory/ (last accessed August 2014).
126 T. Drew-Bear, C. Naour, *Divinités de Phrygie, ANRW* II 18.3 (1990), 1908-2781.
Although Christian communities appear in Lydia early in this period and Phrygia had a strong rural Christian community and was a base for Montanists, this thesis does not deal with these issues. Of the vast bibliography on this subject, only a collection of papers dealing with voluntary and all religious associations, including the relationship between pagans, Jews and Christians was used.\(^{132}\)

There are many studies on slavery in the Roman Empire such as The Cambridge World history of Slavery Vol. 1 The Ancient MediterraneanWorld,\(^ {133}\) general overviews for the ancient world in Bradley’s\(^ {134}\) and Garnsey’s\(^ {135}\) studies, and new study on manumissions in Greek world.\(^ {136}\) However, many issues on slavery in Asia Minor were and are discussed in various articles. A distinctive subject of sacred manumissions and so-called *katagraphe* inscriptions is especially relevant for Phrygia.\(^ {137}\) Unfortunately, one Italian study on economy and demography of slavery in Asia Minor, a revised and published PhD thesis, was not available to me.\(^ {138}\)


New studies, journals and articles on many issues in Asia Minor are being published continuously.
4. SENATORIAL ORDER

When the rule of the Attalids was replaced by that of Rome, the change affected the inhabitants of the new province in various ways. These changes developed only gradually and over a long period of time; the integration of the communities in Asia Minor into the Roman Empire was a lengthy process, not a single event. The process was not finished at time of the formation of Augustan empire. The pace of integration was not even in different parts of the province. In Lydia, and especially in the continental and somewhat isolated Phrygia, this process lasted longer than in the coastal areas. The new political and economic conditions in Anatolian provinces enabled the forming of a new social organization. A sure sign of definitive integration into the Roman world was the appearance of the members of the senatorial elite of local origin. These men left their epigraphic traces in the area much wider than their homeland.

Abundant sources for the members of the senatorial order came from coastal areas, especially Ionia, Lycia and Pamphylia, but several senators and their families are attested in Lydia and Phrygia as well. Honorific inscriptions, dedications and funerary inscriptions offer us the most abundant information on senatorial families. Subjects which can be well explored are the possibilities and conditions for provincial families to reach senatorial status, their place within the *ordo*, as well as local and chronological particularities.
Most of the wealth in the Roman Empire was controlled by a small elite of senators, equestrians and municipal elites. During the first integration process in the provinces, if one wished to enter the senatorial order he had to have a prominent role in the province, as well as merita for Rome, acquire the Roman citizenship and enter the ordo equestris. If all the criteria were met, becoming a senator was imminent. Formally, from the reign of Augustus the minimal census required for entry to the Senate was 250 000 denarii (one million sestercii), but the contemporary sources sometimes indicate the sum of HS 8 million as an appropriate capital for a senator. Senatorial fortunes often exceeded the wildest dreams of even the wealthy local landowners. During the second century there is a significant increase in the number of eastern homines novi in the Senate and this clearly points to a significant rise in prosperity among eastern urban elites in that period. The population of the Empire was constantly on the rise during the first two centuries AD, grinding to a halt only with the onset of the Antonine plague from the 170s onwards. The number of urban settlements also rises in that period and if population grows, then the land becomes inadequate relative to the available labor force. Owners of large estates, as were most members of urban elites in the Roman Empire, became better off because rents started to rise. Means of enrichment varied, but most Roman magnates of high social standing drew their wealth from landed estates.

The rise of provincial aristocracy of Asia Minor into the senatorial aristocracy took place in three distinct phases dependent of the origin of the individual. Under the Julio-Claudians the descendants of Italian settlers (veterans and merchants) prevailed, they usually came from the colonies of strongly Romanized areas such as Pamphylia. In the Flavian-Trajanic period it was the descendants of the native royal houses, especially from the old royal residences such as Pergamum and Ancyra. By the end of the second and in the
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139 The formal structure of civilian wealth qualifications represented ratios of 1:2:4:12. The juryman must have double the wealth of the town-councilor, the knight twice the wealth of a jury man, and the senator three times the wealth of the knight, R. Duncan-Jones, The Economy of Roman Empire, Cambridge, 1977, 3-4.


141 Duncan-Jones, The Economy of Roman Empire, 3-4; cf. Suet. Aug. 41.1 and Cassius Dio 55.13.6 against Cassius Dio 54.17.3; an entry to the Senate, equestrian order, the judiciary, and the town council was in each case controlled by a property qualification cf. statement in census CIL I 593: eorumque nomina, praenomina, patres aut patronos, tribus, cognomina, et quot annos quisque eorum habet et rationes pecuniae.

142 Tacitus Ann. 13.34; Suet, Nero 10; Vesp. 17 cf. Cass. Dio. 60.29.2, Pliny NH 29.7.
third century native upper classes of the cities, usually attested for many generations as provincial priests and equestrians, obtained senatorial rank.

After the civil wars, Augustus, as a censor with Agrippa as his colleague, reformed the Senate, the reason being, as Cassius Dio explains: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τιμητεύσας σὺν τῷ Αγρίππα ἄλλα τέ τινα διώρθωσε καὶ τὴν βουλὴν ἐξήτασε πολλοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἵσπης πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ πεζοὶ παρὰ τὴν ἄξιαν ἐκτῶν ἐμφυλίων πολέμων ἐβούλευον, ὡστε καὶ ἐς χιλίους τοπλήρωμα τῆς γερουσίας.143 Among other measures, he helped financially impoverished young men of senatorial or equestrian rank and provided them with the required census amount.144 The revision of the Senate membership was not based exclusively or even primarily on the census; considerations of political nature or opinions on personal morality usually prevailed. Tacitus wrote that during his reign Tiberius bestowed honors (and included new members in the Senate) with regard to noble ancestry, military renown, or brilliant accomplishments as a civilian.145 We can assume that this policy was followed by later emperors as well and judging by their careers, it seems that senators from the eastern provinces displayed more inlustres domi artes than claritudo militiae. Just few of the senators from Lydia and Phrygia had a military career, such as Tiberius Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus (LS9) or his descendants, Ti. Claudius Iulianus (LS1) and his homonymous son (LS2) as well as Claudius Apollinaris (PhS9) and Claudius Stratonicus (PhS10) from Aizanoi. The composition of the Roman Senate from the death of Nero in AD 68 to that of Alexander Severus in AD 235 changed with respect to both the social classes and the geographical areas from which the new members were drawn.146 After the reign of Septimius Severus, senators whose rank went back more than one or two generations were rare.

During the third century the Senate came to contain almost exclusively men raised from the equestrian rank or the sons of such men, and for the most part these persons were

143 Cass. Dio 52. 42, 1: as a result of the civil wars a large number of knights and even of foot-soldiers were in the Senate without justification in merit, so that the membership of that body had been swollen to a thousand; English translation by E. Cary.
145 Tac. Ann. 4, 6: mandabatque honores, nobilitatem maiorum, claritudinem militiae, inlustris domi artes spectando.
146 V. M. Hammond, Composition of the Senate, A.D. 68-235, JRS 47 (1957), 74-81.
of provincial origin. Under Trajan there is a marked rise in the percentage of provincials and this may be attributed to a conscious policy, since Trajan alone, according to the surviving evidence, admitted more provincials than he inherited from his predecessors. It was Trajan, not Hadrian, who first gave prominence to eastern senators. Though the percentage of westerners drops by 10 per cent under the latter emperor, that of the easterners does not rise correspondingly and the difference is made up by an increase of “Africans”. Hadrian, in fact, added fewer easterners, so far as can be judged, than he inherited. Septimius Severus simply continued the policy begun by Commodus, of decreasing the Antonine emphasis on westerners and Africans in favor of the easterners. The constant need to create new members of nobility and the vanishing of old senatorial families of long standing shows not that they were especially liable to be victims of tyrannical emperors but that they failed to reproduce themselves. The replacement of Italians by provincials was a gradual process and not due to the prejudice of any given emperor, not even Septimius.\footnote{147}

During the early Empire \textit{hominis novi} from Lydia and Phrygia appear less frequently in the Senate. One of them, contemporary of Nero, was L. Servenius Cornutus (PhS17) from Akmoneia.\footnote{148} A new phase started with Vespasian’s reign. The emperor perhaps understood the needs of provincial elite and found the way to use this manpower and their abilities. During this period the Senate was gradually “provincialized”. The influx of a considerable number of ambitious provincials is visible, but they still constituted only a minority. From the approximately 20 equestrian \textit{adlecti} to the senatorial order during Vespasian, only 4 came from the East.\footnote{149} One of those senators, \textit{adlectus inter aedilicios}, was Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaenus (LS9) from Sardeis. He was previously \textit{tribunus militum legionis III Cyrenaicae} stationed in Alexandria and probably involved in the acclamation of Vespasian by the troops in Alexandria on July 1\textsuperscript{st} 69.\footnote{150} Under Domitian, the sons of the first \textit{hominis novi} became senators in greater numbers.

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{147} Hammond, op.cit., 79.
\item \footnote{149} C. Caristanius Fronto from Antiocheia ad Pisidiam, Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaenus (L9) from Sardeis, C. Iulius Cornutus Tertullus from Perge and C. Antius Aulus Iulius Quadratus from Pergamon; cf. G. Houston, Vespasian's Adlection of Men in Senatum, \textit{AJPh} 98.1 (1977), 53-55.
\item \footnote{150} W. Eck, Emperor, Senate and Magistrates, \textit{CAH} XI (2000), 219; Houston, op. cit., 60.
\end{itemize}
We already said that it was Trajan who really opened the doors of the Senate to the new senators. Pliny described Trajan as “one of us”. Friendship with an emperor and illustrious education were crucial factors of social advancement in imperial period. Equestrians and senators who could bridge the gap between the Greek and Roman culture, were well positioned to move into stations of influence as the emperors themselves came to represent this fusion of east and west. An excellent education was prerequisite for all the upper classes, not only for eastern senators. A *homo novus* from the Greek East continued the classical tradition in education and literature. The Antonines gradually welcomed even more newcomers in the Senate, especially Marcus Aurelius who introduced 20 to 25 *hominis novi*. One of the reasons could be the loss of manpower due to the plague and wars and the genuine need for fresh blood in the Senate. The prime motive seems to have been the wish to have enough trustworthy or otherwise suitable men directly available for the responsible official duties. The tendency was to reward individual equestrians and army officers as well as to satisfy the social ambition of municipal elites. The collected data shows that roughly 75% of the new members enrolled in the Senate during the 2nd century AD came from the eastern provinces, as opposed to only 24% in the 1st.

Perhaps an indication of inclusion of entire families (wives and children included) in *ordo senatorius* during the early Empire could be seen in one passage in Suetonius’ *Caligula*, and for some the term senatorial order clearly designated the senators as well as their families. It is probably safe to assume that the Senate membership alone would have raised the status of a whole family for generations. The consulship and the prestigious offices which it could bring represented the pinnacle of aristocratic achievement. But the costs were high (an impressive house at Rome, a huge number of
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151 Pliny, *Pan.* 2.4: unus ex nobis.
152 Sophist Aelius Antipater (*PhS1*) from Hierapolis in Phrygia is a good example. He was *ab epistulis Graecis* of Septimius Severus, friend of Severus and tutor to Caracalla and Geta, *adlectos inter consulares* by Severus and legate of Bithynia. After the murder of Geta, he starved himself to death at the age of sixty eight; cf. *PIR²* A 137; Philostr. *VS* II, 24; 25, 4.
153 Halfmann, op. cit., 50.
155 Suet, *Cal.* 17, 3: totiens abundantissimum epulum senatui equestrique ordini, etiam coniugibus ac liberris utrorumque.
slaves, the presentation of elaborate games, suburban villas) and the financial rewards were uncertain. The rise in status could often drain a family's resources.

We can notice that of our 30 senators in Lydia and Phrygia, the most frequent nomen (thus giving us a hint when the family obtained Roman citizenship) is Flavius (6 occurrences, equally divided to both regions), then Iulius (4 times, only in Lydia) and Claudius (also 4 times, twice in each province), Antonius (3 times in Phrygia) and just one Aurelius (in Phrygia). It is interesting that Tralleis had two senatorial families in the 3rd century, Iulii Philipi and Flavii Clithosteni.

Looking at the hereditary nature of senatorial position we should ask how all of this reflects on senators from Lydia and Phrygia. There is one case where the father, son and grandsons (or great-grandson, following Halfmann)\(^\text{158}\) were senators, the family of Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaenus (LS9), but although they originated from Sardeis, they actually lived in Ephesus and were strongly attached to that metropolis judging by their grand benefactions. There is also one possible case in Phrygia, a family of M. Antonius Zeno (PhS3) from Laodikeia on the Lykos, consul sufectus in 148, his homonymous son (PhS4) being consul sufectus in 168/170 and grandson (or less likely, younger son) M. Antonius Antius Lupus (PhS2) reaching the praetorship. The father-son group is attested 4 times: T. Carminius Flavius Athenagoras Claudianus (PhS8) and his son M. Flavius Carminius Athenagoras Livianus (PhS12) (originated from Attouda in Phrygia, lived in Aphrodisias), M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus (LS4) and Cn. Licinius Rufinus (LS3) from Thyateira, C. Asinius Protimus Quadratus (PhS6) and C. Asinius Nicomahus Iulianus (PhS5) (perhaps from Blaundos, with possible ties to Sardeis and Ephesus) and T. Flavius Clitosthenes (LS6) and T. Flavius Stasicles Metrophanes (LS7) from Tralleis.

\(^{158}\) Halfmann, op. cit., 147 no. 57 and 174 no. 94; contra PIR\(^2\) C 902.
4.1 Origin of the senators

Italian veterans, ancestors of the first senators from the East, usually became more prominent during the first or the second generation. Some senators were descendants of earlier royal houses: the father of L. Servenius Cornutus (PhS17) from Akmoneia, L. Servenius Capito, married Iulia Severa, a descendant of the Galatian and Attalid royal houses. L. Servenius Capito was most probably of Italian descent, as his nomen is very rare and unlikely to have been obtained from any governor or Roman official in the East. Perhaps his ancestor emigrated from central Italy during the Republican period. Both of Cornutus’ parents served as ἄρχειερευς ἄρχειερεια of the imperial cult. One senator, P. Calpurnius Proculus Cornelianus from Ankyra, married Servenia Cornuta, possibly a daughter (or perhaps a granddaughter) of the aforementioned L. Servenius Cornutus. Tiberius Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus (LS9) came from a long line of priests of Roma in Sardeis. He was the father of Ti. Iulius Aquila Polemaeanus (LS8), consul suffectus in 110, and Iulia Quintilia Isaurica, whose son, Ti. Claudius Iulianus (LS1), possibly served as a consul suffectus in 129/130. As they probably had the same financial and political goals, it is perhaps expected that some regional groups were formed in the Senate, so marriage connections among these families were not unusual as can be seen from the example of
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159 Halfmann, op. cit., 29.
161 PIR2 I 701; MAMA VI 263-265, IGR IV 656; cf. Halfmann, op. cit., 102.
162 It is attested several times in the western part of Mediterranean i.e. CIL III 3190 (Dalmatia), CIL VI 1056 (Roma), CIL IX 1698 (Beneventum), CIL XI 5338 (Hispellum); W. Schulze, Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen, Berlin 19662, 230-231; cf. OPEL IV, 73.
163 B. Levick, Roman colonies in southern Asia Minor, Oxford 1967, 106.
164 MAMA VI 263.
165 PIR2 C 304-305.
166 For Servenia Cornuta v. PIR2 S 568; for the possibility that Servenia Cornuta Cornelia Calpurnia Valeria Secunda Cotia (?) Procilla Porcia Luculla Domna married to an Ancyran senator in IGR III 192 is not her, but her daughter v. PIR2 S 569.
167 PIR2 I 260.
168 I. Sardis 22, 91, 92, 109, 116.
169 PIR2 I 168.
Aphrodisias (Caria) and Attouda: a daughter of a senator from Aphrodisias Sallustius Rufus, Sallustia Frontina, married a procurator Augusti T. Sallustius Flavius Athenagoras Agathus and they had two sons styled as συγκλητικοὶ, T. Flavius Athenagoras and T. Sallustius Sanactus Athenagoras, and a daughter Flavia Appia, ἀρχιερεῖα Ασίας married to M. Ulpius Carminius Claudianus (son of ἀρχιερεῖς and an ἀρχιερεῖς himself) from Attouda, their son being T. Carminius Flavius Athenagoras Claudianus (PhS8), proconsul provinciae Lyciae et Pamphiliae et Isauriae and a consul suffectus under Commodus. Carminii from Attouda gained Roman citizenship by the end of the first century AD from Sex. Carminius Vetus, the proconsul Asiae.

Less than a century later T. Carminius Flavius Athenagoras Claudianus was already a senator. The family of Iulii Phillipi from Tralleis had imperial gentilicium and perhaps some 200 years after receiving Roman citizenship (assuming they had had Roman citizenship already in the time of Augustus) this family had a consul suffectus in Rome. The family of M. Antonius Zeno (PhS3), a senator from Laodikeia on the Lykos, was descended from the royal houses of Pontus and Thrace. One question imposes itself immediately: are these senators of Italian descent or natives of Asia Minor? All the senators from Lydia and Phrygia originated from Asia Minor (with perhaps the exception of the father of L. Servenius Cornutus), as there were no large Roman colonies or military posts in these provinces. More significantly, there was a surge in local elite wealth during the second century AD and local influence, esteem and fortune were essential prerequisite for all high statuses of public life under the Principate. The Roman state was firmly oligarchic and timocratic. Asia Minor progressively created its new elites and we can trace the rise of certain families through generations. For some men, being the first generation of senators was a significant fact, important enough to be acknowledged in the inscription.

170 MAMA VIII 517 a-b.
171 IAph2007 12.1111, CIG 2783; PIR² C 433.
172 PIR² C 429.
173 MAMA IV 74-75.
174 CIG 2783.
175 W. Eck, Senatoren, 148; cf. PIR² C 436.
176 Halfmann, op. cit., 44ff.
177 For example, TAM II 282 (Xantos, Lycia) ll. 2-5: τάς ἐν ἱππηθῆ [τάξει ἀρχός πάσας / διελθ]φόν μέχρι ἐπιτροπ[ής ἀρχής καὶ ἐν τῷ / γένει] πρῶτος συνκλητικός [γεγενημένος τοῦ / [δ]ήμου Ρωμαίων…
Roman senators and equestrians were usually recruited among the members of urban elites, especially in provincial capitals.\footnote{Halfmann, op. cit., 51.} Greek families received Roman citizenship, started naturalization and entered the system of privileged classes. Senatorial families are much more frequently attested in western Asia Minor, in large towns and Roman colonies then in the central highlands (such as Phrygia), due to the distribution of epigraphic material, among other things. Nevertheless, we have 12 possible senators from Lydia and, perhaps surprisingly, 18 from Phrygia.\footnote{One anonymous senator (\textit{LS12}) attested in the inscriptions from Hierokaisareia (\textit{SEG} XLI 1032) and Thyateira (\textit{TAM} V2 923) perhaps did not originate from Lydia; one senator from Phrygia, Claudius Apollinaris (\textit{PhS8}) is attested in \textit{IGR} IV 570 (Aizanoi) only as \textit{στρατηγός} but his probable legateship of \textit{legio I Minervia} in Germania inferior is probably confirmed in fragmentary \textit{CIL} XIII 7946 (Iversheim), Halfmann included him in his lists of Eastern senators, cf. Halfmann, op.cit, 199 nr. 132 and ibid, Die Senatoren aus den kleinasiatischen Provinzen des Römischen Reiches vom 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert, \textit{Tituli} 5 (1982), 634.} Most of them are attested in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century, as could be expected, with only one senator during the first century from Lydia and Phrygia respectively. The origins of the senators are usually distinctively described. The family of C. Iulius Severus from Ankyra was styled as \textit{γνώριμοι τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀνωθεν Φρυγίας}.\footnote{Arist., \textit{Or}. L p.428; cf. Halfmann, op. cit., 56.} Halfmann argues that the \textit{origo} of Quadrati, the family that gave one of the first consuls from Asia Minor, C. Antius A. Iulius Quadratus\footnote{\textit{PIR} I 507; \textit{cos. suff}. 94 AD.} from Pergamon, was in the area west of Akmoneia on the Lydo-Phrygian border.\footnote{Halfmann, op. cit, 56; \textit{MAMA} I 24 (Laodikeia Katakkaumene, eastern Phrygia): l. 8 \textit{praedia Quadratiana}; note also \textit{IGR} IV 387 (Pergamon): [Α.Ἰνύιηνλ Αὔινπ] <π>ἱὸ<λ> Κνπαδξᾶηνλ δὶο ὕπαηνλ ἟ παηξίο; that Pergamon was understood to be the homeland of Quadrati see Arist., \textit{Or}. XXX p. 203f; cf. G. Bowersock, \textit{Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire}, Oxford 1969, 19.} Alternatively, one could suppose it was only one of Quadratus’ many estates. Other members of this family are attested in various places in Lydia. Among others, we find them in Koloe (south of the river Hermos),\footnote{\textit{TAM} VI 71.} and Thermai Theseos (between Saittai and Koloe).\footnote{Notice all the relatives, \textit{IGR} III 173:} 

Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaenus (\textit{LS9}) came from the ancient Lydian royal capital, Sardes. His son, Ti. Iulius Aquila Polemaeaus (\textit{LS8}), who dedicated the grand library in Ephesus to his father, had relatives in Ankyra, the aforementioned Iulius Severus.\footnote{Sitz. Ber. Wien 265 (1969), 57 nr. 13.} \textit{Origo}
of the family is not always easy to establish. For example, Halfmann supposes that another senatorial family originated from Sardes, father C. Asinius Protimus Quadratus (PhS6) and son C. Asinius Nicomachus Iulianus (PhS5). His assumption is based on the attestation of the name C. Asinius Nicomachus as archontes on coins in Sardes during the reign of Severus Alexander.\textsuperscript{186} There is another Nikomachus attested in an inscription from Sardes as one of the στρατηγοί in 1 BC.\textsuperscript{187} In the inscription listing the fountains in Sardes from the period of Marcus Aurelius, Halfmann also suggests the restoration of line 21 by inserting the name of Asinius Nicomachus Iulianus.\textsuperscript{188} C. Asinius Protimus Quadratus was attested together with his brother C. Asinius Rufus in an inscription from the island of Amorgos. It is a dedication to the emperor Antoninus Pius, where the emperor is referred to as the “savior and benefactor” of the brothers who are styled as οἱ κράτιστοι ὁδελφοί.\textsuperscript{189}

The same senator is also honored in Ephesos by the boule as benefactor of the city.\textsuperscript{190} His son, C. Asinius Nicomachus Iulianus, consul suffectus and proconsul provinciae Asiae, is honored by boule and demos of the community of Blaundos as a benefactor and founder of the city.\textsuperscript{191} An inscription from Drepanon in Sicily testifies that C. Asinius Nicomachus Iulianus had an estate on the island and that it was probably his domicile as a Roman senator. These inscriptions offer at least two possibilities for origo of this senatorial family, Sardes and Blaundos. Although, I consider the latter more probable, there is no definitive epigraphic evidence that would settle the matter.

During the second and third century AD several senators came from Attouda (two),\textsuperscript{192} Aizanoi (two),\textsuperscript{193} Thyateira (two),\textsuperscript{194} Laodikeia on the Lykos (three)\textsuperscript{195} and

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[186]{Halfmann, Die Senatoren aus den kleinasiatischen Provinzen, 631; cf. SNG v. Aulock 8260.}
\footnotetext[187]{I. Sardis 8, l. 120.}
\footnotetext[188]{In I. Sardis 17 ll. 21-22 the name was published as Ασινίνος Μ[— —c.15— —] / -νος and Halfmann proposes to restore it as Ασινίνος Νεικόμαχος Ιούλιανος.}
\footnotetext[189]{IGR IV 4013.}
\footnotetext[190]{IGR IV 1013.}
\footnotetext[191]{IGR IV 717.}
\end{footnotes}
Tralleis (three). But by far the greatest number of senators during all three centuries is attested in Akmoneia, five. The family of T. Flavius Clitosthenes (LS6) from Tralleis originated from the island of Thera. The majority of senatorial families from the eastern provinces came from the province of Asia, more then 120. Of them around 30 came from Lydia and Phrygia, approximating to one fourth of all the known families.

Geographical distribution of the above mentioned places of origin in both Lydia and Phrygia does not display any easily recognizable pattern. Senators originated from all parts of Lydia. Some Phrygian senators claim descent from southern Phrygia or from Lydian and Phrygian borderlands, but others came from places like Akmoneia and Aizanoi that are much further to the north and east. The same goes for of the comparative size and importance of these cities. That the large and prosperous capital of Lydia was home of several senators is no surprise, but many of the mentioned places are towns of rather modest importance. There is no obvious explanation why Akmoneia, a comparatively small city, situated deep within the central Phrygia, was the homeland of so many senators. A similar question can be asked regarding Blaundos, Attoua, Aizanoi and many other places. A very large city and a major commercial center of Roman Asia, such as Apameia Kibotos (Kelainai), famed for its general abundance and its large number of wealthy residents, so far, gave no senators. As far as we can tell from the preserved evidence, there is no direct and simple correlation between the wealth and importance of a particular city and the number of senators originating from it.

193 Claudius Apollinaris (PhS9), cf. PIR² C 1033; Claudius Stratonicus (PhS10), cf. PIR² C 1033.
194 M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus (LS4), cf. PIR² L 236 and his son Cn. Licinius Rufinus (L3), cf. PIR² L 236-237.
195 M. Antonius Zeno (PhS3) and his homonymous son (PhS4), cf. PIR² A 883 and grandson and son M. Antonius Antius Lupus (PhS2), cf. PIR² A 812.
196 T. Flavius Clitosthenes (LS6), PIR² F 243 and his son T. Flavius Stasicles Metrophanes (L7) PIR² F 370; C. Iulius Philippus (LS11) PIR² I 458-460.
197 L. Servenius Cornutus (PhS17) (1st century), T. Flavius Montanus Maximianus (PhS15) (middle of the 3rd century), T. Flavius Lartidius (PhS14) and T. [Diogenianus (PhS11) (3rd century) and one anonymous senator (PhS18).
198 IG XII 3, 325 ll. 14-15 where Thera is referred to as γλυκώτατη πατρίς.
199 Halfmann, op. cit., 58.
4.2 Careers

On the way to becoming a senator one had to follow the usual *cursus honorum*, performing various duties in the provinces and Rome itself, gradually climbing towards the consulate. Some of the senators pursued military careers\(^\text{200}\) and most of them performed high administrative duties in various provinces.

The first attested senator from Phrygia, so far as we know, from the period of Nero’s reign, is L. Servenius Cornutus (PhS17) from Akmonia.\(^\text{201}\) At first he was a member of the collegium of ten members of the court (*Xviri stilitibus iudicandis*). From the time of Augustus the *Xviri stilitibus iudicandis* acted as presiding officers in the several sections of the centumviral court\(^\text{202}\) and they settled cases on the civil status of the citizens. Subsequently, Cornutus was nominated quaestor of the province of Cyprus, *aedilis*, praetor and the legate of the province of Asia (*legatus pro praetore provinciae Asiae*).\(^\text{203}\)

One of the best known senators from Sardeis, Tiberius Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus (LS9) was first a military tribune (*tribunus militiae angusticlavum*) of the legion *III Cyrenaica*, stationed in Alexandria at that time and probably was involved in the acclamation of Vespasian in July 69 AD. Afterwards, in 73-74 AD he was *adlectus inter aedilicios*\(^\text{204}\) and his career advanced further. From 77 to 79 AD he was *legatus (iuridicus) Augusti provinciae Cappadociae, Galatiae, Ponti, Pisidiae, Lycaoniae, Paphlagoniae, Armeniae minoris* under the governor of Cappadocia, Galatia and Armenia minor M. Hirrius Fronto Neratus Pansa.\(^\text{205}\) He was in charge of the legal matters for these provinces.\(^\text{206}\) Afterwards, in 79-82 AD he was *legatus Augusti* of the legion *IV Scythica* stationed in the East (probably Syria), in 84/85 AD he was proconsul of the province Bithynia and Pontus and from 85/86 till 88/89 AD he was *praefectus aerarii militaris*. In

\(^{200}\) Cf. Claudius Apollinaris and Claudius Stratonicus were both, at some period, *legati Augusti legio I Minerviae: CIL XIII* 7946; *PIR² C* 1033.

\(^{201}\) *PIR²* S 566.


\(^{203}\) *MAMA* VI 254, 262.

\(^{204}\) *IEph* 5102; cf. W. Eck, Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian, München 1970, 98 n. 22.


\(^{206}\) RE XII/1, s.v. *legatus*, 1149; cf. G. P. Burton, Proconsuls, Assizes and the Administration of Justice under the Empire, *JRS* 65 (1975), 94-95.
the period from 88/89 till 91/92 AD he was legatus pro praetore provinciae Ciliciae and consul suffectus in 92 AD. He ended his prosperous career as a proconsul provinciae Asiae in 105/106 AD. His son Tiberius Iulius Aquila Polemaeanus (LS8) was consul suffectus in 110 AD. A grandson of the former, nephew of the latter, Tiberius Claudius Iulianus (LS1) was a military tribune of the legion IV Scythica in the East. Afterwards, he was at first the quaestor of the province Achaia and later the legate of this same province, legatus pro praetore provinciae Achaiae. His homonymous son (LS2) was first legatus Augusti of the legion XI Claudia stationed at the time in the province of Moesia inferior and later the governor (legatus Augusti pro praetore) of the province Germania inferior. He was one of the suffect consuls between 154 and 156 AD as attested in a military diploma from Dacia.

---

### Family stemma of Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus

---

208 Degrassi, *Fasti*, 33.
209 *IEph* 5106, cf. *PIR²* C 902.
210 *CIL* III 7474 (Durostorum).
211 *CIL* XIII 8036 (Bonna).
212 *CIL* XVI 110.
A senator from Laodikeia on the Lykos M. Antonius Zeno (PhS3) was legatus pro praetore provinciae Thraciae in the period from 141 until 144 AD as attested on several inscriptions from Thrace (Kabyle and Serdica) as well as on coin issues.\textsuperscript{213} He was consul suffectus in 148 AD as attested in fasti and one military diploma from Pannonia superior.\textsuperscript{214} His homonymous son (PhS4) was consul suffectus in 168/170 AD\textsuperscript{215} and was proconsul provinciae Africæ in 183/185 AD, responsible, among other things, for building the aqueduct near Thugga:

[Pro salute Imp(eratoris) Caes(aris) M(arci) Aurelii Commodi Antonini Aug(usti)]

The career of a well-known jurist, whose Regulae are quoted several times in the Digestae, and senator M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus (LS4) from Thyateira (3rd century) is a very good example.\textsuperscript{217} Thyateira had connections with Rome back at the beginning of the province of Asia, and its resident Romans, organized in a conventus are attested in numerous inscriptions.\textsuperscript{218} After several equestrian offices, consiliarius Augusti, ab epistulis Graecis, a studis Augusti, a rationibus, Rufinus was adlected into the Senate by Alexander Severus and became praetor, legatus of Noricum, consul suffectus, amicus Caesaris and finally a member of vigintiviri set up in a crisis of 238.\textsuperscript{219} At some stage of his career he

\textsuperscript{213}AE 1974, 580; IGR I 683 = IGR I 1454; see also for example Imhoof-Blumer, Monn. Gr. 44 nr. 31 (Perinthos), BMC Thracia 161 nr. 4 (Philippopolis), Imhoof-Blumer, Ant. Munz. Nordgriech. I 1, 349f, nr. 1255ff (Nicopolis).
\textsuperscript{214}Degrassi, Fasti, 42; diploma: CIL XVI 96.
\textsuperscript{215}G. Alföldy, Konsulat und Senatorenstand unter den Antoninen, 197.
\textsuperscript{216}IL Tun 1408.
\textsuperscript{217}TAM V2, 984-988; P. Hermann, Die Karriere eines prominenten Juristen aus Thyateira, Tyche 12 (1997), 111-123 (= SEG XLVII 1656).
\textsuperscript{218}Cf. TAM V2, p. 306-315.
represented the province of Macedonia, evidently successfully in a case concerning the
collection of the Thessalians and he is praised as most experienced in laws.\footnote{By the
end of the 1\textsuperscript{st} or in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century Thessaly had been detached from the province of Achaia, and
attached to Macedonia. \textit{Synteleia} has a variety of meanings, but the most likely point at
issue here was surely the question of the financial contribution which the cities of Thessaly
would be required to make to the koinon of the province in which they now found
themselves. It is very likely, though it cannot be certain, that the dispute between the
Thessalians and the koinon of Macedonia had also been heard by an emperor.}

T. Flavius Montanus Maximianus (\textbf{PhS15}) attest\textsuperscript{ed} in \textit{MAMA XI} 104 from
Akmoneia also followed a successful senatorial career, culminating in the consulship. He is
no doubt descended from an older T. Flavius Montanus of Akmoneia, high-priest of Asia
during the reign of Trajan, attested both at Akmoneia and in several inscriptions from
Ephesos.\footnote{T. Mommsen, \textit{Römisches Staatsrecht} II, Leipzig 1877, 259.} Maximianus’
career seems to have followed a standard pattern:

\begin{verbatim}
quaestor (urbanus)
quaestor provinciae Africæ
aedilis Cerialis
praetor
curator
legatus Augusti pro praetore provinciae Thraciae
consul
\end{verbatim}

In the inscription the terms καίστωρ and ταμίας both denote the Latin \textit{quaestor}. Maximianus
has evidently held office as quaestor twice, once in Rome, and once in the
province of Africa. The double quaestorship is well-paralleled; it is usually assumed that
the second appointment arose in cases when one of the provincial quaestors died during the
period between election and the start of the proconsular year.\footnote{\textit{EKM} I Beroia 101: ἀγαθή τύχη./ <κατά τὸ δόξαν τῶν> / <λαμπροτάτω συνε>/ δρίῳ Λικίνιων / Θουρφείνον, τὸν ὑπατικόν, συναγο/ρεύσαντα τῇ ἐπαρ/χείᾳ περὶ τῆς συντε/λείας τῶν Θετταλῶν, / Δομίτιος / Εὐρυδίκος / ὁ μακεδονάρχης / ἐκ τῶν ἐαυτοῦ.}

\footnote{\textit{IGR IV} 643 = \textit{IGR IV} 1696; \textit{IEph} 498, 698, 854, 1130, 2037, 2061-3}

\footnote{T. Mommsen, \textit{Römisches Staatsrecht} II, Leipzig 1877, 259.}
quaestорships in Greek the two posts are consistently distinguished, as in this inscription (the transliteration κωάιστορ for the urban quaestorship, the Greek translation ταμιάς for the provincial quaestorship). After his second quaestorship, Maximianus held office as aedilis Cerialis. The use of the mixed Graeco-Latin phrase ἀγορανόμον κερεάλιον to represent aedilis Cerialis seems to be unparalleled.223

Following his praetorship, Maximianus held an unknown number of praetorian offices, beginning with a curatorship of some kind (curator via rum, reipublicae, etc.), and concluding with the governorship of Thrace. Maximianus’ consulship is the latest office to be mentioned in the inscription. However, in I Eph 698 ll. 1-4, an honorific inscription for a proconsul of Asia, dated to the third century AD stands Ἀν[τανόν] | Μαξυμή[νον] | τῶν λαμπρό[τατον ἀνή] | βασιλέων. As suggested in MAMA XI the proconsul of I Eph 698 could also be restored as Φλ. Μον[τανόν] | Μαξυμη[θόν], identifying him with the consularis T. Flavius Montanus Maximianus from Akmoncia.224 A possible evidence for the date of T. Flavius Montanus Maximianus’ proconsulship of Asia comes from the Codex Iustinianus, a rescript of the emperor Philip the Arab to a certain Montanus, likely to be a provincial governor.225 The presence of Philip (II) as Caesar in the imperial titulature sets the date of the rescript between July/August 244 and July/August 247. We are fairly certain that the proconsul of Asia for the year 244/5 was L. Egnatius Victor Lollianus.226 In order for the governor Montanus of the Codex Iustinianus to be identical with the proconsul T. Flavius Montanus Maximianus, the only possible dates for his tenure of office are AD 245/6 and AD 246/7. Assuming an interval of fifteen years between consulship and the proconsulship of Asia, as seems to have been normal from the reign of Hadrian onwards227 Maximianus’ suffect consulship could possibly be dated c. AD 231.

The cursus honorum of the anonymous senator from 3rd century attested in Lydia (LS12? - we are not actually certain that he originated from Lydia as well) shows the usual

223 In SEG VI 555 (Pisidian Antioch) the Latin title is simply transliterated, αἰ[δίηλ] κερεάλιν.
224 For other possibilities cf. the proconsul [- ] of TAM V 3, 1422 (Maionia), also in PIR² M 390.
225 Codex Iustinianus 7.45.5: Imp. Philippus A(gustus) et Philippus C(aesar) Montano.
way for entering the consular rank: he was a *vir viarum curandarum, questor urbanus*, provincial questor, a plebeian tribune, praetor, *curator rei publicae* in Alexandria Troas, *legatus iuridicus Apuliae, Calabriae, Lucaniae, legatus iuridicus Hispaniae dioceos Taracconensis, legatus provinciae Asiae* and *consul*.

For *hominis novi* there were two possibilities, to be awarded the *latus clavus* from an emperor or be promoted to the Senate by *adlectio* introduced by Claudius and Vespasian and made permanent by Domitian. It was an opportunity for a young person barely within reach of the proper age for an office, or for an elderly equestrian to be awarded the senatorial rank. It has been noted that between 96 and 192 AD of 157 *hominis novi* 122 (22 from the East) were awarded the *latus clavus* and 35 (9 or 10 from eastern provinces) the *adlectio*.

Unfortunately, for some senators we do not have much information besides their name and/or status. T. Flavius Claudianus Ponticus (*PhS13*) is only attested in a fragment of an architrave block from Dorylaion, probably from the middle of the 3rd century. In this dedication of the monument (perhaps a *heroon*) we can only see that at some point of his career he was *tribunus laticlavius*. Aurelius Sanctus (*PhS7*) and his wife Plotia Agrippina from Prymnessos erected a dedication to Caracalla, probably in the spring of 198 AD; they are both simply styled ΣΥΝΚΛΗΤΙΚΟΙ. Nothing more could be said for very fragmentary and heavily restored joint dedication by two 3rd century senators, T. Flavius Lartidius (*PhS14*) and T. [ ] Diogenianus (*PhS11*) from Akmoneia.

The careers of these senators with military careers show us that in the early period the provincial commands of Greek and oriental officials were confined to the East. It seems they were more useful in the part of the Empire they knew best and more apt to govern provinces whose language and customs they were familiar with. There was ambitious competition among senators for the imperial appointments and for the higher sacerdotal

---

228 *IGR* IV 1307; *SEG* XLI 1034; *TAM* V2 923.
230 Halfmann, op. cit., 83.
231 *SEG* XXVI 1373; *SEG* XXXVI 1193.
offices. Such efforts could be primarily seen as a careerist, individualistic attempts, in which the priesthood itself has little distinctly religious meaning. Nevertheless, only three senators had their priestly functions mentioned in the inscriptions. T. Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus (LS9) was *XV vir sacris faciundis*, M. Antonius Antius Lupus (PhS2) was augur and *sodalis Titii* and T. Flavius Stasicles Metrophanes (LS7) from Tralleis was priest of Zeus Larasios and *agonothetes* on all competitions during the first Pythian Games in his hometown. Concerning practicing religion, at some point (our oldest surviving evidence is from the late second century) senators and their families begin to offer inscriptions to healing dieties. It was on a military tour that one particular dedication was made to German “matronae” by the wife of Severan senator Claudius Stratonicus (PhS10) (*consul suffectus* in 190) from Aizanoi. Another example of a dedication for one’s well-being is the one erected in Lydia Katakekaumene in the 2nd or 3rd century on behalf of Curtia Flavia Archelais Valentilla, ὑπατίκη.²³⁴

Some senators originating from Phrygia had a number of dramatic changes in their careers. An interesting example is M. Antonius Antius Lupus (PhS2),²³⁵ son and grandson of senators, descendant of the famous rhetor Zenon and of the Pontic royal family, member of a prominent family from Laodikeia on the Lykos. During his career in Rome, he was *praefectus feriarum Latinarum, Xvir stlitibus iudicandis, tribunus militum legionis II adiutricis Piae fidelis* stationed in Aquincum, *quaestor, praetor, sodalis Titius* and *augur*. He was married to Claudia Regilla from Athens, probably the daughter of of Ti. Claudius Appius Atilius Bradua Regillus, *consul suffectus* in 185 AD.²³⁶ They had a daughter, named after her paternal grandmother, Antia Marcellina. He was put to death by Commodus in 191 AD with so many others.²³⁷ He was later given a large funerary monument, 6 meters high, on the Via Ostiense, erected by his relatives, the pontifex M. Valerius Bradua Mauricus (himself a consul in 191) and his wife, as well as two further *amici*, the *praetor urbanus* T.

²³⁴ *SEG* XLVI 1496; probably a daughter of senator T. Flavius Archelaos Claudianus and Curtia Iulia Valentilla (herself daughter of senator C. Iulius Crispus) from Philadelphia.
²³⁵ *PIR²* A812.
²³⁶ *CIL* VI 1343; Rémy, 176
²³⁷ *Vita Comm*. 7,5.
Annaeus Placidus and Q. Fabius Honoratus. The inscription directly states that Antonius’ fate was unfair and finally resulted in restitution of title and memoria: “of whom, being oppressed by force, the memoria has been restored to honor, according to the senatus consultum of the most powerful order”.

---

238 CIL VI 1343: D(is) M(anibus) / M(arci) Antonii Antii Lupi pr(aetoris) / patricii auguris quaest(oris) sodal(is) Titii trib(uni) / mil(itum) leg(ionis) II Adiutric(is) Piae Fidel(is) Xvir(i) stl(itibus) iud(icandis) praef(ecti) fer(iar Lat(inarum) cuius memoria per vim oppressi in / integrum secundum amplissimi ordinis / consultum restituta est sepulc{h}rum ab eo coeptum / Claudiae Regillae uxori et Antiae Marcellinae fil(iae) / pietatis suae erga eum testificandae gratia et / nominis eius in perpetuum celebrandi perfeccerunt affines / M(arcus) Valerius Bradua Mauricus pontif(ex) et Antonia Vitellia / amici / Q(uintus) Fabius Honoratus T(itus) Annaeus Placidus accomodata gerunt [ - - - ] / praetextas stamina serum [ - - - ] / aedificata tholis [ - - - ]
The Carminii of Atouda

(the family *stemma* taken from P. Thonemann, A Meander Valley. A Historical Geography from Antiquity to Byzantium, Cambridge 2011, 231)
The career of T. Flavius Carminius Athenagoras Claudianus (PhS8) from Attouda in Phrygia was meteoric. He relocated to Rome, married one Livia, had four children, entered the Senate and had brilliant career in public life. Under Commodus, he attained the proconsulate of Lycia-Pamphylia-Isauria and was consul suffectus in or around 190. After the violent and premature end of Antonine dynasty and by the summer of 193, Septimius Severus was installed in Rome, while the East had supported Pescennius Niger, governor of Syria. Niger was defeated at Issus less than a year later and the senatorial supporters of Niger, eastern governors, legates and others suffered misfortune and eclipse. In the Digest, one of these victims, named Flavius Athenagoras, had seen his estate confiscated and his daughter left without a dowry, until Septimius intervened in her favor. It is very likely that this unfortunate father is none other than T. Flavius Carminius Athenagoras Claudianus. His youngest daughter Carminia Liviana Diotima married well, to P. Attius Pudens, thus joining an eminent Ephesian family, and this could have been the marriage that required imperial support. Although one of his sons was also consul suffectus (PhS12) it seems the family faded into insignificance although one T. Flavius Athenagoras Cornelianus is attested as a student of medicine in Rome and it is a plausible suggestion that some members of the family stayed in Rome in reduced circumstances.

The sophist Aelius Antipater (PhS1) from Hierapolis in Phrygia is another good example. His father Zeuxidemus was described as one of the most distinguished men in the flourishing city of Hierapolis. Antipater was ab epistulis Graecis of Septimius Severus,
friend of Severus and tutor to Caracalla and Geta, *adlectus inter consulares* by Severus and legate of Bithynia. Caracalla’s letter to Ephesians mentions his teacher: ... Ἀδλ(ιος) Αντίπατρος ὁ φίλος καὶ διδάσκαλος κ[αὶ τὴν τάξιν τῶν Ἑλλη[νικῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἐπιτετραμμένος]...\(^{249}\)

Philostratus has given a brief description of Antipater’s position and downfall:

\(^{250}\) Ὅταν δὲ ἐγέρθησε καὶ ἐτάφη σῶκοι, λέγεται δὲ ἀποθανόντος ἡμῖν καὶ θεῶν διδάσκαλον ἐκαλοῦμεν αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἐπαίνοις τῆς ἀκροάσεως, ἀποθανόντος δὲ τοῦ νεωτέρου σφόν ἐπ’ αἰτία, ὡς τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἐπιβουλεύοι, γράφει πρὸς τὸν πρεσβύτερον ἐπιστολήν μονωθίαν ἐπέχουσαν καὶ θρήνον, ὡς εἰς μὲν αὐτῷ ὀφθαλμός ἢ δυοῖν, χείρ δὲ μία, καὶ οὕς ἐπαιδεύσεσθαι ὁπλα ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων αἱρεθαι, τούτως ἂλούς καὶ ἀλλήλων ἠμένους. ὧρ’ ὃν παροξυνθήναι τὸν βασιλέα μὴ ἀπιστῶμεν, καὶ γὰρ ἄν καὶ ἰδιώτην ταῦτα παρώξυνε βουλόμενον γε τὸ δοκεῖν ἐπιβεβουλεύοι μὴ ἄπιστεῖσθαι.\(^{251}\)

He also mentioned an episode concerning the private life of this sophist, showing a possible pattern of conduct among elite provincial men, although the entire episode sounds somewhat anecdotal. Philostratus says that, after Antipater became imperial secretary he wanted to arrange a marriage between his daughter, said to be very unattractive in appearance and a young sophist, Hermocrates of Phocaea.\(^{252}\) Hermocrates tried to avoid this replying that he could never become the slave of a large dowry and a father-in-law’s...

\(^{249}\) IEph 2026 II. 18-19.

\(^{250}\) The statement that “he showed himself too ready with the sword” and that “he was relieved of the office” almost certainly implies the use of excessive force during his mandate. It was highly unusual for a governor to be replaced during his mandate and it was probably the result of numerous complaints of provincial population to the Senate and the Emperor.

\(^{251}\) Philostr. *VS* II, 24.

\(^{252}\) His maternal grandfather was Attalus, son of the sophist Polemo and his father Rufinianus of Phocaea was man of consular rank, cf. Philostr. *VS* II, 25.
pomp. Only when the Emperor intervened, Hermocrates married the girl, but the marriage was soon dissolved.²⁵³

The social status of ancestors was one of the most important criteria for one’s individual position in the Roman society. We usually find ancestors of senators performing various high administrative and priestly duties. It could be argued that the father’s (or ancestor’s) position in the local imperial cult indeed played a positive role in helping a new provincial senator-to-be reach the order. Several of our senators had ancestors involved in the Imperial cult:

- L. Servenius Cornutus (PhS17), whose parents were archiereis of imperial cult
- T. Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus (LS9), whose family was of priestly origin in Sardis: ἱερεὺς τῆς Ἤρωμης
- M. Antonius Zeno (PhS3), whose more distant forefathers of the first century were involved in imperial cult in Asia and Phrygia
- T. Carminius Flavius Athenagoras Claudianus (PhS8), whose father was an asiarch
- Aelius Antipater (PhS1), whose grandfather P. Aelius Zeuxidemus Cassianus was asiarch in Hierapolis, Phrygia
- C. Iulius Philippus (LS11), whose grandfather was an asiarch and archiereus Asias in Tralleis
- T. Flavius Clitosthenes (LS6), whose father was asiarch in Ephesus
- C. Asinnius Nicomachus Iulianus (PhS5), whose father was ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς Ἀσιάς in 176 AD

Transformed religious ideas and rituals shaped how senators perceived their own roles and also how they tried to shape that of the emperor. The social category of the senate, their political powers, though restricted, and practiced religion were closely intertwined in the early empire. As we have seen senators from Lydia and Phrygia took part in religious activities in municipal cults as well as imperial ones.

4.3 Family ties

The research of B. Rémy on the marriages in Anatolian senatorial families shows that Lydian and Phrygian senators usually married women from similar senatorial families or descendants of earlier royal houses and local aristocracy, and all but one of these ladies came from Asia Minor. Most of them already had some connections with the clarissimi. Senators, of course, tended to marry their daughters into other senatorial families, as shown by the examples of L. Servenius Cornutus (PhS17) from Akmoneia, Celsus Polemaeanus (LS9) from Sardeis, T. Carminius Flavius Athenagoras Claudianus (PhS8) from Attouda, (Curtius Iulius ?) Crispus (LS10) from Lydia (probably Philadelphia) and C. Asinius Nicomachus Iulianus (PhS5) perhaps from Blaudos.

Most of the mentioned senatorial families were connected and related, as for example, C. Antius A. Iulius Quadratus from Pergamon. A part of his name could probably derive from a member of the known Ephesian family of Prytaneis and councilors, C. Antius Rufus. Quadratus’ sister, Iulia Polla was prytenant in Ephesus and married T. Flavius Apellas from Hypaipa (Lydia), agonothete in Ephesus. The mother of Iulia Polla (and probably of the aforementioned senator C. Antius A. Iulius Quadratus from Pergamon) was Iulia Tyche. She was attested in an inscription from Pergamon styled as prytenant and the priestess for life of Demeter and Kore, honored for her piety. There is also an inscription ...

254 Claudia Regilla, the wife of M. Antonius Antius Lupus (PhS2) from Laodikea on the Lykos, son of M. Antonius Zeno (PhS4), was from Athens. She was perhaps a daughter of Ti. Cl. Appius Atilius Bradua Regillus, cos. suff. 185 AD (CIL VI 1343; Rémy, 176).
256 Servenia Cornuta (or her daughter) married P. Calpurnius Proculus Cornelius cf. IGR III 192 (Ancyra).
257 Julia Quintilia Isaurica married Ti. Claudius Iulianus from Ephesos (I Eph 5016-5017).
258 Carminia Liviana Diotima married P. Attius Pudens, a senator from Ephesos (CIL XV 7424a).
259 PIR 2 C 1596; Two daughters: IGR IV 1623, TAM V1 273, TAM V3 1466.
260 Daughter (Asinia?) married to Sex. Cocceius Anicius Faustus Paulinus from Uzapa in Africa procos; after the name of many Anicii, notably M. Iunius Caesonnius Nicomachus Anicius Faustus Paulinus and Annius Anicius Iulianus, (PLRE, Paulinus, no. 17 and Iulianus, no.23), cf. Rémy, 188, n. 11.
261 I Eph 1013.
262 Relationship attested in I Eph 3034.
263 I Eph 989a.
264 I Eph 1122.
265 MDAl (A) 37 (1912), 298 nr. 24: [οι θεσμοθέται Ιουλίας Τύχης [πρύτανας και διά βίου ἱερείαν τῶν θε[σμο]φόρων θεόν. 69
from Koloe mentioning one Iulia Tyche. Assuming this is the same person, this could also mean the family had more elaborate connections in Lydia. A possible descendant of this illustrious Pergamene family was C. Iulius Quadratus, whose estate and slaves are indicated in Thermai Theseos in the 2nd century AD.

As one of the earliest attested senators L. Servenius Cornutus (PhS17) is also named in one inscription from Apollonia, we could perhaps link him to another Apollonian family of Cornuti. Other Cornuti, perhaps his relatives, were prominent at Apollonia in the first and second centuries AD. A small issue of bronze coinage was minted under Tiberius in the name of Κορνοῦτος εὐεργέτης. There is also an inscription of the first century AD honoring a certain C. Iulius Patruinus Cornutus φιλόπατρις and two fragments of an architrave block inscribed in both Greek and Latin recording the name of another Iulius Cornutus, identified by Mitchell as a prominent member of the local elite at Perge under Nero. In the second and third centuries AD the people of Apollonia celebrated games called the Αἰιεία Κορνουτεία, probably instituted under Hadrian.

---

267 TAM V1 71 (140/141 AD, Thermai Theseos).
268 Cf. MAMA XI 5.
269 RPC I 3528.
270 MAMA IV 163.
271 AE 1975, 812.
273 MAMA IV 154.
The Flavii Clitosthenes from Tralleis

(the family *stemma* taken from *PIR*² III, p. 144)
Another prominent family of Roman Lydia are Flavii Clitosthenes. Of the two earliest attested members of the family, almost nothing is known. They are T. Flavius Clitosthenes Claudianus and his son Clitosthenes Iulianus, both of them attested in a building inscription from Thera. This family exemplifies upward social mobility among the provincial elites of the Roman Empire. While the first two members were merely representatives of the municipal elite that relocated from one province to another, the grandson of the first Flavius Clitosthenes, T. Flavius Clitosthenes Iulianus was in the first ranks of the provincial elite in Asia as an asiarch and the priest of Zeus Larasios in Tralleis, and his son T. Flavius Clitosthenes (LS6) was already a member of the Senate and a consul suffectus around 220/230 AD. The latter married Ti. Claudia Frontoniana, a daughter of an ἀρχιερεύς 'Ασίας Ti. Claudius Frontonianus from Ephesos. Their two sons were both senators, as seen from IK Tralles 141 where their grandfather is styled πατρὸς ὑπαγορή θα[ι] πάπποι συνκλητικῶν. One of them, Ti. Flavius Stasicles Metrophanes (L7) was probably married to Claudia Capitolina, daughter of the consul and possible governor of the province of Asia, Claudius Bassus Capitolinus. Their sons, T. Flavius Cleitosthenes and T. Flavius Capitolinus are styled as οἱ κράτιστοι παῖδες.

One of the daughters of the Ephesian sophist Flavius Damianus was married to senator C. Iulius Philippus (L11) from Tralleis. Ephesus presented itself as a leading city of Asia and a cultural center and acted as a magnet for all the influential people from neighboring regions as well as the other provinces. The proximity of Aphrodisias and

---

274 V. family stemma on previous page.
275 IG XII, 3 325 (149 AD).
276 PIR² F 245; IK Tralleis 141.
277 PIR² F 243; IEph 635b; IK Tralleis 82;
278 PIR² C 1094; IEph 635b.
280 PIR² C 826, but also check PIR² C 814; IK Tralles 72; for possible governorship of the province of Arabia see ILS 9258 (Philadelphia, Arabia) and AE 1929, 171 (Philadelphia, Arabia).
281 IK Tralles 72.
282 CIG 2392; cf. PIR² I 458.
Attouda, just 20 km apart, brought the families of T. Flavius Athenagoras and M. Ulpius Carminius Claudianus together, creating thus a group of kinsmen in the Roman Senate. Whether their shared provenance led to some form of group identity or if there is a specific career pattern in forming alliances, it is difficult to say. A more detailed prosopographic study based on inscriptions and literary sources is desirable and may serve to complete the picture.

From the time of Trajan all the senators had to have a legal domicile in Italy and to transfer 1/3 of their fortune to Italy and invest in landed property. Epigraphic evidence shows us that they usually had households near Rome or in southern Latium, Calabria or Sicily. It is known that Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaenus (LS9) and T. Carminius Flavius Athenagoras Claudianus (PhS8) were domiciled in Rome, L. Antonius Albus (from Ephesus?) in Tusculum, M. Cassius Apronianus from Nikaia in Ostia and C. Asinius Nicomachus Iulianus (PhS5) in Drepanon on Sicily. Although their Roman domicile was not supposed to be merely a temporary lodging, many senators remained connected to their towns of origin in various ways, including serious financial interests there. As a rule, the ties with their native country were much stronger than those with Roman Italy as documented by inscriptions and can be seen from the numerous benefactions bestowed by senators on their hometowns.

---

283 Dig., I, 9, 11.
284 IG XIV 1966 = IGR I 338.
286 EE IX 686.
287 CIL XIV 4089, 26 = XV 2164.
288 IG XIV 283-284.
290 W. Eck, Emperor, Senate and Magistrates, CAH XI (2000), 223.
4.4 Senatorial women

As women were excluded from *patria potestas*, barred from the highest magistracies, and because they were not capable of acting under the Roman law, they eventually occupied roles that were not the most prominent ones. About this matter Ulpian wrote: *femianae ab omnibus officis civilibus vel publicis remotae sunt*. Women had no independent claim to rank; they derived their social rank from that of their nearest male relatives, from their father at birth or from their husband at marriage. Nevertheless, in Lydia and Phrygia they did hold certain public positions and always with a sense of performing worthy and socially desirable acts on the behalf of the community.

One of the first known eminent women and a mother of the earliest attested senator L. Servenius Cornutus (*PhS17*) was Iulia Severa from Akmoneia. She was a descendant of Galatian and Attalid royal houses. Iulia Severa is attested in multiple inscriptions from Akmoneia and Apollonia. She was honored by the *gerousia* of Akmoneia as a priestess and *agonothetes* of the imperial house, ἄρχιερας καὶ ἀγονοθήτιν τοῦ σύνταγματος τῶν ἑών Σεβαστῶν [οἴκου], on account of her virtues and her benefactions. Furthermore, she is attested as a benefactor of a local synagogue, together with Turronius Cladus and Lucius, son of Lucius, both of them ἄρχισυνάγωγοι. Finally, Iulia Severa is attested as an eponymous magistrate, together with Turronius Rapo (there seems to be no particular connection between Iulia Severa and him). Her husband, L. Servenius Capito, is attested on local coin issues as ἄρχιερεψ. As previously said, Servenia Cornuta, most probably the daughter of L. Servenius Cornutus, was probably married to a senator, P. Calpurnius Proculus Cornelianus from Ankyra as attested in *IGR* III 192. Some scholars mention the possibility that there are two women with the name Servenia Cornuta in Akmoneia, Apollonia and Ancyra. In that case, the one married to the Ancyran senator would be the

---

292 Ulpian, *Dig.*, L 17, 2.
293 *PIR²* I 701.
294 *MAMA* VI 263.
295 *MAMA* VI 264.
296 *MAMA* VI 265.
297 *PIR²* C 304-305.
298 *PIR²* S 569.
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daughter, Servenia Cornuta Cornelia Calpurnia Valeria Secunda Cotia (?) Procilla Porcia
Luculla Domna. Regardless, Servenia Cornuta is mentioned in two fragmentary
inscriptions, one engraved on the epistyle of a portico or colonnade in Apollonia, another
on a great tomb in Akmoneia.299 As other family members are also named, one could
presume that the building started in the time of Iulia Severa, and continued under her son
and granddaughter. However, the editors of MAMA XI are inclined to think that the
reconstruction of the architrave proposed in MAMA IV 139 cannot be correct. According to
previous editions, Iulia Severa and Servenius Cornutus dedicated a public building in
Apollonia to another member of their own family. They argue that this would be highly
unlikely: “public buildings could be dedicated to deities, to members of the imperial family,
to the local demos or other civic bodies (boule, gerousia), or to all three; the dedication of a
public building to a private individual would be without parallel,” so far.300 Following their
argumentation, there is no need to introduce Servenia Cornuta in this inscription and they
believe that Cornutus dedicated the monument ‘along with’ (σῶν) his mother Iulia Severa
and restore the text as:

Θε[οίς Σεβαστοίς καὶ τῷ δήμῳ Λ. Σερούνιος Κ]νξλν[ῦηνο ηακίαο δήκσκαίσλ ἐ]π αξρε

Even if we agree with the proposed restoration and the resulting conclusion, it
remains undeniable that Servenia Cornuta did exist and was an important member of
senatorial families in Akmoneia and Ancyra.

Some of the senatorial women are not necessarily mentioned in connection with the
male members of their families. Flavia Politta,301 attested in several inscriptions from Lydia
and Rome and, according to one opinion, even in the early Christian literature, seem to be a
benefactor and estate owner in her own right. Evidence concerning her position poses

299 MAMA IV 139 (Apollonia); MAMA VI 254 (Akmoneia).
300 http://MAMA.csad.ox.ac.uk/monuments/MAMA-XI-005.html (last accessed October 2014).
301 PIṚ F 434.
several problems that will be discussed briefly. The first known attestation of Flavia Politta is from Rome (discovered in 1891) in a fragment of the acta of the Secular Games of 204 AD (list of women supplicants from the senatorial order) as matronae Fl. Pollitta Manili.[302] At the time it seemed reasonable to assume that she was the wife of Manilius Fuscus, mentioned in the same inscription as magister of the quindecimviri in the year 203. There are also some possible attestations of their children.[303]

Next epigraphic attestation of Flavia Politta comes from funerary inscription in Apollonis (discovered in 1959 by P. Hermann) of one doulos pragmateutes, Eutychianus.[304] Apparently, Eutychianus was her estate manager. There is no mention of her husband and son; she seems to be the sole proprietor of this estate. In this inscription she is styled as ὑπαηηθή.

The third attestation of Flavia Politta is from the bath-gymnasium complex in Sardeis. She is mentioned as one of the benefactors, together with another woman of consular rank, Antonia Sabina.[305]


302 CIL VI 32329.

303 Manilia Lucana, presumably their daughter, is also mentioned in CIL VI 32329 as one of the singers; cf. PIR² M 144. Their son Manilius Fuscus was accompanying his father while he was legate in the province of Syria Phoenice, AE 1947, 178: Μανηλίου Φούσκου / Μανηλίου Φούσκου / ὑπατικοῦ νώ [ / Ηρώδης Σαραχοῦ; cf. also PIR² M 136-137; Eck supposes that the son could have died in the province, RE Suppl. XIV, 273 nr. 24a: Manilius Fuscus.

304 TAM V2 1213.

305 SEG XXXVI 1094; see also the edition of P. Hermann, Inschriften von Sardeis, Chiron 23 (1993), 233-248, and especially 235 n. 8.
Ἀντωνίας Σαβείνης ὑπατικῆς καὶ Φλαβίας Πολλίτης ὑ[πατικῆς / λο]γιστεύοντος Ι. Ἀντ. Κοδράτου Απανοῦ τοῦ κρατίστου

The inscription is dedicated to Caracalla, Geta and Iulia Domna and thus dated in 211 AD. We see that both women are credited for lavish decoration of the building and they are both styled ὑπατική.

In his monograph, Pagans and Christians, Robin Lane Fox made an intriguing suggestion that this Flavia Politta is also attested in early Christian literature.306 In Martyrdom of Pionius (Passio Pionii), a work set in the middle of the 3rd century Smyrna, we read about a certain woman, a “lawless Politta”307 living on the estate somewhere in the hills beyond Smyrna. This Politta abused her Christian slave Sabina with intention of forcing her to renounce her faith. The girl ran away and was temporarily saved by local Christians. About this Lane Fox writes:

“Politta is a name with a new and intriguing history. Up in the valleys northeast of Smyrna lies the lesser village (!) of Apollonis, a former colony of Macedonian soldiers who had been settled near modern Palamut. Recently, it threw up the inscription of a certain Eutychianus, business agent of a Flavia Politta. As the wife of a Roman citizen, she had come by an estate near Apollonis. This Flavia Politta, a Roman matron, is not unknown. She married Manilius Fuscus, a future governor of Asia, who may well have bought this estate while serving in the province, probably around the year 210. His origins have been traced tentatively to Spain, and he is known as a senator with strong views.”308

Lane Fox was convinced in the identification between our Flavia Politta from Lydia and this “lawless Politta” on following grounds: name Politta is supposedly very rare, location of the estate seemed fitting, and time of the event is within Politta’s lifetime. This is, undoubtedly, an attractive, if bold, theory but one with numerous difficulties. An especially convincing critique of Lane Fox’ conclusion is given by C. P. Jones. He pointed out that, in fact, none of the arguments brought forward in favor of the identification theory

---

307 M. Pion 9, 3: ἄνομος.
308 Lane Fox, Pagans, 463.
are very compelling. First of all, the argument based on the name frequency is a false one. It is a diminutive form of the very frequent Polla, but even if we consider the diminutive as a separate name it is not actually rare. The estate near Apollonis may seem to be close to Smyrna when viewed from a modern map. In reality, there is no direct line of access between Smyrna and Apollonis (a full polis community at this time, certainly not a “lesser village”), the ancient route ran around Mount Sipylus. In fact, Apollonis is better connected with Pergamon and Sardeis than Smyrna. Finally, there are chronological difficulties. In the beginning of the 3rd century Flavia Politta probably had a grown daughter in Rome involved in a procession during Secular games. If she was really identical with the “lawless” Politta she would be very old indeed in 250 AD. As we have previously seen, a senator C. Antius A. Iulius Quadratus of Pergamum, consul for the second time in 105 AD had a sister Iulia Polla, so perhaps this Politta might be in some way connected with the illustrious Pergamene family, especially as Apollonis was historically and geographically linked to Pergamon. Until some new evidence in support of it eventually emerges, this will remain an unproven assumption.

There is also a question of Politta’s husband career and official position in the province of Asia. Beyond any doubt, Manilius Fiscus was one of the most successful members of the senatorial order of the era. He was legatus legionis XIII geminae in Dacia in 191 AD, legatus Augusti pro praetore provinciae Syriæ Phœnicæ, and consul in 195/196. Much of the modern literature dealing with Severan senators claims him also to be the governor of Asia. This claim is almost certainly false. It originated with W. M. Ramsey in 1935 in his discussion on the previously published text of MAMA IV 27 from Prymnessos. Ramsey’s mistaken assumption was uncritically followed by many other authors and ultimately by works of reference such as the second edition of Prosopographia Imperii Romani and Pauly's Realencyclopädie from which it was disseminated even

310 CIL III 1172
311 IGLSyr VI 2776: Manil[iō] / Fusco leg(ato) Aug(usti) / pr(o) pr(aetore) prov(inciae) Phoe/nices, co(n)s(uli) leg(ato) / Aug(usti) pr(o) pr(aetore) prov(inciae).
312 W. M. Ramsey, Le thema Leontokomeös et le Kaystropedion de Xenophon, CRAI 1935, 131.
313 PIR M 137.
further. In most of these publications the text quoted by Ramsey is treated as identical to MAMA IV 27, although there is actually no mention of Manilius Fuscus in it.

Politta’s friend and other benefactor of the Sardian bath and gymnasium complex was Antonia Sabina. Her tomb inscription on a lavish sarcophagus from Sardes is also preserved: Κλ(αδίας) Αντ(ονίας) Σαβείνης ύπατικής.

Although the husband of Flavia Politta, Manilius Fuscus was a prominent figure in Rome during the reign of the Severan dynasty, and Claudia Antonia Sabina could have belonged to the distinguished family of M. Claudius P. Vedius Antoninus Sabinus from Ephesos, it seems safe to assume that these women owned some wealth and estates in their own right.

Another eminent woman from Lydia is Curtia Iulia Valentilla. She was the daughter of the senator (Curtius Iulius) Crispus and his wife Haruspicia Demo. Later on, she was highly likely married to the Philadelphian senator and legatus Augusti Asturiae et Callaedicae, T. Flavius Archelaos Claudianus.

Philadelphia seemed to be her hometown as attested in a fragmentary inscription: ... καὶ τῇ γυναικὶ ἅτη πατρίδι [. . . Ίούλια Οὐαλέντιλλα. Her siblings are also attested in the same town, her sister Priscilla and possible brothers, Aelius Verissimus and Aelius Maximus.
She is attested in two inscriptions from another Lydian region. The first one is from Thermai Theseos:325

Μητέρος ἀθανάτων Φρύγιον θάλος ἄγλαον Ἁτην / ἄντρο ἐνί ζαθέω, γείτονα Ναϊάδων / εἴδρυσεν κλείουσα Οὐαλέντιλλη ἐυπατέρεα / [ά]ξομέγη μακάρων ἄδιοι γένεσιν

It is a dedication by Valentilla to Attis in a sacred cave of Cybele. Here she is styled as εὐπατέρεα, a daughter of a nobleman.

The other inscription is from the nearby Tabala:326


Her marriage with T. Flavius Archelaos Claudianus (LS5) is possibly confirmed by an inscription from Katakekaumene mentioning their daughter Curtia Flavia Archelais Valentilla:327

Ὑπὲρ ὑγείας / καὶ σωτηρίας / τῆς κυρίας Κουρ/τίας Φλαούιας / Αρχελαίδος / Οὐαλλεντίλλης ὑπατικῆς

The daughter is here addressed as ὑπατική and κυρία just as her mother in the inscription from Tabala. Since the text from Tabala is very likely erected by a subordinate from the honorand’s estate, it is tempting to assume that this latter text comes from the same estate or from another in the same area, especially as Valentilla in TAM V1 73 could also be the daughter, Curtia Flavia Archelais Valentilla. There is also one more inscription that could be mentioning our Valentilla, kept in the Museo Maffeiano di Verona, of uncertain provenance and previously dated to the end 3rd or 4th century AD: [- - -]ε

325 TAM V1 73.
326 TAM V1 209.
327 SEG XLVI 1496.
Some senatorial women followed their husbands during their provincial careers: so Flavia Tiberina, most probably the wife of Claudius Stratonicus (PhS10) went to Germania Inferior with her husband, and Quintilia, the wife of Celsus Polemaeanus (LS9), probably followed her husband to Galatia. Flavia Tiberina, while her husband was on duty in Germania inferior as an imperial legate, made an offering to the Matronae Aufaniae pro salute sua.

4.5 Wealth and benefactions

The status of senatorial class was defined as a legal category, but their most recognizable trait, at least as far the outside observer is concerned, was their wealth. It is hardly a coincidence that the families which attained a position of social and official prominence included men of great wealth. The tradition, ideology and social status all required of senators to be landowners. Thus, the origin of wealth for most Anatolian senatorial family was probably primarily agrarian too. Nevertheless, we know that there were significant exceptions and that some members of the senatorial families engaged in other professions. For example, M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus (LS4) and Aelius Antipater (PhS1) were rhetors. Not surprisingly, the origin and extent of their wealth is not explicitly mentioned in the inscriptions. As we have seen, senatorial families had many estates in different parts of the province. The Pergamene family of Quadrati had estates in Phrygia and Lydia. Severi from Ancyra had estates in Phrygia and Pamphylia.
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328 SEG XXXI 1658; also in R. Merkelbach, J. Stauber, Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten, Stuttgart 1998, 451 no. 04/15/02 (non vidi).
330 M.-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier, Epouses et familles de magistrats dans le province romaines, Historia 31-1 (1982), 66 nr. 370; Flavia Politta is also on this list (nr. 365) accompanying her husband while in Asia, although, as we have seen, there is no explicit evidence for his governorship of this province.
331 AE 1930, 30 (184–6 AD, Bonna): Matronis | Aufaniabus | pro salute sua | Fla(via) Tiberina | Cl(audii) Stratonacci | [l]egat[is] [Aug]ust[i] [l]eg(ionis) I M(inerviae) P(iae) F(idelis) v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).
332 MAMA I 24 (Laodikeia Katakeumene); Sitz. Ber. Wien 265 (1969), 57 nr. 13 (Koloe); TAM V 71 (Thermai Theseos).
There are just three inscriptions mentioning slaves of senatorial families in Lydia and Phrygia. There is one Leontas, a slave of Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaenus (LS9) in Rome and Dadouchos, doulos pragmateutes of C. Iulius Philippus (LS11) in Trralleis. Another doulos pragmateutes, Eutychianus, is mentioned as a slave of Flavia Politta in an inscription from Apollonis.

A number of inscriptions honored the senators for benefactions either to their hometown or the one close to their family history.

Ti. Iulius Aquila Polemaeanus (LS8) may have dedicated the well-known library in Ephesos to his father Celsus Polemaeanus but also made a new cultural center for everyone in the city. The most important information about this benefaction is given in the foundation of the library inscription:


333 IGUR II 913.
334 IK Tralles 194.
335 TAM V2 1213.
336 IEph 5101, 5113.
337 IEph 5113.
As we can see from the inscription, the family bestowed 25,000 denarii for the library. From that sum, 2000 denarii were spent during one year and the yearly income based on the remaining 23,000 should be used for the maintenance of the library. New books ought to be bought every year. Also Celsus’ statues should be decorated three times a year and all other statues should be decorated every year on the birthday of Celsus.

Construction of the library began in 117 and was completed in 120 AD. Judging by the ceramics in the aisles behind the southern book closets, the building seems to have been destroyed in the second half of the 3rd century AD. Either the well-known earthquake of 262 AD had made it unusable, or the Goths who plundered the defenseless city of Ephesos shortly afterwards had set fire to the library. Only the facade survived. About 400 AD, the library was transformed into a Nymphaeum. The facade was completely destroyed by a later earthquake, likely in the late Byzantine period.

The style of the library, with its ornate, balanced, well-planned facade, reflects the Greek influence on Roman architecture. The library's marble facade rises with nine steps to 17 m height, with a width of 21 m, leading up to three front entrances. The center entrance is larger than the two flanking ones, and all are adorned with windows above them. Before the entrance wall, there are four pairs of columns on pedestals with composite capitals. The middle one of the three portals is wider and higher, and has a richly decorated frame like the other two. Above them are windows: a small one above the middle entrance, a larger one above each of the lower side entrances. The Corinthian upper floor columns are lower and thinner than those downstairs, they also stand further apart. There is only a hall of about 14.50 m by 9.50 behind this colossal facade, and there are no adjoining rooms except for an apse in the middle of the back wall. The building's other sides are irrelevant architecturally because the library was flanked by buildings. The inside of the building, not fully restored, was a single rectangular room (measuring 17x11 m) with a central apse framed by a large arch at the far wall. Celsus’ tomb lay directly below in a vaulted chamber, in the main entrance which is both a crypt containing his sarcophagus and a
sepulchral monument to him. It was unusual to be buried within a library or even within city limits, so this was a special honor for Celsus.

Since no traces of stairs are to be found, the library attendants can only have reached the podium by mobile wooden steps and from this arrived on the next gallery level by ladders and through hatches. In any case we have thirty wall cabinets which housed *rotuli*, perhaps also already codices or other documents. It is pointless to speculate how many book rolls the library might have held at its best time. Since we do not know how high the upper cabinets were, how many wooden shelves they contained, and whether the rolls had to be kept in rows or heaps, the theoretically calculated number of 12,000 cannot be confirmed. It is also unclear whether the cabinets have ever been full.

Four pedestals, which were preserved and put up again on the upper floor, bore bronze statues that are also lost. According to the detailed inscriptions, they were three honorary statues of Celsus and one of Aquila. Two of them were donated by Celsus’s daughter Iulia Quintilia Isaurica,\(^{338}\) two by her son, Celsus’s grandson, Tiberius Claudius Iulianus,\(^{339}\) who had already become a *praetor*. Celsus Polemaeanus is honored both as a Greek and a Roman; the library itself may have had a similar dual character, recalling twin libraries of Trajan in Rome.\(^{340}\)

We unfortunately do not know the annual salary of the (two or three?) librarians, or the budget for the acquisition of new books. Their annual salary must have been about 400 denarii. As the library was important, and if there was not enough money in the foundation fund, the city of Ephesos must have contributed books or money.

Another elaborate and illustrative example is the following inscription from Aphrodisias (Caria) honoring Marcus Ulpius Carminius Claudianus\(^{341}\) from Attouda, the father of the senator T. Carminius Flavius Athenagoras Claudianus (*PhS8*):\(^{342}\)

\(^{338}\) *IEph* 5104 and 5105.

\(^{339}\) *IEph* 5106.


\(^{341}\) Zuiderhoek presumes he was an equestrian cf. Zuiderhoek, 8.

\(^{342}\) *IAph*2007 12.1111.
ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Αφροδισιέων καὶ ἡ γερουσία / Μάρ(κον) Οὐλ(πιον) Καρ(μίνιον)
Κλαυδιανὸν ὑδν Καρ(μίνιον) Κλαυδιανοῦ / Ἀσίας ἀρχιερέως πάππου καὶ προπάππου συν-/κλητικῶν τειμηθέντα ἐν πολλοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων ἄνδρα Φλ(αβίας) Ασφίας
ἀρχιερείας / Ἀσίας μητρὸς καὶ ἁδελφῆς καὶ μάμμης συνκλη/tικῶν φιλοπάτρηδος θυγατρὸς τῆς πόλεως καὶ / Φλ(αβίου) Ἀθηναγόρου ἐπιτρόπου Σεβαστοῦ πατρὸς καὶ / πάππου καὶ προπάππου συνκλητικῶν αὐτὸν ἀρχιερέως τῆς Ἀσίας ὑδν πατέρα Καρ(μίνιον)
He is praised as a distinguished member of an illustrious family, who donated around 110,000 denarii to Aphrodisias, his wife’s hometown. He established an endowment to provide the priestly crown and votive offerings in perpetuity, gave money to the city for the seats in the theatre and a reconstruction of a street; with personal funds he built a room in the gymnasium of Diogenes, supplied sculptures and statues at his own expense as well as white-marble pillars, established an endowment for the distribution of honoraria to the boule and gerousia, often made donations to city inhabitants and to those living in the countryside and made other gifts on various occasions. He also carried out embassies and in the end is called εὐεργέτης and φιλόσωτρος. Thanks to an inscription honoring M. Ulpius Carminius Claudianus we have a detailed insight in the nature of grand benefactions.

As we have seen from these examples, the grandest benefactions were in the largest centers in the area, Ephesos and Aphrodisias. Among the evidence on private benefactions in Lydia and Phrygia, most inscriptions speak in rather vague terms mentioning benefactors but not their specific deeds. L. Servenius Cornutus (PhS17) is honored as εὐεργέτης in Akmoneia, and in Sardeis Celsus Polemaeanus (LS9) is styled εὐεργέτης and σωτήρ. C. Asinius Protimus Quadratus (PhS6) was εὐεργέτης in Ephesos and his son C. Asinius Nicomachus Iulianus (PhS5) εὐεργέτης and κτίστης of Blaundos. As far as I know there is only one lavish building benefaction in Lydia explicitly named in an inscription, namely, the part of the bath-gymnasium complex in Sardeis, a benefaction by Flavia Politta and Antonia Sabina. M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus (L4) was honored by the tanners (οἱ βουρσεῖς) and gardeners (οἱ κηπουροί) in Thyateira for his many deeds and buildings, as well as for leading many embassies to the imperial court. Perhaps he also provided
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343 MAMA VI 262.
344 I. Sardis 45.
345 I Eph 3040.
346 CIG 3866 = IGR IV 717.
347 SEG XXXVI 1094.
348 SEG XLVII 1656 II.11-18: προσβεύσατα πολλάκις πρὸς τούς / αὐτοκράτορας καὶ πάντα τὰ δίκαια / τῷ πατρίδι καταστάσαντα τὸν / λαμπρότατον ὑπατικὸν διὰ τε / ἀφθονίαν τροφῶν καὶ ἐργῶν πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων κατασκευῶν κοι/νή τε καὶ κατά ἐνα εὐεργέτην / οἱ κηπουροί.
financial help to those guilds and industry. He is styled κτίστης and εὐεργήτης of his homeland by the tanners.\textsuperscript{349}

Many other inscriptions give us an idea of the size and nature of benefactions by wealthy individuals, so we can presume that the senators acted in the same fashion. Most of them donated various religious structures, stoas, baths or gymnasia or gave contributions for festivals and money distributions to city officials and citizens.\textsuperscript{350} Their relatives served as civic magistrates as did their ancestors and in that way the senatorial families had an impact on everyday life in their native communities. In their native provinces senators and their families were always present through their monuments; they were praised as good patriots, and financial euergetai.\textsuperscript{351} New senators also had relations with their homeland, at least during the first generation. It is interesting to note the close relations of local dignitaries of the Greek East in the Senate but further connections were severed during the second generation.\textsuperscript{352}

An interest in one’s place of origin as a final resting place is attested for both the Western and Eastern provinces of the empire. Most of these provincial burials, while giving due representation of the particular rank achieved by the member of the ordo senatorius, seem either to have followed local religious habits or, more often, to have pushed potential grand-scale self-representation to the limit. Thus the funerary monuments suggest not only that new senators did keep up strong ties with their original provinces and the religion practiced there (contrary to the restrictions about their obliged residence and landownership in Italy), but also that senators may have sought out those connections because the potential for display was greater there. Rather remarkably, some of the commemorations also share important characteristics with euergetism. The best example is the particular combination of the commemorative and euergetistic aspects in the Celsus library in Ephesus, as the heroon dedicated in memory of the elder Polemaeanus by his son, Ti. Iulius Aquila

\textsuperscript{349} TAM V2 986: Μ. Γνυϊον Λικίνιον / Ῥουρφίον τῶν λαμπρότατων / ὑπατικῶν, φίλων τοῦ / Σεβαστοῦ, κτίστην / κ(α) ἐφεργέτην τῆς / πατρίδος / οἱ βουσαῖς.
\textsuperscript{350} Zuiderhoek, op. cit., 71-112.
\textsuperscript{351} Cf. also G. Alföldy, Örtliche Schwerpunkte der medialen Repräsentation römischer Senatoren, in: W. Eck, M. Heil (Hg.), Senatores populi Romani. Realität und mediale Präsentation einer Führungsschicht, Stuttgart 2005, 53-71
\textsuperscript{352} S. Demougin, L’ordre équestre sous les Julio-Claudiens, Rome 1988, 644 n. 228.
Polemaenus (LS8): the sarcophagus of T. Iulius Celsus Polemaenus (cos.suff. in 92) from Sardeis stood in the middle, flanked by two equestrian statues, one with a Greek commemorative inscription, the other with a Latin one, while his four main philosophical virtues, as statues, decorated the façade of the library. He selected four main virtues, σοφία, ἀρετή, εὔνοια and ἐπιστήμη, offering an example of the elite use of philosophical virtue language in a clearly religious perspective. Two other senators buried in their places of origin were L. Servenius Cornutus (PhS17) buried in a heroon in Akmoneia and T. Flavius Claudianus Ponticus (PhS13) (senator from the period of Commodus or Severi), buried in Dorylaion in Phrygia, probably also in heroon.357

4.6 Conclusion

The senatorial families living in Lydia and Phrygia were not numerous. The senators were usually away due to their military and political career and their immediate family followed. Nevertheless, their influence was evident, their connections important; relatives mention illustrious kinsmen in the inscriptions,358 citizens praise them and it seems they remained associated with their homeland. Ones who had gained admittance to the elite of the empire maintained their ties with their own cities and acquired ties with others who wished to have them as patrons.

The very appearance of the senatorial families in Lydia and Phrygia had a wider social significance. In a way, this feature can be seen as the definitive indication of the successful process of Romanization: a distant and comparatively isolated provincial community provides members of the Senate. From this point on, as far the ruling elite are concerned, Lydia and Phrygia were successfully and fully integrated in the Roman world.

353 IEph 5108: σοφία Κέλσου.
354 IEph 5109: ἀρετή Κέλσου.
355 IEph 5110: εὔνοια Κέλσου.
356 IEph 5111: ἐπιστήμη Κέλσου.
357 SEG XXVI 1373; cf. also SEG XXXVI 1193.
The earliest senator, attested in Phrygia during Nero’s reign, L. Servenius Cornutus, was descendant of the Galatian and Attalid royal houses on his mother’s side and most probably of the Italian descent on his father’s side. Although both parents were wealthy and influential (both were involved in the imperial cult) and royal ancestry was hugely important, it was the Italian descent that made Cornutus acceptable in the Senate during this early period. It seems that unions between wealthy Italian colonists or merchants and royal descendants from Asia Minor compensated what each side lacked in the first place. All senators from Lydia and Phrygia originated from Asia Minor. Marriages were an indicator and important factor of social mobility in their class. Our senators married among other illustrious senatorial families from the region. Only one attested senatorial spouse is not from Asia Minor, Claudia Regilla, probably from Athens, was the wife of M. Antonius Antius Lupus. The geographically close marriages were not uncommon among elite families as we have seen from the research of Rémy and Raepsaet-Charlier. It seems that almost 77% of attested senatorial marriages were concluded locally or regionally.\(^{359}\)

What were the factors of elevation of local families into the senatorial ranks? As far as the evidence from Lydia and Phrygia is concerned, there seems to be a complex dynamics of causes at work. Ambition of the wealthy local families is one very obvious aspect but insufficient in itself. The material requirements for fulfilling the political and social role of a senator were tremendously high even by the standards of the wealthy local landowners. Only a handful of the richest families in both Lydia and Phrygia were prosperous enough to even consider the possibility of such grand social advancement. But aspirations, possessions and abilities of the local notables is only one side of the process. Far more important element is the imperial policy itself. The emperors were in the position to choose whoever they preferred from a vast pool of possible candidates from all corners of the Empire. This factor alone is enough to explain considerable fluctuations regarding the origin of the new senators. For a long time during the Early Empire, senators originating from the province of Asia, and eastern senators generally were only a minority among the *hominem novi* in the Senate. This changed significantly in the later 2\(^{nd}\) century when imperial policy began to favor the easterners. This was not only due to the personal

---

\(^{359}\) Rémy, op. cit, 180, especially n. 30.
desires and impulses of a particular emperor, but was largely dictated by the current circumstances and the genuine need to obtain both capable and loyal personal to fulfill the requirements of military leadership and administration.

How significant was the number of senators from Lydia and Phrygia and how does it compare to the other regions of Asia, and to the other provinces of the Empire? Judging by the Halfmann’s studies there were roughly 200 senators from the eastern provinces during the first three centuries AD. Most of them originated from the province of Asia, more than 120 of them. This is not surprising considering the well known facts about the population, wealth and level of development of this province. The greatest majority of them came from great cities in the western part of the province. Only a quarter of these are from Lydia and Phrygia, 12 and 18 respectively. It was not only a sign of the level of integration of particular region into the Roman Empire, but also an indication of its comparative importance in it. However, we have to bear in mind the fragmentary nature of our evidence. Epigraphic monuments that mention senators are only a fraction of once existing inscriptions. We really cannot make any definitive assumptions about the total number of senatorial families in Lydia and Phrygia. Also, since our epigraphic sample is purely coincidental, any comparison with other areas as well as any form of statistical analysis is of only relative value. Any conclusion based on it would be necessarily hypothetical by nature.

Leaving that aside, comparison between the number of senators in Lydia and Phrygia with that of the known senators from the other eastern provinces leads to some intriguing and, perhaps, surprising conclusions. Simply, numbers that seem modest when compared with multitude of senators from province of Asia, when measured against the other eastern provinces, suddenly appear exceptionally high. For example, the Greece proper (province of Achaea) was the homeland of 21 senators in total, significantly more than Lydia but only slightly more than Phrygia. A province of major strategic and economic importance such as Syria provided only 16 senators by the 3rd century AD, still less than the larger of the two Anatolian regions. Egypt and Cyrenaica were homelands of only 8, which is less even than what is know for Lydia. Of course, these numbers can easily lead us astray, even if assume that they represent the actual historical situation accurately.
Conjectures of the relative importance of certain regions or provinces, based on these figures, will almost certainly be wrong, even if assume that importance is assessed only from purely Roman perspective. Lydia and Phrygia were certainly not more important than, for example, Syria or Greece (as they combined numbers would suggest), no more then the province of Asia was more important for Romans then all the other eastern provinces taken together. Eastern senators themselves were only a small minority in the imperial Senate and their number does not do justice to actual significance of the eastern provinces. That said, it is still significant that these two Anatolian regions were places of origin of so many of them. If anything, we can well conclude that these regions were fully integrated into Roman Empire, with various personal connections that linked them to the capital.

As we have seen the number of known senators from Phrygia is, so far, significantly larger than those from Lydia. This, perhaps surprising disparity can be explained using the third factor we singled out earlier. Most of the Phrygian senators are attested in the 2nd century, during the reign of one particular emperor, Commodus. Thus, the policy of Commodus led to creation of several new senatorial families in Phrygia. Nevertheless, he was also responsible for the downfall and death of one Phrygian senator, M. Antonius Antius Lupus. It is significant to notice that Antius Lupus was from the illustrious family from Laodikeia on the Lykos that provided senators from two prior generations (his grandfather and father). This case confirms the reputation of Commodus as hostile towards old senatorial families.

A person entering the Senate was expected to permanently change the status of his family. The family of Antius Lupus was hardly the only one with senatorial membership encompassing several generations. As we can see from tables 1 and 2, this, so called “father-son” group, is attested 4 times in Lydia and Phrygia, mostly in the 3rd century AD: T. Carminius Flavius Athenagoras Claudianus (PhS8) and his son M. Flavius Carminius Athenagoras Livianus (PhS12) (originated from Attouda), M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus (LS4) and Cn. Licinius Rufinus (LS3) from Thyateira, C. Asinius Protimus Quadratus (PhS6) and C. Asinius Nicomahus Iulianus (PhS5) (perhaps from Blaundos) and T. Flavius Clitosthenes (LS6) and T. Flavius Stasicles Metrophanes (LS7) from Tralleis. And we
could also add the family of Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaenus (Ls9), of Lydian origin, who gave 4 senators.

These are some clear examples of hereditary principle regarding senatorial families from Lydia and Phrygia. Such, in fact, was the prestige attached to the senators that kinship with them became a source of great pride, and the laudatory inscriptions of members of their families include such honors a "father of a senator" or "a consular," "mother and grandmother" or "grandfather and great-grandfather of senators," "cousin and uncle of senators and consuls." Hereditary nature of senatorial positions is a feature common to elites throughout the Empire. This point was made in an important article by Alföldy: “As to the descendants of consuls, the following rather surprising statement may be made, as far as I know not yet stated explicitly for the imperial period: the consulate was, as in the Republic, hereditary; that means, the son of a consular, in the event that he reached the requisite age, could in principle automatically count on the consulship”. Afterwards, according to the most studies, the Roman senatorial order became and for a long time remained a hereditary aristocracy. The son (or sons) of a senator had not only the right, but also the obligation to follow in his father's footsteps into the Senate, provided he had at least the legally prescribed wealth. The exalted social status of the father resulted not only in the son's promotion to the office, but also in the speed with which he rose. It seems that the sons of suffect consuls achieved the office approximately five to ten years later than the sons of ordinarii.

A question why there weren’t more provincial senatorial families that lasted more than two or three generations still remains. Hopkins argued that politically successful fathers may have been unable to launch their son or sons into politics and in that way success might not secure succession. But one could also argue that the reduction of social inheritance among consular families to the father-son relationship causes a serious misrepresentation of the social realities. Some authors consider that Hopkins' suggestion that particularly the sons of consuls who came from provincial families will have
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361 J. Hahn, P. M. M. Leunissen, Statistical Method and Inheritance of the Consulate under the Early Roman Empire, Phoenix 44-1 (1990), 68.
withdrawn from political life is especially implausible. It is possible that the expectations of their fellow hometown citizens would have fallen heavily on their shoulders - to remain at Rome, to build up and also try to use their political connections in the service of their *patriae* as patroni. It is hardly imaginable that the political ambitions of newly prominent provincial families would have been satisfied after the success of just one generation. One should have in mind that the generations of fathers and grandfathers of the old senatorial families from Italy can be traced back through considerably better attested chronological data. The situation was probably somewhat different for newly risen families of provincial origin. The possible family histories in Rome of those who only recently became consuls, as regards statistics, still reside in prosopographic obscurity.

Surviving evidence allows for some conclusions about the significance of their ancestral towns and regions for these families. It is beyond doubt that initial wealth of Lydian and Phrygian senators was entirely local, most probably (although direct evidence for the most cases is lacking) in form of the large estates. Few examples that we have, testify that their political and social influence developed gradually and naturally from within very local boundaries to the wider provincial level and then, for those who were fortunate enough, to the level of entire Empire. Did their place of origin preserve any significance for these men, after they entered the ranks of senatorial elite? It needs to be remembered that careers in imperial service invariably led them not only to Rome and Italy but also to every other corner of the Empire. It was also expected of senators (and, from the time of Trajan, obligatory for them) to settle in Italy and thus to transfer a significant part of their assets to Rome or Italy.

In spite of these reservations, the answer to this question seems to be overwhelmingly positive. The connections between senators and their Anatolian homeland remained important both for senators and the local communities, as we can see from the continual benefactions and honors offered in return. The reasons for preservation of these connections are not explicitly stated anywhere in existing sources, but it can be assumed with reasonable degree of certainty. Firstly, most of them must have remained in possession
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of substantial possessions and sources of income in their places of origin, even if they
invested heavily in Italian land. Secondly, even as senators, they drew a significant power
from the very fact that they still had a measure of public and political influence in the
province and the regions from whence they came. As third point we ought to mention sheer
public prestige, never an insignificant factor for the ruling aristocracies in the Graeco-
Roman world. Finally, one should not rule out more human, emotional factors such as the
sentimental connection these people might have felt towards the places where they were
born and raised.

But connections with their *origo* are commonplace for the most provincial senators.
Are there any features that would single out senators of Anatolian origin among their peers?
Based on the available evidence the answer would be a confident “no”. It is almost striking
how typical and unremarkable their careers were, without so much a trace of any particular
“Lydian” or “Phrygian” characteristic. They followed the usual *cursus honorum*, sought
imperial patronage and support and, once enrolled in Senate, performed any duty required
of them. Their family members fit dutifully into the same Roman mold, diligently
supporting their fathers, husbands, brothers and sons in their role of the elite members of
Roman society. At least in their outward, public aspect these people became Romans to a
degree unconvinced of by their fellow-countrymen. However, it would be a mistake to
assume that the picture presented by the evidence we have (i.e. public inscriptions) is the
whole truth. Trough media of public inscriptions we perceive the members of senatorial
elite *exactly as they wanted to be perceived*, but hardly as they truly were. Above all, they
wanted to be seen as rightful and typical members of the senatorial order. In this respect,
too much emphasis on their distinctiveness and local tradition and features was undesirable
and was to be avoided in official Roman context. Once again, the nature (as well as
quantity) of preserved sources set limits to what we can actually learn.

Still, if any inhabitants of the imperial Lydian and Phrygia can be described as fully
“romanized” they are the members of senatorial and equestrian families. Even during the
Antonine Empire, when aptitude for all things Greek flourished, accepting a number of
distinctly Roman features was a requisite for the highest members of ruling class in the
eastern provinces. Once taken to be the indisputable aspect of the Roman culture and
imperial policy, romanization is nowadays treated as a highly problematic concept and debates about it validity and proper usage are frequent. But, setting this endless debate aside, and accepting a more focused and manageable definition of “romanization”, for example the one which treats this phenomenon simply as a degree of successful integration into the Roman Empire, we can still speak of “romanization” of, at least, upper stratum of society in Roman Lydian and Phrygia. Indeed, by any criteria or aspect we choose to judge, the romanization fades as we descend down the social ladder. Only senators and equestrians were romanized in any real sense and only among them we may assume any widespread usage of Latin language. Apart from the descendants of the Roman colonists in the East, this cannot be inferred even for the members of municipal elite, let alone for the social groups of a more humble status.
5. PROVINCIAL AND MUNICIPAL ELITE

Only a very small fraction of elite families in Roman Anatolia achieved senatorial rank. But even the smallest community with the status of polis had a number of families who were separated from the rest of population by their wealth, their social status and their role in public affairs. Although there is no evidence that ordinary citizens were formally banned from occupying higher public offices or, indeed, being member of the local councils, only the members of wealthiest families are actually recorded doing so in the first three centuries AD. For every intent and purpose, the urban communities of imperial Lydia and Phrygia were governed by these narrow elites.

Fabulously rich by the standards of the mass of urban population, most of these families could not realistically hope ever to obtain senatorial rank. This is not to say that the majority of them were satisfied with strictly local ambitions. As the following pages will show, they too made considerable efforts to be seen and accepted as a part of larger Roman world. By the 2nd century AD most of these families acquired Roman citizenship. They sought and built connections on the local, provincial and, if possible, imperial level. They acted as emissaries of their cities in the provincial bodies, and as envoys before representatives of Rome (and sometimes before the emperor himself). And, while senatorial rank always remained the ultimate goal of personal aspirations, many could satisfy their ambition by entering imperial service and, in time, becoming members of equestrian order.
5.1 Equestrian order

When the equestrian order is mentioned in an inscription, it is usually an indication of a rank bestowed by the Emperor. The equestrian order never constituted one united political formation, and its political interventions are rarely unanimous, but it was one of the fundamental structures in civil, social and political hierarchy. There should be a clear distinction between the equestrians in a proper military sense during the Roman Republic (and later) and *ordo* as a social structure, the individuals who had enough money to qualify for that status in the Roman Empire. Since the time of Augustus the equestrian order seems to be of heterogenic structure with internal stratification and contrasts, but it was also the factor for dynamic rejuvenation of elites, thus reinforcing its place in the social system.\(^{363}\) It was argued that there were many knights who, although lacking the *equus publicus*,\(^{364}\) nevertheless had a legitimate claim to equestrian title on the simple grounds that they possessed the equestrian census and were of citizen status and descent.\(^{365}\) That would mean that *hones equestri censu* were given an official position of honor and a measure of political influence but probably not the right to a public horse.\(^{366}\)

The majority of equestrian promotions seem to have been honorific and brought an enlargement of the privileged classes where future administrators might be recruited as both senators and equestrians could transform their official position into social prestige and pass this on to their successors.\(^{367}\)

For the military equestrians Devijver presented the pyramid of *militiae equestres*, which was the rule in the middle of the second century\(^{368}\):

---


\(^{364}\) The term *equus publicus* or in Greek, ἵππος δημόσιος, is not frequently attested in Asia Minor: *IEph* 3048 (Ephesus, 123/148 AD), *IK Prusias ad Hypium* 54, Bosch, *Quellen Ankara* no. 158 (Ankyra, 155 AD), *IGR* III 778 (Attaleia, 138 AD), *SEG* XVII 584 (Attaleia, 2\(^{nd}\) century AD) and only once in Phrygia, in Aizanoi *SEG* LII 1251: ἵππος Ῥωμαϊὸν ἵππω δημόσίῳ.


Militia I: *praefectus cohortis quingenariae/tribunus cohortis voluntariorum* – about 300 posts.

Militia II: *tribunus militum legionis augusticlavius/tribunus cohortis milliariae* – about 190 posts.

Militia III: *praefectus alae quingenariae* – about 90 posts.

Militia IV: *praefectus alae milliariae* – about 9 posts.

We can say that only few equestrians could be promoted in the four *militiae* system.

Proportion of *procuratores* originated from Asia Minor rose in the period of Vespasian and Trajan for 12%, and that trend continued from Hadrian to Commodus.\(^{369}\) On the other hand, Hadrian also created a possibility of the civil (non-military) equestrian career by introducing the office of *advocatus fisci* to many. As we can see in tables 3 and 4,\(^{370}\) most (more than a half) of attested equestrians from Lydia and Phrygia are from the 3\(^{rd}\) century, with only three equestrians being securely from the 1\(^{st}\) century AD.

Discussing an equestrian from Sagalososs in Pisidia, H. Devijver outlined three preconditions for the membership in the new aristocracy: wealth (*facultates*); education in the Greek liberal arts (*paideia*); and munificence within the framework of the *polis* (*euergesia*). As previously said, the minimum requirement was 400000 sesterces for the equestrian order– with all applications to be registered in Rome and subject at all time to review by the emperor. The second condition, that one had to be Hellenized before becoming Romanized, implies a far deeper cultural significance than the possession of mere wealth. Nevertheless it was the wealth that best assured the privilege of a good education and best predispositions. But, it was *paideia*, with the sense of identity that made possible belief in and loyalty to the empire.\(^ {371}\)


\(^{370}\) Although I have to stress that tables 3 and 4 consist only of those whose position, title and equestrian status are specifically stated in the inscriptions. We have to note that a very limited number of the known provincial high-priests of Asia are known to have belonged to the equestrian order, cf. S. Demougin, *L’ordre équestre en Asie Mineure*, 579-612. On the other hand, if we consider Zuiderhoek’s assumption that almost all *asiarchs* and *archereis Asias* are of the equestrian status we should also take table 5 and 6 into the account.

The earliest attested equestrian is from Phrygia, L. Antonius Zeno (PhE 6 and PhAA 7) from Laodikeia on the Lykos. He was a member of a Laodikeian elite family to which also the famous sophist M. Antonius Polemon (first half of the 2nd century AD) belonged. The family descended from the rhetor Zenon, probably the great-grandfather of the honorand. As Strabo inform us, when the Parthian army in 40 BC, led by the rebel Roman general Labienus attacked Laodikeia, the defence was organized by Zenon and his son Polemo. As a reward for his courageous deeds, the following year Polemo was established as tetrarch in parts of Lycaonia and Rough Cilicia; in 37 or 36 BC he was transferred to the kingship of Pontus. The family also received Roman citizenship from Marcus Antonius.

L. Antonius Zeno is attested in two inscriptions from Phrygia. In one from Antonia Salbake he is designated as a military tribune of legio XII Fulminata in Syria awarded the “royal purple” (βασιλικὴ πορφυραφορία), an unprecedented symbolic honor awarded by Augustus, either because of his kinship with Pontic dynasty or in his capacity of a provincial high-priest of the emperor cult.


He subsequently returned to Asia, became archiereus Asias during Tiberius’ reign and is attested as eponymous priest of Laodikeia on the coins from the period of Claudius-

---

372 cf. family stemma on the next page.
373 Strabo 14.2.24: οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι μεθ’ ὅπλων ἐπινότι καὶ Παρθικῆς συμμαχίας, ἡδὲ τῶν Παρθοναίων τὴν Ἀσίαν ἑρχόταν, ἐξαν ἀλλ’ ἄλλοι καὶ εἰρηνικοὶ: Ζήνων δὲ οἱ Λαοδικεῖοι καὶ Ὑβρέας οὐκ ἔμειναν, ἀμφότεροι ρήτορες, ἀλλὰ ἀπέστησαν τὰς εαυτῶν πόλεις.
374 Strabo 12.8.16: Ζήνων δὲ ὁ ῥήτωρ ὑπερέκορ καὶ οὐκ ἄλλοι πολέμων, ὡς καὶ βασιλείας ἥξιωθε διὰ τὰς ἀνδραγαθίας ὑπ’ Ἀντωνίου μὲν πρώτον ὑπὸ Καίσαρος δὲ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ μετὰ ταῦτα.
375 SEG XXXVII 855 (Apollonia Salbake).
Nero.\textsuperscript{376} He was the first with this characteristic career pattern: single equestrian \textit{militia}, followed by provincial high priesthood and various civic duties. He was, undoubtedly, a very influential person with family connections all over Asia Minor. According to two fragmentary inscriptions and possible reconstructions, L. Antonius Zenon (\textsc{phE} 6 and \textsc{phaa} 7) was also honored in the Pontic city of Amisus\textsuperscript{377} and even beyond Bosporus, at Pontic Apollonia. It was probably the same individual who made a dedication for the health and safety of his cousin Pythodoris and her husband king Rhoemetalces.\textsuperscript{378}

One other possible attestation of our L. Antonius Zenon could be a fragmentary honorary inscription for Antonia (\textsc{phaa} 6), from Laodikeia on the Lykos:\textsuperscript{379}

\[
— — / — — —}.
\]

As Corsten pointed out, the father of Antonia, highpriestess of Asia, is named as L. Antonius Zenon (\textsc{phaa} 7), archierus Asias himself and the name of her husband is lost. He could very well be our first documented equestrian. However, another L. Antonius Zenon is attested as \textit{prophetes} in Laodikeia and Klaros in 141/142 AD.\textsuperscript{380} He could have later assumed the position of \textit{archieerus} of Asia and may also be the father of aforementioned Antonia.

His younger contemporary from Eumeneia, C. Iulius Cleon (\textsc{phE} 15 and \textsc{phaa} 28) had a similar path. He was a descendant of an old family from Eumeneia; his father and mother, Epigonos as \textit{philopatris} and Castoris as \textit{soteira}, struck a small series of coins

\textsuperscript{376} \textit{MAMA} VI 104 (Herakleia Salbake); \textit{RPC} I 2912-2916; \textit{RPC} I 2928;
\textsuperscript{377} \textit{IGR} III 1436 as restored in С. Ю. Сапрыкин, ИЗ истории Понтийского царства Полемонидов, \textit{ВДИ} 1993/2, 25-6.
\textsuperscript{379} \textit{IK Laodikeia am Lykos} 53.
\textsuperscript{380} \textit{IK Laodikeia am Lykos} 67 and L. Robert, Laodicée du Lycos, 300 no. 8.
during the reign of Augustus. Cleon was a military tribune of legio VI Ferrata, also in Syria, and held the high-priesthood of Asia along with his wife in the early years of Nero’s reign. A bronze coin series at Eumenea was struck, once more in the names of both husband and wife, commemorating the event.

---

381 RPC I 3142 (Epigonos) and RPC I 3143 (Castoris), cf. also honorific inscription at Eumenea for Epignon in IGR IV 741 (Ramsay, Cities and bishoprics 377, no. 199): ὁ δήμος / Ἐπίγονον Μενεκράτους / Φιλόπατριν, τὸν ἱερὰ τῆς / Ῥώμης, σωτῆρα καὶ εὐπρεπῆν / διὰ προγόνων.

382 Iulius Cleon (RPC I 3149–50) and Bassa daughter of Cleon (RPC I 3151–2); his full name is known from IEph 688: Γάτνλ Ἰνύϊηνλ ἖πη/γόλνπ πἱὸλ Φαβία / Κιέσα ηὸλ ἀξρηε/ξέα η῅ο Ἀζίαο / ρεηιίαξρνλ ιεγηῶ/λνο ϛʹ / Ζηδεξᾶο / Ἀιέμαλδξνο Μελάλ/δξνπ Δὐκελεὺο ὁ θαὶ ἖/θέζηνο ηὸλ ἑαπηνῦ θίινλ; cf. also SEG XXVI 1244, after H. Engelmann, C. Iulius Kleon aus Eumeneia, ZPE 20 (1976), 86 who made the connection between the inscription and the coinage.
The Antonii from Laodikeia on the Lykos

(the family stemma taken from P. Thonemann, A Meander Valley. A Historical Geography from Antiquity to Byzantium, Cambridge 2011, 207)
The majority of equestrian families came to wealth through agricultural property (almost normality among this *ordo*) but most of our evidence comes from literary examples, since epigraphic evidence is generally unhelpful in this matter. On the other hand, epigraphic evidences for local euergetism, in inscriptions both by and in honor of the benefactors (most, but not all, involved in local public life) are abundant, and they enable a discussion on the possible reasons for their readiness to undertake this form of public generosity. Some members of equestrian families were honored by professional associations allowing thus for the possibility that some of them were engaged in the city’s production industry through their representatives. The elite members of a Roman city were inevitably resident in the towns for at least a part of the year. A variety of social ties involved them in contact with the commercially active population.

Numerous relations of equestrians with local aristocracy are frequently attested, as they were part of the same social circle. They created the social circle of municipal aristocracy and the lower echelons of equestrians. Not all local aristocrats were admitted into *equites*. Municipal equestrians (*equites municipales*) formed a compact group. They had very active connections with their homeland, looking after their regional interests. They were close to their compatriots and defended their interests; the affections towards the cities took diverse forms: personal benefactions to their fellow citizens, performance of civil duties as magistrates, euergetism, and patronage.³⁸³

The usual equestrian designation in the inscriptions is ἵππικος,³⁸⁴ or ἵππικος Ἦλλος,³⁸⁵ probably stating only the social status of the individual. From the mid-second century AD onwards ὁ κράτιστος or *vir egregius* in the inscriptions became a standard term for middle ranking equestrian officials.³⁸⁶ Eck implies that this title was given only to those who had taken on equestrian duties after service as an officer in the army and not to

---

³⁸⁴ *TAM* V2 915, 950-954, 957, 985; 1181 (Thyateira); *SEG* XLVII 1656 (Thyateira); *I. Sardis* 76; 77; *IGR* IV 615 (Temenothyrai, Phrygia), 883 (around Themisonium, Phrygia); *MAMA* VI 378 (Synnada).
³⁸⁵ *MAMA* IX P246 (Tiberiopolis, Phrygia); *IK Tralleis* 51.
all those who belonged to the *ordo equester*. The term appears several times in our provinces and on six occasions the inscriptions mention imperial procurators, T. Ant. Cl. Alfenus Arignotus, Tib. Claudius Zoilos, Aurelius Faustinus, Aelius Aglaos (*procurator provinciae agens vice proconsulis*) and Aurelius Marcianus (*procurator Augustorum officii*) in a petition to the Emperors and M. Aurelius Artemon from Philadelphia, once the *advocatus fisci Alexandreae et totius Aegypti et Libyae Marmaricae*. This expression also appears in the inscriptions about three equestrians and future senators, M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus from Thyateira and C. Iulius Philippus and T. Flavius Stasicles Metrophanes from Tralleis. An asiarch from mid-3rd century, Domitius Rufus (*LAA 34*) from Philadelphia, son of an asiarch, was also styled a *vir egregius*.

Nevertheless, two inscriptions from Phrygia cite this title for both men and women (married couples, Statilius Critonianus (*PhE 21*) and Aelia Larcina (*PhE 1*) and Aurelius Elpidephoros (*PhE 9*) and Claudia Septimia Nikarete (*PhE 11*)) without mentioning any official duty. Of course, we should not expect every inscription to provide the complete overview of a public career. Limitations of physical monument, type of document, context or other considerations we might not be aware of, may pose restrictions on what can be said in an inscription. In other words, the fact that no official title is mentioned in those particular inscriptions has no special significance.

---

388 TAM V2 935 (Thyateira); TAM V 3 1418, 1422, 1498-1499 (Philadelphia); *I. Sardis* 60; *IK Tralleis* 54, 82; *IK Tralleis* 141; *IK Laodikeia am Lykos* 51; *MAMA IV* 65 (Symnada), *MAMA VI* 378 (Symnada).  
389 TAM V2 935, TAM V 3 1418, 1498-1499, *I. Sardis* 60.  
390 *PME* A 132.  
391 *PIR* C 1056.  
392 *MAMA VI* 378.  
393 TAM V 3 1418.  
394 TAM V 3 1498-1499.  
395 *IG* X 2(1), 142 (Thessalonica).  
396 *IK Tralleis* 54.  
397 *IK Tralleis* 82.  
398 TAM V 3 1422.  
5.2 Military careers

Several equestrians mentioned in Lydia and Phrygia were military equestrians in the proper sense. Some of them were connected with their homeland and some were detached and served throughout the Empire.

T. Antonius Claudius Alfenus Arignotus (LE 2) from Thyateira performed priestly duties for Apollo Tyrimnos in his hometown, and he was also praefectus cohortis II Flaviae Numidarum in Dacia, praepositus cohortis II Flaviae Bessorum in Dacia Inferior, tribunus cohortis I Cilicum and praepositus cohortis I Gaetulorum in Moesia Inferior, praefectus alae II Flaviae Agrippianae in Syria and νεωκόρος τῆς λαμπροτάτης Κυζίκηνδον μητροπόλεως, procurator Augusti arcae Livianae and νεωκόρος τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ. In the honorific inscription erected by the dyers of Thyateira, Arignotus is styled as a relative of senators, son and grandson of Ἀσίας and a nephew of Alfenus Apollinaris, a censibus Augusti. It was previously suggested that Alfenus Apollinaris was also the prefect of Egypt in 199/200 AD, but that suggestion was later refuted. Nevertheless, it seems that he is attested in a graffiti inscription from a tomb in Thebes, Egypt, together with his brother, (Alfenus) Modestus: Ἀπολλινάρις Αλφινός Θεομετρούς ἐκλήζει / Μόδεστος / άδελφος. There is a possibility that this Modestos was Alfinus Modestos, strategos in Kyzikos and father of our Arignotus, himself designated in TAM V2 935 as νεωκόρος τῆς λαμπροτάτης Κυζίκηνδον μητροπόλεως.

L. Egnatius L. f. Quartus (PhE 14) from Akmoneia was praefectus cohortis II Claudiae and curator alae Augustae Geminae in Cappadocia, tribunus militum legionis VIII Augustae in Germania Superior and praefectus equitum alae Augustae (in Britannia or Syria). According to Halfmann, he could have been of Italian origin, a descendant of

---

400 TAM V2 935.
401 TAM V2 913.
403 IGSyringes 1544.
404 L. Robert, Études Anatoliennes, 125-127.
Roman negotiatores in Akmoneia. His cursus honorum is the same in all three honorific inscriptions, one from Akmoneia and two from Temenothyrai. Nevertheless, we should note the suggestion of editors of MAMA VI that these two inscriptions have to be from Akmoneia as well. In Akmoneia he was honored by the boule and demos. In Temenothyrai (or Akmoneia) he was honored by the wole body of the city.


He was also honored as εὐεργήτης by the association of fullers in the same town.

In his funerary inscription Ser. Calpurnius Iulianus (LE 10) is described as tribunus militum, stephanephoros, strategos, and agoranomos and has discharged all the other services and offices in his native city of Magnesia on the Sipylos (?).

Σέρ(βιος) Καλπούρνιος Ἰουλιανός, / δίς χείλαρχος, στεφανηφό/ρος, στρατη[ό]ς, ἀγορανόμος, / ἐ<πι>τετελεκῶς καὶ τὰς λουπᾶς / λειτουργίας καὶ ὑπηρεσίας πά/ςας τῇ πατρίδι …

M. Aurelius Bassus (LE 6) from Thyateira was a ἵππικως ἀπὸ χείλαρχον, more precisely, a military tribune of legio II Italica. This legion was established during the

406 SEG LVI 1492 (Akmoneia); SEG VI 167 and IGR IV 642 (SEG VI 174; both Temenouthyrai in SEG); cf. also PME E 3.
407 MAMA VI List p. 149, n. after nos. 166 and 167.
408 IGR IV 642 (MAMA VI List p. 149, no. 166).
409 A ςήςηζκα, probably a misspelled word, is published in IGR IV 642 and every edition since, without any further commentary.
410 SEG VI 167.
411 TAM V2 1409 (Moschakome, Lydia).
412 Cf. PME C 57.
413 TAM V2 985.
reign of Marcus Aurelius in the wake of Marcomanic wars and was stationed in Lauriacum in Noricum from the reign of Commodus.\textsuperscript{414} Bassus was also a Θυστερηνον βουλευτης.\textsuperscript{415} He dedicated one inscription to a more famous Thyateiran, jurist and senator M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus, honoring him as his personal benefactor.\textsuperscript{416} It is interesting to note that at one time Licinius Rufinus was a legatus Augusti pro praetore of Noricum and, as such, in command of legio II Italica where Bassus was a tribunus militum.

An interesting bilingual funerary inscription (2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD) from the area of Aizanoi in Phrygia present another equestrian, L. Mamius Fabius Largus (PhE 20), eques Romanus equo publico (ιππικος Ρωμαιον ιππο δημοσιω), performing the duties of a scriba quaestorius. Since the name of deceased is unprecedented in Aizanoi it is possible that he may have only passed by on an official business and died suddenly there.\textsuperscript{417}

Some military equestrians, such as Aelius Stratonikos (PhE 3) from Dorylaion (second half of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century), was designated as ἀπο ιππικων στρατευων (militiae). He was ἀρχιερευς Ασιας in Pergamon, epistates in his hometown and stephanephoros:\textsuperscript{418}

\[\text{ἀγαθὴ τύχη / Αἴλιον Στρατόνες[ι]/κον, ἀπὸ ιππικῶν / στρατεύων, καὶ ἀρχιερεύς Ασίας ναὸν τῶν / ἐν Περγάμῳ, ἐπιστάτην τῆς πόλεως κα[ι] / στεφανηφόρον / φύλη Σεραπίας / ἐκδικοῦντος Κορνη[η][λίου] Αθηναίου, γραμμα/τεύοντος Αύρ. Ζωτικοῦ Απά}\]

\textsuperscript{414} Ritterling, RE XII col. 1468-1470.
\textsuperscript{415} TAM V2 1181 = IEph 243.
\textsuperscript{416} TAM V2 985: Μ. Γλ. Ληθίλη[ν]πθεῖ/λνλ, ηὸλ ιακπξόηα/νλ ὑπαηηθ ο/λ, Μ. Αὐξ. / Βάζζνο ἱππηθὸο ἀπὸ / ρεηιηαξρηῶλ ηὸλ ἑαπ/ηνῦ εὐεξγέηελ.
\textsuperscript{417} C. Lehmler, M. Wörrle, Neue Inschriftenfunde aus Aizanoi III: Aizanitica Minora I, Chiron 32 (2002), 573 no. 2 = SEG LII 1251.
\textsuperscript{418} MAMA V Lists I, 181, no. 33 (=IGR IV 525).
5.3 Archiereus Asias / Asiarchs

One way to observe equestrians is as a part of the provincial elite. And one of the distinguished features of this elite is the high-priesthood of the imperial cult in the province of Asia. Many aspects of the Imperial cult have been thoroughly studied in the past few years. The social and religious significance of this imperial cult for the populace can easily be underestimated partially as the result of the imposition of modern viewpoints and assumptions onto ancient evidence. But modern distinctions between politics and religion do not fit the ancient context, where the social, religious, economic and political spheres were intricately inter-connected and often inseparable.

The question regarding the role and function of archiereus Asias and asiarchs was much debated since the second half of the 19th century and it seems that in some points there is still no definitive answer. As far as we know the archiereus Asias performed the duties of high priest of the Emperor’s cult in the province of Asia. Should we identify asiarch with this title? Some scholars argue that these two titles designated two different offices: two titles for two distinct positions. Others assume that they were virtually synonymous and referred to the same office: two titles for one position. Magie, for example, reports on earlier studies stating that most contemporary scholars believe this term was either an alternative designation, used less formally, for the archiereus Asias (“the

---

420 J. Marquardt, EE 1 (1872), 210ff; LBW III, 244-246 no. 885; W. M. Ramsey, The Province of Asia, Classical Review Vol. 3, No 4 (1889), 175: “The Asiarch who presided at the games also bore the title of Ἀρχιερεύς Ἀσίας. This once disputed point is now probably universally accepted”.
Chief Priest of the province”) or a distinct title held by the official who presided over and bore the cost of the provincial festival, and gave his opinion based on the sources that these two offices were not identical.\textsuperscript{422} Robert discusses archiereis and asiarchs only as being in charge of gladiatorial games and does not make any difference between these terms.\textsuperscript{423} In his study on the provincial koina in the Roman Empire Deininger elaborately argued his opinion on the identification of the offices.\textsuperscript{424} It seemed that after so many years of discussion the identification theory was accepted as a fact.\textsuperscript{425} However, the debate has become especially intensive in recent years. In the last decade of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century S. Friezen presented arguments against such views and vigorously started another debate.\textsuperscript{426} His opinion was strongly criticized by other scholars.\textsuperscript{427} Even studies on other topics, such as building benefactions, have discourses about archiereus Asias and asiarchs.\textsuperscript{428} Differences arise interpreting the same epigraphic and literary evidence. Almost every aspect of the nature of these titles was examined and discussed. It seems that, for the time being, arguments are in favor of the identification theory.

Archiereus (or archiereia) Asias was a title held by both men and women performing duties of high priest/priestess of the Imperial cult, usually connected to one of the great temples in Ephesos, Smyrna and Pergamon. From the reign of Augustus the title was ἀρχιερεύς θεᾶς Ῥώμης καὶ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος θεοῦ νιόν Σεβαστοῦ,\textsuperscript{429} changing into simple ἀρχιερεύς τῆς Ἀσίας / ἀρχιερεύς Ἀσίας in mid I century AD.

\textsuperscript{422} Magie, Roman Rule in Asia Minor 1, 449; cf. II, 1298-1301 n. 61.
\textsuperscript{423} L. Robert, Les gladiateurs dans l’Orient grec, Amsterdam 1971\textsuperscript{2}, 270-272.
\textsuperscript{424} J. Deininger, Die Provinziallandtage, 36-60.
\textsuperscript{428} S. Cramme, Die Bedeutung des Euergetismus für die Finanzierung städtischer Aufgaben in der Provinz Asia (Inaugural Dissertation), Köln 2001, 279-280.
\textsuperscript{429} I. Sardis 8.
Other provinces also had provincial *koina* and high-priests of Imperial cult, the so-called lykiarchs, makedoniarchs, bythiniarchs or pontarchs, and certain parallels are possible even though *archiereus Asias* and asiarchs are more numerous. The common thing is that they were presiding officers of their respective *koina* and high-priests of the Imperial cult, also in charge of provincial festivals.\(^{430}\) One should note that the documents of these high-priests and their respective *koina* in other provinces are far less documented than those in province of Asia and that conclusions about asiarch and archiereus Asias are used as an argument in the discussion about these lesser known offices. Obviously, there is a danger of so-called circular argument: dominant but unproven opinion on asiarchs is used as a proof in debate on macedoniarchs or lykiarchs. Conclusion reached in this way returns in asiarch-debate as a fresh argument.

It is a question whether or not there was a sole archiereus of Asia or several equal ranking ones, but it is accepted that only one archiereus of Asia held office in any single temple at a time.\(^{431}\) Provincial temples proliferated in Asia beginning with 26 AD, and a provincial high priest was appointed for each temple. Deininger also argued that the high priests of Asia were not arranged in a hierarchy but were of equal status.\(^{432}\) What started as an office whose title emphasized the objects of pious activity became one of several offices entrusted with the task of expressing the province's reverence for imperial authority.\(^{433}\) Chief priesthood of the *koinon* was considered the summit of a provincial career.\(^{434}\) Chief priests were generally not just Roman citizens but knights or sometimes even of senatorial family, and frequently they were friends of prominent Romans in power. The office was very costly, and could involve massive expenses not only to add special magnificence to the *koinon* festivals (for which the cities also made contributions), but for such things as gladiatorial games and feasts, special building projects or even the payment of taxes for the entire province. Because of this, and especially when presiding over the contests they gave,

\(^{430}\) For a different view see M. F. Petraccia Luceroni, Il Macedoniarch: funzionario o sacerdote?, *AIV* 142 (1983-1984), 365-379.
\(^{431}\) Deininger, *Die Provinziallandtage*, 38.
\(^{432}\) Deininger, *Die Provinziallandtage*, 37-41.
the chief priest or chief priestess was often allowed the right to dress in purple, to wear a crown set with busts of the Augusti, and to walk at the head of the ritual procession of the koinon.435

To hold the office of high priest, and to do so lavishly, was expected of members of the elite. The extent of the pressures may be judged by those exceptional cases in which people tried to evade their responsibilities of office. The diaries of Aelius Aristides reveal his lengthy attempts to avoid the office of high priest of the provincial cult, and to maintain his health, with the help of Asclepius. His city of Smyrna proposed him as candidate, but Aristides declined the honor. However, two months later the delegates of Smyrna succeeded in getting him elected, despite his attempts to prevent it. Aristides had to appeal to the governor, which resulted in his exemption from the election on grounds of ill health. The fact that Aristides had to fight off two more attempts to force him to hold other public offices demonstrates the strength of the public expectation of service.436 The sophist Favorinus also tried to avoid being elected to the imperial priesthood by his native city by referring to the fact that this would not be in accordance with his position as a philosopher. In support of his position, he appealed to the law which exempted philosophers from public service.437

There is also a question whether women served as high priestesses on their own right or only in connection with a male family member. Nearly all the studies on this topic have concluded that some or all of the known high priestesses from Asia received the title as an honorific designation on the basis of their husband's high priesthood. Magie stated that "the Chief Priest's wife enjoyed the privilege of being called Chief Priestess."438 Deininger, for example, does not ask what the nature of the office of high priestess was, but

435 Burrell, 346.
437 Philostr. *VS* I 8; Cass. Dio, 69, 3, 4-6.
rather whether high priestesses were married to high priests. Kearsley questioned previous opinions and she cited differences between the titles of husbands and wives, women listed with no references to husbands or fathers, and high priestesses whose husbands were known not to have held high priesthoods. Friesen adopted this approach with further commentary. As there are no high priestesses in the first half of the first century it has been suggested that chief responsibility of archiereia Asias was the cult of the Augustae; in Asia Tiberius’ mother shared his cult in the provincial temple in Smyrna from 26 AD. Livia’s deification in 41 AD probably contributed to the spreading the office throughout the province. So far, there are no women asiarchs attested, although there are many high-priestesses of Asia. Only one woman’s name, Marcia Claudia Iuliana, is associated with the asiarchy from any city in Asia and she appears to have held the office twice together with a man M. Aur. Zenon, who may or may have not been her husband.

One could argue that if archiereus of Asia and asiarch were one and the same, that the title of archiereus was for religious duties of the Imperial cult and asiarch for political ones involving the koinon and therefore, archiereia of Asia would be in charge of the cult of Imperial women and there was no need for a female asiarch. Nevertheless, we cannot be certain, especially as possible parallels, lykiarchissa and makedoniarchissa are attested. One should note that the high priestess in Beroa inscription is the wife of a makedoniarches and for Chaniotis this confirms the assumption that the makedoniarches is identical with the high priest of the provincial emperor cult also showing that

---

439 Deininger, 41; 154.
441 Friesen, Twice Neokoros, 81-89.
443 IK Smyrna I 386.
445 IG X 2,1 153 (Thessaloniki): Flaviane Nepotiane; EKM 1 Beroia 94 (Beroia): Flavia Isidora.
446 EKM 1 Beroia 77.
makedoniarchissa, the wife of a makedoniarches, served as high priestess. Either way, the office of the high priestess of the provincial emperor cult in Asia Minor was extremely prestigious and contributed to the ‘visibility’ of elite women in public life.

There are suggestions that the title of asiarch was used by some simply as an honorary one which denoted wealth and social prominence but not any formal position or, at the most, only a person who had formerly been archiereus of Asia and who subsequently bore the title asiarch for life. Kearsley, on the other hand, suggested that asiarch’s sphere of operation was focused on the cities rather than on the imperial cult in the province and often combined with city magistracies.

Strabo mentioned asiarchs in Tralleis stating that they were the men who held chief places in province: συνοικεῖται δὲ καλὸς ἐὰν τίς ἄλλῃ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν, ὑπὸ εὐπόρων ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἀεὶ τινες ἐξ αὐτῆς εἰσίν οἱ πρωτεύοντες κατὰ τὴν ἐπαρχίαν, οὗς Ἀσιάρχας καλοῦσιν; ὁ Πυθόδωρος τε ἦν, ἀνήρ Νυσαῖος τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἔκεισε δὲ μεταβεβηκώς διὰ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Πομπήιον φιλία διαπρέπον μετ’ ὀλίγον. Strabo continues to elaborate about the fortunes of Pythodorus’ extremely wealthy and influential family. Several points are to be noted. Firstly, asiarchs are identified by their wealth. They are treated more like a distinct social group than as specific officials or priests; in fact, there is no mention of their connection with koinon of Asia or about sacerdotal nature of their office. This point is reinforced by the example of Pythodorus and his family. They are presented as extremely wealthy and socially and politically connected, even Pompey himself was among personal contacts of Pythodorus. Finally, Strabo’s account leaves us with an impression that possibly there are several asiarchs at the same time in the same city.

448 Deininger, Die Provinziallandtage, 46; Rossner, Asiarchen und Archiereis Asias, 106-7.
450 Strabo 14. 1. 42: And it is as well peopled as any other city in Asia by people of means; and always some of its men hold the chief places in the province, being called Asiarchs. Among these was Pythodorus, originally a native of Nysa, but he changed his abode to Tralleis because of its celebrity; and with only few others he stood out conspicuously as a friend of Pompey. English translation by H. L. Jones.
The Acts of Apostles also refer to asiarchs as chiefs of Asia, in reference to Paul’s visit to Ephesos. Again one should note the plural in this text, as it could mean that there were several asiarchs appointed in Ephesos at the same time, or, perhaps they were former asiarchs. Herrenius Modestinus (first half of the 3rd century) wrote about asiarchs in *Digestae* and he defines asiarchy as a priestly office on the provincial level.

As can be seen from tables 5 and 6 there are 23 confirmed archiereis Asias (ten women) in Lydia and 28 in Phrygia (six women). There are 26 asiarchs in Lydia as well, but only 13 in Phrygia.

One inscription from Thyateira states that one Iulius Dionysios (*LAA* 42) is ἀσιάρχης Περγαμημόνων and also agonothete, archiereus in his native city and twice stephanephoros. T. Flavius Clitosthenes (*LAA* 36) from Tralleis was ἀσιάρχης ναὸν τῶν Ἂ Ἐφέσῳ and ἀσιάρχης δίς. Several asiarch from the 3rd century Lydia have obviously held the office more than once: Menander (*LAA* 52) from Hypaipa twice, as well as L. (or Aurelius) Annianus (*LAA* 3) from Thyateira, L. Pescennius Gessius (*LAA* 53) attested in Philadelphia was asiarch three times, and [L.] Cornelius Vettenianus (*LAA* 32) from Sardeis was styled asiarch four times on the coins.

There are only seven men in our list that held both titles of archiereus Asias and asiarch: M. Ulpius Carminius Polydeukes Claudianus (*PhAA* 37) from Attouda.

---

Aelius Zeuxidemus Cassianus (PhAA 5) from Hierapolis,\textsuperscript{461} C. Iulius Philippus (LAA 49) from Tralleis,\textsuperscript{462} M. Ulpius Appuleius Eurykles (PhAA 33) from Aizanoi,\textsuperscript{463} M. Iulius Aquila (PhAA 26) from Amorion,\textsuperscript{464} M. Aurelius Diadochus Tryphosianus (LE 7 and LAA 18) and his father in law, Aurelius Athenaios (LAA15), both from Thyateira.\textsuperscript{465} It is important to point out that none of them is named archiereus Asias and asiarch in the same inscription.

M. Ulpius Carminius Polydeukes Claudianus (PhAA 37) from Attouda was also styled “the son of demos” (υἱὸς τοῦ δῆμου) and “son of polis” (υἱὸς πόλεως),\textsuperscript{466} and he served as stephanephoros\textsuperscript{467} and a priest of Meter Adrastou\textsuperscript{468} and Dionysos Prokathegemon.\textsuperscript{469} His asiarchy is attested only on coins.\textsuperscript{470} He was the first prominent member of Carminii from Attouda, his son being M. Ulpius Carminius Claudianus (PhAA 35) archiereus Asias, stephanephoros for life honored for his benefactions in an inscription from Aphrodisias,\textsuperscript{471} grandson T. Carminius Flavius Athenagoras Claudianus a senator\textsuperscript{472} and another grandson M. Ulpius Carminius Claudianus neoteros (PhAA 36) asiarch and stephanephoros.\textsuperscript{473} Obviously, this family had very good connections in Asia Minor (especially in Aphrodisias in Caria) as well as in Rome and they were wealthy.

P. Aelius Zeuxidemus Cassianus (PhAA 5)\textsuperscript{474} from Hierapolis was also curator rei publicae (λογιστης) in Aezanoi and he did some services for the city that earned him gratitude as εὐεργέτης.\textsuperscript{475} His son, P. Aelius Zeuxidemus Ariston Zeno (PhE 5) was advocatus fisci for both Phrygia and Asia (συνήγορος τοῦ ἐν Φρυγίᾳ ταμιείου [καὶ]

\textsuperscript{461} IGR IV 819; IGR IV 828; MAMA IX 26 (2nd century).
\textsuperscript{462} OGIS 498; IK Tralleis 51; 54; 128-130 (Antoninus Pius).
\textsuperscript{463} MAMA IX P18; OGIS 508, IApH2007 12.538; MAMA VIII, 505; IGR IV 573-576 = MAMA IX P6-P9; SEG XXXV 1365 (Marcus Aurelius, Lucius Verus, Commodus); Col. Wadd. 5545.
\textsuperscript{464} SEG XXXVII 1099bis and I Eph 686 (second half of the 2nd century).
\textsuperscript{465} TAM V2 950, 951, 952, 954 (Severus Alexander).
\textsuperscript{466} Imhoof-Blummer, KM I 124-5, nos. 7-11; SNG Von Aulock 2500; Coll. Wadd. 7048; SEG LV 1409.
\textsuperscript{467} SEG LV 1409.
\textsuperscript{468} MAMA VI 74; cf. also SEG LV 1409 (Attouda) for commentary on Meter Adrastou.
\textsuperscript{469} SEG XXXIV 1289.
\textsuperscript{470} Col. Wadd. 2268.
\textsuperscript{471} IApH2007 12.1111.
\textsuperscript{472} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{473} MAMA VI 74; SNG Von Aulock 2501; 2505: διὰ Καρμίνιον Κλαυδιανοῦ Ἀσιάρχου Αττούδεων.
\textsuperscript{474} PIR² Α 282.
his grandson Aelius Antipater was a sophist, *ab epistulis Graecis* of Septimius Severus, friend of Severus and tutor to Caracalla and Geta, *adlectus inter consulares* by Severus and legate of Bithynia. After the murder of Geta, he starved himself to death at the age of sixty eight.

C. Iulius Philippus (*LAA 49*) from Tralleis was also agonothete for life and boularchos in Tralleis, honored also in Olympia in 149 AD. It is supposed that as asiarch he lead the *koinon* festival when the Christian martyr Polycarpus was executed. His homonymous son (*LE 16*) was δικαστής (one of *iudices selecti*) and *procurator* (ἐπίτροπος), as well as a priest of Zeus Larasios. The youngest C. Iulius Philippus was a senator during the reign of Septimius Severus and married one of the daughters of a notable Ephesian sophist Flavius Damianus.

M. Ulpius Appuleius Eurykles (*PhAA 33*) was the third known generation of Ulpii Appulei from Aizanoi and his career, which spanned through the second half of the second century, is well documented. The family probably gained Roman citizenship under Trajan. His grandfather M. Ulpius Appuleius Flavianus (*PhAA 34*) was ἄρχιερεως Ἀσίας ναὸν τὸν ἐν Περγάμῳ and his father M. Ulpius Appuleianus Flavianus was the first agonothete of Deia and probably the founder of these games for Zeus. He was also eirenarches twice, boularchos, strategos and priest of Zeus.

---

476 *PIR²* A 281; *IGR* IV 819; 828: … Π(οτιού) Αἰλπιοῦ Σευσιόμου Κασσιανοῦ ἀσιάρχου…
477 Forschung in Ephesos II, 125, 26 v. 18; *PIR²* A 137
478 Philostr. VS II, 24, 25, 4.
479 *PIR²* I 460.
480 *IK Tralleis* 128-130.
481 *I Olympia* 455.
483 *PIR²* I 459.
484 *IK Tralleis* 51.
485 *PIR²* I 458.
487 *CIG* 3831-3834 (Aizanoi), *CIG* 3836=MAMA IX P18 (Aizanoi), *IGR* IV 573-576 = MAMA IX P6-P9 (Aizanoi); *SEG* XXXV 1365 (Aizanoi); *SEG* XLI 1185-1188 (Aizanoi); *IEph* 25 (Ephesos), *IAph*2007 12.538; MAMA VIII, 505 (Aphrodisias).
489 *SEG* XXXV 1365
In his native city Eurykles was, like his father, agonothete of Deia and a priest for life of Dionysos. He was also the city representative in Panhellenion in Athens probably from 152/3 till 156/7 AD. During this period he distinguished himself so much that, when he left Athens for Asia, his fellow Panhellenes and Athenians sent four letters of commendation on his behalf: two to Aizanoi and two to the koinon of Asia.\(^{490}\) Cultivation or paideia was the mark of all educated Greeks: as such, it must have been normal among the high officers and councillors of the Panhellenion, drawn as they were from the upper strata of their cities. In first of the letters,\(^ {491}\) Ulpius Eurykles’ virtues are described in general terms: he had become conspicuous for his culture (παιδεία) and every other excellence (ἀλλη ἀρετή) and his fairness (ἐπείκεια). In another letter the virtues of Ulpius Eurykles are again stated in general terms: he has employed fairness (ἐπείκεια) and used every kind of dignity (πάση αἰδώς) towards the Panhellenion in his term as Panhellene.\(^ {492}\) The letter from the Areopagus\(^ {493}\) expands the eulogy of Ulpius Eurykles by saying that he had acted with humanity (ὁμιλών παιδεία) and was distinguished for his zeal in the finest and most holy pursuits (πάσαν ἐνάρετον προαίτεσιν ἀποδεικνύμενος διὰ τῆς περὶ τὰ κάλλιστα καὶ σεμνότατα σπουδῆς). The letter bears witness to his dignity, character and love of culture (τῆς τε κόσμιτητος εἶνεκεν καὶ τοῦ τρόπου καὶ τῆς περὶ παιδείαν φιλοτιμίας). It was also noted that Ulpius Eurykles during his stay in Athens had conducted himself as though he were in his fatherland and that therefore they were honoring him with a statue and an image (καὶ ἀνδριάντος καὶ εἰκόνος). This honor of allowing Ulpius Eurykles to pick the place in Athens where he wanted his dedication to stand is a high honor. Another letter was sent to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, but only his reply survived.\(^ {494}\) He was archiereus Asias in 161 when he erected statues in honor of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus in Aizanoi.\(^ {495}\) Shortly afterwards, in 162 or 163, he was appointed by the proconsul the logistes of Ephesian gerousia.\(^ {496}\) Some twenty five years

\(^ {490}\) IGR IV 573, 574, 576 = MAMA IX P6, P7, P8.
\(^ {491}\) IGR IV 573 = MAMA IX P6.
\(^ {492}\) IGR IV 576 = MAMA IX P8.
\(^ {493}\) IGR IV 574 = MAMA IX P7.
\(^ {494}\) IGR IV 575 = MAMA IX P9.
\(^ {495}\) MAMA IX P18: …Μ. Οὐλπίου Ἀπουλ[η]ου Ἐὐρυκλέους, ἀρχιερέως ἀποδειγμένου Ασίας…
\(^ {496}\) IGEph 25.
later he is designated archiereus Asias in temples in Smyrna for the second time and this inscription also suggests that during the 180-ties he was logistes in Aphrodisias as well.497 His asiarchy is attested only on coins issued in Aizanoi.498 On the same coins he also appears as grammateus. His family relations are furthermore on display in a series of fragmented inscriptions on four gray marble blocks from the Eastern analemma wall of the stadion in Aizanoi.499 Each column of SEG XLII 1186 was probably dedicated to a prominent member of the family: unidentified person, M. Ulpius Appuleius Eurykles; in his wake his wife and sister are mentioned and at the end the maternal grandfather of Eurykles’ mother, Antonius Asklepiades:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{a} & \text{b} & \text{c} \\
\hline
[- -τὸν ἐν τῇ] & καὶ ἄγγινοθέ- & ὅς ἐνείκα ἄπτως, \\
[μητρ]οπ[ὸλει] & τοῦ κοινῶν & ἀνέφεδρος, ἀ-
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{τῆς Ασίας} & \text{Αὐγουστεί-} & \text{μεσολάβητος} \\
\text{ιανεῖων, ὅς} & \text{ον ὑπὸ τὰ αὐτὸν} & \text{Ὀλυμπιάδι σιή,} \\
\text{καὶ τῇ πατρὶ-} & \text{καὶ τῆς πατρίδος} & \text{τῆς μητρὸς} \\
\text{δὶ φιλοτεμεῖ-} & \text{ἀρξαντός, ὃ συν-} & \text{τῶν Εὐρυκλέ-
\end{array}
\]

tαι & ἀρχιεράται τῆς Α- & ὅς παιδὸν \\
\text{[σ]ίας καὶ ἡ γυνὴ} & \text{μητροπάτωρ} & \\
\text{βηρεῖνα, ἀρχιερά-} & \text{ναὶ ναὸν τῶν ἐν} & \\
\text{ται δὲ καὶ ἡ ἁδελφή} & \text{Περγάμῳ σὺν τῷ ἄν-} & \\
\text{ἡ Εὐρυκλέους ᾿Ιου-} & \text{[δρ]ὶ Ασκληπ[ῶδ]η} & \\
\text{λία} & \text{ναὸν τῶν} & \\
\text{Περγάμῳ} & \text{Περγ̆άμῳ} & \\
\text{σὺν τῷ ἄν-} & \text{σὺν τῷ ἄν-} & \\
\end{array}
\]

Eurykles’ wife was thus identified as Severina, probably the daughter of L. Claudius Severinus attested in *MAMA* IX 10, supplying the funds for an aqueduct.\(^5\) Her marriage with Eurykles implied a possible connection of the Aizanitan Ulpii and Claudii. The *archineokoros* Ἰου(λιος) Οὔλπ(ιος) Σευηρεῖνος, who issued a coin under Gallienus,\(^5\) was probably a descendant of that family. His sister Iulia’s husband Asklepiades possibly belonged to the family of Antonius Asklepiades,\(^5\) perhaps he was the latter’s son.

A well-connected family attested both in Amorion in Phrygia and in Ephesos had several members acting as high priests of Asia. In an honorary inscription for Aelia Ammia (*PhAA* 2) from Amorion we learn that she was the daughter of Alexandros, wife of M. Iulius Damianus and mother of M. Iulius Aquila (*PhAA* 26), the asiarch. She was styled *θυγάτηρ τῆς πόλεως* and *archiereia Asias*, honored for all her virtues:\(^5\)

On the basis of the names of her husband and son, Aelia Amnia is now also restored as the honorand of a fragmentary inscription from Ephesos; where she has another public function, a joint priesthood of the city-league of Ionians.\(^5\) Although we know almost nothing about her father, her husband Damianus was highly likely one of the

---

500 Other possible family connections are mentioned on p. 34-35.
501 *BMC* Phrygia 28, n. 34f.
502 Antonius Asklepiades is mentioned with Eurykles’s paternal grandfather in *SEG* XLII 1188 in an inscription within wreaths and diadems commemorating several local dignitaries: Ἀλησλίνπ Ἀζθιεπηάδνπ ληθήζαληνο ηὰ ἐλ Πείζῃ ‖ ὦιύκπηα παίδσλ πάιελ; in 218\(^{th}\) Olympiad (93 AD), he was ca. 15 years old.
503 *SEG* XXXVII 1099bis.
children of M. Iulius Damianus of Mylasa and Flavia Polla attested in an inscription from Eleusis. In this Eleusinian inscription Flavia Polla was styled as a daughter of one Flavius Apellas from Hypaipa. T. Flavius Apellas from Hypaipa, agonothete of the Balbillea in Ephesos under Trajan between 97 and 102 AD was, in turn, married to Iulia Polla, a prytanis in Ephesus and sister of the famous senator C. Antius A. Iulius Quadratus from Pergamon.

![Family tree diagram]

The family *stemma* of M. Iulius Aquila from Amorion
(taken from R. Kearsley, Asiarchs, Archiereis, and the Archiereiai of Asia: New evidence from Amorium in Phrygia, *EA* 16 (1990), 76)

This is a classic example of a prestigious family with prominent connections throughout the province of Asia, and we could assume the family and ancestors of Aelia Ammia were of similar status.

M. Iulius Damianus and son M. Iulius Aquila are documented on one more inscription from Ephesos:

\[
\text{τῆς πρώτης καὶ μεγ[ί]/στῆς μητροπόλεως} / \text{τῆς Ασίας καὶ δίς νεω/κόρου τῶν Σεβαστῶν} / \text{Έφεσίων πόλεως [η]} / \text{βουλῆ καὶ ο} \; \text{δήμος} / \text{ἐπείμησαν Μᾶρκου} / \text{Ἰούλιον Ἀκ[ύ]λαγ} / \text{νίων}
\]

505 *IG II²* 2959.
506 *IEph* 1122.
507 *IEph* 989a.
508 *IEph* 686.
Unlike the title of asiarch he bears in an honorary inscription for his mother from Amorion, M. Iulius Aquila is here designated as a former archiereus Asias in the temple of Ephesos. This inscription could be dated between 132 and 211 AD according to the reference to the second neokorate of Ephesos. Unfortunately, we cannot precisely date the document from Amorion, but these inscriptions were part of the debate if the title of asiarch was perhaps an honorary one for previous holders of highpriesthood of Asia, used for the rest of their life.  

Apart from fulfilling his duties of the provincial high-priest, M. Iulius Aquila was also agonothete of the Great Balbillea, like his maternal grandfather, Flavius Apellas, before him.

One extended family from Thyateira had two members who were both archiereus Asias and asiarchs. M. Aurelius Diadochus Tryphosianus (LE 7 and LAA 18), designated as ἵππικός, was also boularchos in Thyateira for life and archiereus in the city as well as archiereus Asias in Pergamon and asiarch. Actually, these two inscriptions mentioning his titles could be supporting the identification theory:

---

510 TAM V2 950; it is not sure whether there were annual boularchoi in Thyateira, cf. K. Nawotka, Boularchos in Roman Asia Minor, Epigraphica 62 (2000), 68 n. 44.
511 TAM V2 954.
512 TAM V2 950.
513 TAM V2 954.
ἐλδόμσο θαὶ κεγαινθξό λ / ἄλδξα ἐπὶ ἢζεζη θαὶ ἐπηεηθείαη / θαὶ η῅η πξὸο ηὴλ παηξίδα /
euλνίαη δηαπξέπνληα

and

ἡ πατρίς / Αὐρηλιάν Ἐρμώνασσαν, τήν / διὰ βίου ιέρειαν τῆς Τύχης τῆς / πόλεως καὶ ἐπτάκι πρύτανιν / μετὰ τοῦ γένους καὶ δίς ἄρχει/ρειαν τῆς τε Ἀσίας καὶ τῆς πατρί/δος, θυγατέρα Αὐρ. Ἀθηναίου / ἀσιάρχου καὶ νεωκόρου καὶ πρυ/τάνεως καὶ ῥήτορος, καὶ Φλα.

Πρεισκύλλης ἄρχερείας δίς τῆς / Ἀσίας καὶ πρυτάνεως γυναίκα / Αὐρηλίου [Δι]αδόχου ἰππικοῦ / ἀσιάρχου καὶ ἄρχερεως κατὰ / τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν τῆς πατρί/δος καὶ διὰ βίου βουλάρχου τήν / σώφρονα καὶ φιλανδόρον καὶ / φιλόπατριν.

Expression τοῖς ὀξέσι also requires some passing comments. This expression puzzled earlier editors and epigraphists until L. Robert offered a plausible solution. According to him it is an abbreviaton of τοῖς ὀξέσι σιδήροις. The expression is believed to refer to the organization and providing for a special type of gladiatorial games. Diadochus Tryphosianus received honors from Alexander Severus: in one person he gathered (συνάψαι) at the same time duties of archiereus together with the organization of gladiatorial games.

His title of strategos is also attested on coins. As we have seen, he was a member of a well-established family, his father Aurelius Moschianus was prytanis and his late mother Aurelia Tryphosa was also prytanis: ἀγαθὴ τύχη / ἡ κρατίστη βουλή Μ. / Αὐρ. Διάδοχον Τρυφω/σιανὸν ἰππικόν υἱόν / Μ. Αὐρ. Μοσχιανοῦ β´ / Αλεξάνδρου πρυτάνε/ως καὶ Αὐρ. Τρυφω/σις ἡρωίδος πρυτάνε/ως, στρατηγήσαντα / ἀγνώς.

514 TAM V2 950
515 TAM V2 954.
517 This unabbreviated expression is attested only in Sagalassos, IGR III 360. Apart from our example from Lydia, similar expressions are attested in Ionia: MDAI (I) 35 (1985), 124-130 no. 1 (Miletos), IK Smyrna 637 and I Eph 810. All these are honorary inscriptions for either high-priest of Asia or asiarchs. This also lands some support to the identification theory.
518 BMC p. CXXIV adn. 7; Imhoof-Blumer, NZ 48 (1915), 96: ἐπὶ στρ. Μ. Αὐρ. Διαδόχου ἰππικοῦ.
519 TAM V2 952.
He married Aurelia Hermonassa, priestess in Thyateira and twice ἀρχιέρεια Ἀσίας,\textsuperscript{520} daughter of Flavia Priscilla, who was of senatorial origin and performed the duties of ἀρχιέρεια Ἀσίας twice, and Aurelius Athenaios (LAA 15), an asiarch, neokoros, prytanis and rhetor (ἀσιάρχος καὶ νεοκόρος καὶ πρύτανις καὶ ρήτωρ).\textsuperscript{521} Aurelius Athenaios is attested also as archiereus Asias in one inscription from the agora in Ephesos:\textsuperscript{522}

Αὐρ(ήλιον) Αθήναιον ἀρχιερέα / Ἀσίας καὶ νεοκόρον τοῦ / Σεβαστοῦ τὸν ρήτορα, ἀ/ρετής ἑνεκα καὶ τῆς περὶ / τὰς συνηγορίας τῆς πατρί/δος ἡμῶν εὐνοίας τε καὶ / προθυμίας / ἡ τειμὴ κατεσκευάσθη / ἀπὸ τῶν τῆς βουλῆς / χρημάτων, ἐκ πόρων / βουλαρχίας Πο(πλίου) / Κορ(νηλίου) Ἰταλοῦ / νεωτέρου, ὑοῦ / Πο(πλίου) Κορ(νηλίου) Ἰτα/λοῦ φιλοσεβάστου / γραμ/ματέως τοῦ δήμου τῷ / αὐτῷ ἐτεί.

\textsuperscript{520} TAM V2 951, 954.
\textsuperscript{521} TAM V2 954, 957; cf. stemma on the next page.
\textsuperscript{522} IEph 3057.
The family *stemma* of M. Aurelius Diadochus Tryphosianus from Thyateira
(taken from *TAM V2* p. 351)
The rise of these families is paradigmatic for the promotion of municipal aristocracy from equestrian status to senatorial order. Their obvious wealth and connections made them ideal for further advanced positions throughout the Empire.

5.4 Family ties

In Lydia and Phrygia we have both equestrian military officers and whole families with equestrian status designation who are well connected and among the most prominent in the cities. Equestrians with military career are commonly descendants of elite city families and they usually became city’s officials upon returning from the army. A family of an equestrian was not only deemed honorable, it was admitted among the best. Personal conduct of an individual was very important and they were guided by social conventions, inherited moral code and tradition. They are sometimes related to senatorial families and usually perform highest civic duties in the cities. One of the most notable cases is that of Iulii Philippi from Tralleis. The first C. Iulius Philippus (LAA 49) was archiereus Asias and asiarch, and his homonymous son, the father of the senator C. Iulius Philippus (LE 16) (second half of the II century AD) is called δικαστής (one of iudices selecti) and procurator (ἐπίτροπος) as well as a life-long priest of Zeus Larasios.

Γ(άιοι) Ἰουλίου, Γ(αίου) Ἰουλίου Φιλίππου ἄρχιερέως / Ἄσιας υἱόν, Οὐελίνα, Φίλιππον, ἱππέα Ἱω/μαίον, τῶν ἐκλέκτων ἐν Ῥώμῃ δικαστῶν / ἐπίτροπον τῶν Σεβαστῶν, πατέρα Ἐουλί(ου) / Φιλίππου συγκλητικοῦ στρατηγοῦ Ῥωμαί/ων, ἱερεὰ διὰ βίου τοῦ Διός τοῦ Λαρασίου

In Synnada in Phrygia during the reign of Marcus Aurelius certain Iulius Lycinius (PhE 16) was a σύνδικος ταμειοῦ (advocatus fisci), as was his maternal grandfather Ulpius Lycinus (PhE 23). According to the honorific inscription for his mother, Ulpia Saturnina, he continued the family tradition of benefaction (ἐκ προγόνων

---

523 IK Tralleis 51; 54.
524 IK Tralleis 51.
525 PIR² I 392.
His father, Iulius Mochos was a stephanephoros and a descendant of ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας.\textsuperscript{526}

In the same inscription his sister Iulia Marcellina appears as the ἀρχιερεία Ἀσίας in Pergamon. Iulius Lycinius is also attested on coins from Synnada as ἱερεύς.\textsuperscript{527}

As we have seen, another example of a well-connected equestrian family is the following one from Thyateira (end of II and beginning of the III century AD).\textsuperscript{528} M. Aur. Priscillianus (\textit{LE 9}) is named ἵππικός and neokoros of Augustus, his mother Flavia Priscilla was of senatorial descent and performed the duties of ἀρχιερεία Ἀσίας twice, and the father, M. Aurelius Atheniaos (\textit{LAA 15}), is asiarch and ἀρχιερεύς Ἀσίας, neokoros, prytanis and rhetor. His brother in law, M. Aur. Diadochus Tryphosianus (\textit{LE 7} and \textit{LAA 18}), also a member of the equestrian order, is asiarch, ἀρχιερεύς Ἀσίας in Pergamon,\textsuperscript{529} and boularch for life, ἀρχιερεύς in Thyateira and strategos.\textsuperscript{530}

M. Aurelius Popilius Bakhios (\textit{LE 8}) was designated as ἵππικός and he was also agonothete in Sardeis when a certain Aurelius Agathias won the race of the torch-bearers.\textsuperscript{531} C. Arruntius Antonius (\textit{LE 4}), attested in inscriptions from Thyateira and Sardeis in the early 3\textsuperscript{rd} century, was a descendant of Arruntius Maternus, an asiarch from Sardeis related to many senatorial families.\textsuperscript{532} Arruntius Antonius was styled as ἵππικός, and archon in Thyateira:\textsuperscript{533}

He was also attested as strategos in Thyateira on coins. The other inscription mentioning his name and family ties, is heavily restored I. Sardis 77:


Unfortunately, the most damaged part of the inscription is the one with Arruntius Antonius’ titles and so far, we can suppose that he was secretary, agonothete and giver of prizes in the games of Chrysantina in Sardeis. This must date soon after the first games instituted under Septimius Severus at the beginning of the 3rd century AD. They were named either after the marigold (χρυσάνθεμον), sacred to Artemis, or more probably after Χρυσανθής, a cult-name of the goddess. A new reading of I. Sardis 77 in SEG XXXVI 1091 is connecting the family of Arruntii with Stlaccii, in ll. 6-8. [Ἀρρούντι[ον Ματ[ῆρ]] / Α[νταν][κα]ν / Στ[ῆλα]] / τοῦ δεινός καὶ / τοῦ δεινός] 534 BMC p. CXXV adn. 4, Imhoof – Blumer, NZ 48, 1915, 96: ἐπὶ στρ. Γ. Ἀρρούν. Ἀνταν(ε)νὸν ἵππ[ὶ] κ/θοντον. 535 Cf. commentary on I. Sardis 77. 536 SEG XXXVI 1091; the correction was first made by L. Robert, OMS III, 1607.
another prominent family in Lydia mentioned several times in Sardeis,\textsuperscript{537} Maonia,\textsuperscript{538} and even Alexandreia Troas and Rome.\textsuperscript{539}

In late 2\textsuperscript{nd} century T. Flavius Clitosthenes (Iulianus), the father and grandfather of senators from Tralleis was ὸ κράτιστος and an asiarch twice:\textsuperscript{540}

\[M(άρκος) Αὐρ(ήλιος) — βουλευτ/τής καὶ φιλοσέβαστος Μ(άρκον) / Αὐρήλιον Σωτήρα βουλευ/τήν και φιλοσέβαστον τό / υον, ἀδελφόν Μ(άρκου) Αὐρηλίου Αμιμανόβ βουλευτόν / και φιλοσέβαστον και / γραμματέως τού δήμου / νικήσαντα / τόν ιερόν ἀγώνα τόν Σπαρ/τατόν και τόν ιερόν / ἀγώνα τόν Ἱρακλείων / παίδων παγκράτιον / και ἱσαγωγόν τόν Ὀλυμπίου / ἐπί ιερέος διά βίου Δ/ύς τοῦ Ἀρασίου Φλασού / Κλειτοσθένους τοῦ κρατ/ίστου δ/ς ἀσίάρχου, πρώτου / Ἀσίας, πατρός ἰπατικοῦ κα[ι] / πάππου συνκλητικῶν, τής / θ’ αὐτοῦ πενταετηρίδος

The honorific inscription of Magnios Dionysius (PhE 19), ἱπικός from Dorylaion (beginning of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century) is a clear example of the continuity of political activity of elite families. The honorand was a son of M. Aurelius Dionysius, an archon twice and stephanephoros, and a grandson of M. Aurelius Hermolaios, with the same titles:\textsuperscript{541}

\[ἀγάζ῅η  ηύρεη  / Μάγληνλ Γην/λύζηνλ, ἱππη/θὸλ ἀπὸ ζηξαηεη/ῶλ, πἱὸλ Μ. Ἐξρ/νληνο ηὸ βʹ θαὶ ζηε/θαλεθόξνπ, ἔγγν/λνλ Μ. Αὐξ.Γη/νλπζίνπ πξώηνπ / ἄξρνληνο ηὸ βʹ θαὶ ζη[ε]/θαλεθόξνπ, Μάγλ[η/ν]ο Γ ἄλεζηεζελ\]

A funerary inscription for children from Tiberiopolis in Phrygia mentions M. Ulpius Hermogenianos (PhE 22) as ἱπικός Ζωμαίος. He was also a bouleutes in

\textsuperscript{537} I. Sardis 61 and 43.
\textsuperscript{538} TAM V1 542 and 553.
\textsuperscript{539} For a new member of this family cf. M. Haake, L. Flavius Stlaccius aus Sardis, der ‘beste Sophist’. Eine neue Ehreninschrift aus Alexandria Troas für einen bislang unbekannten Sophisten, E. Schwertheim (Hrsgb.), \textit{Studien zum antiken Kleinasien VII} (Asia Minor Studien 66), Bonn 2011, 147-158; see also CIL VI 14190.
\textsuperscript{540} IK Tralleis 141; father of T. Flavius Clitosthenes and grandfather of T. Flavius Stasicles Metrophanes.
\textsuperscript{541}MAMA V Lists I, 181 no. 19 (=IGR IV 528).
Ancyra and Aizanoi which is both a testimony of his elite status and of the connection between elite groups in various cities.\footnote{MAMA IX P246 (= IGR IV 631).}


Another very interesting inscription from Hierapolis is the commemorative stele from the first half of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century.\footnote{SEG XLVI 1657; cf. L. Robert, Les gladiateurs, 56-57 and 170 no. 156 (= IAph2007 12.1211).}

Ἀγαθή Τούχη / ὑπόμνημα φα/μιλίας μονο/μάχον καὶ κυ/ɲηγεσίων καὶ / ταυροκαθαψι/αὶν Βναίου Ἀπ/ίου Ἀπουλη/που, Ἀυριλιανοῦ / ϊνο, χειλιάρ/χου καὶ ἀρ/χιερέως, καὶ / Ἀυρηλίας Με/λιτίνης Ἀντ/ικήνης, ἀρχιε/ρείας, τῆς γν/αίκος αὐτοῦ.

The gladiatorial shows were offered by, and the \textit{familia} of gladiators belonged to Gnaeus Arrius Apuleius and his wife Aurelia Melitine Attikiane. Both were highpriests in the imperial cult of the city and both are otherwise unattested in Hierapolis. Arrius was \textit{tribunus militum} (χειλιάρχος) and thereby \textit{equus Romanus}. It was not unusual after mentioning tribuneship to omit any reference of a legion (nor of any of the other \textit{tres militiae}, for that matter).

In Aizanoi there are several inscriptions honoring a certain Ti. Claudius Pardalas (\textit{PhAA 13}), \textit{archiereus Asias} in the temple in Pergamon.\footnote{MAMA IX 18-21.} He was also stephanephoros, agonothete (three times?) of the Great Pentaeteric Games, strategos and the priest of Zeus: \footnote{MAMA IX 19.}


\footnote{MAMA IX P246 (= IGR IV 631).}
This Ti. Claudius Pardalas could be identified as (or at least related to) one Claudius Pardalas, a strategos and *neokoros* in Pergamon during the reign of Antoninus Pius. This strategos was also a friend of Aelius Aristides and, from childhood, a friend of influential and very well connected C. Iulius Severus from Ankyra, *consul suffectus* in 139 AD. Aelius Aristides and Severus both agreed that Pardalas was an expert on oratory and literature. The *cognomen* Pardalas is also attested several times in Sardeis, but *nomen* of these individuals is Iulius.

Another inscription from the area of Aizanoi records L. Claudius Pardalas, financially responsible for setting up a bomos for a friend, T. Flavius Lepidus:

> ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δήμος ἐτείμησεν Τ. Φλ. / Δέπιδον, τὸν / εὐεργέτην / τῆς πατρίδος / ἐν πᾶσιν τὴν τεμημίν / ἀναστήσαν/τος παρ’ ἐαυ/τοῦ Λ. Κλ. Παρ/δαλᾶ τοῦ φίλου / αὐτοῦ.

This same Pardalas appears also on a dedication by the freedman Chrestos on his master’s behalf:


As editors of *MAMA* IX argued, there is a slight possibility that L. Claudius Pardalas is the man attested in Pergamon, although heavily restored *MAMA* IX 19, together with other inscriptions mentioning Ti. Claudius Pardalas, make the latter a more suitable candidate for such eminent and influential friends, while L. Claudius Pardalas would have perhaps been a less distinguished member of the family.

However, there seems to be another family connection concerning L. Claudius Pardalas. In one honorary inscription, also from Aizanoi, the honorand is a high-priest

---

546 *PIR²* C 951.
547 His connections with Phrygia were mentioned in the previous chapter.
548 *Ael. Arist. Or.* L (26) 27 (432K) and 87 (447K).
549 Iulius Pardalas in *I Eph* 3825 in Hypaipa; Tib. Iulius Pardalas from Sardeis on a military diploma *CIL* XVI 7 (22. dec. 68 AD); Socrates Pardalas *I. Sardis* 22; *I. Sardis* 91; *SEG* XXVIII 928.
550 *MAMA* IX P46.
551 *MAMA* IX 54; cf. also possible restoration in *SEG* XL 1226 and *SEG* XLV 1720.
of Asia holding office in Smyrna before that city received its third neokoria under Caracalla (ca. 214 AD).\textsuperscript{552}

\[\text{— — — — / } [\text{ἐν τῇ πρ}]	ext{ῷ}<\text{τη}> / [\text{τῆς}] \text{Ἀσίας καὶ δι[ζ] νεωκόρφ τόν / } [\text{Σ}]	ext{εβαστών Σμύρ/ναίων πόλει <δ>/κόν]ον Λουκίου / [ ] \text{Κλαυδίου / [Σεουμπ]είνο / — — —} \]

Both, Wörrle\textsuperscript{553} and editors of \textit{SEG}\textsuperscript{554} believe that the honorand in question is L. Claudius Lepidus, attested as \textit{archierus Asias} in the temple of Smyrna on two more inscriptions from Aizanoi:

\[\text{ἡ Ἡρακλεᾶς φυλὴ / Λ. Κλ. Λέπιδον, τόν / ἀρχινεωκόρον, ie/ρέα τοῦ αὐτοκράτο/ρος διὰ βίου, ἀρχιερεῖ/α Ἀσίας ναὸν ἐν / Σμύρνῃ, στεφαν/φόρον καὶ ἁγιων/θέτην ἀποδεδε/γκέλνο τῆς πατρί/δος τόν εὐεργ/ῆν, ἐπιμεληθέν/ν[τος — — —]} \]


Wörrle suggests that L. Claudius Lepidus is the grandson of L. Claudius Severinus,\textsuperscript{557} also attested in \textit{MAMA IX} 10 as supplying funds for an aqueduct and that L. Claudius Pardalas is the member of the same family. He also argues that Cl(audius) Severinus (identified as previously mentioned L. Claudius Severinus) and Berenike, on record on a sarcophagus found near Aizanoi in 1990 and now in the Museum of

\textsuperscript{552} \textit{MAMA IX} P51 = \textit{IGR} IV 541.
\textsuperscript{553} M. Wörrle, Neue Inschriftenfunde aus Aizanoi I, \textit{Chiron} 22 (1992), 361-363.
\textsuperscript{554} Commentary on \textit{SEG} XLII 1189.
\textsuperscript{555} \textit{MAMA IX} P55 = \textit{IGR} IV 586.
\textsuperscript{556} \textit{SEG} XXVI 1352.
\textsuperscript{557} For the opinion that L. Claudius Lepidus was the brother of L. Claudius Severinus see M. D. Campanile, Sommi sacerdoti, asiarchi e culto imperiale: un aggiornamento, \textit{Studi Ellenistici} 19 (2006), 537.
Kütahya (dating probably from around 150-175 AD) are possibly the parents of Severina, the wife of the famous M.Ulpius Appuleius Eurykles.\textsuperscript{558}

One distinguished family originating from Eumeneia was also attested in Ephesos and Hierapolis. The first elite member was (M.) Claudius Valerianus (\textit{PhAA 16}), \textit{archiereus Asias} in the time of Domitian.\textsuperscript{559} His wife, Claudia Terentulla was also \textit{archiereia Asias} attested on Eumenian coins.\textsuperscript{560} Their son M. Claudius Valerianus Tertullianus (\textit{PhAA 17}) is attested in three inscriptions from Eumeneia. He erected an honorary inscription for the people of Eumeneia during the reign of Hadrian, presenting himself as \textit{υἱὸς Ἀσιάς} and \textit{ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσιάς}.\textsuperscript{561} In the second, an honorary inscription for members of the Imperial family, the same man is \textit{ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσιάς} ναὸν τῶν ἐν Ἑφέσῳ as well as \textit{agonotheses} and \textit{grammateus of boule}.\textsuperscript{562} Finally, he left a grave monument for his loyal freedman Claudius Zosimos.\textsuperscript{563}

An inscription from Ephesos records one Claudia Valeriana, daughter of a Valerianus, a priestess of Artemis.\textsuperscript{564} It is highly likely she was a daughter of (M.) Claudius Valerianus and Claudia Terentulla, especially since in an inscription from Hierapolis we find M. Flavius Valerianus Terentullianus (\textit{PhAA 24}) as \textit{archiereus Asias}.\textsuperscript{565} It is reasonable to assume that from his mother’s side he belonged to the family of Claudii Valeriani from Eumeneia, while his father was a Flavius.

Suitable intermarriage between local notables raised the social standing of involved families, brought benefits to the individual families and, indirectly, to their native cities. The growing number of intermarriages between notables of different cities is particularly well attested for sophists’ families. In one such case, Flavius Rufinianus, from Phocaea, who lived in the time of Commodus, married (Claudia) Callisto, from a famous family of sophists of Laodikeia. They had a son, the sophist L. Flavius Hermocrates.\textsuperscript{566} Callisto was the daughter of the sophist P. Antonius Claudius Attalos,

\textsuperscript{558} M. Wörle, Neue Inschriftenfunde aus Aizanoi I, \textit{Chiron} 22 (1992), 362; more on Eurykles and his family in chapter 5.3
\textsuperscript{559} \textit{RPC} II 1386-1387 (=\textit{BMC Phrygia} 218, no. 47f).
\textsuperscript{560} \textit{RPC} II 1388.
\textsuperscript{561} \textit{SEG} XXVIII 1115.
\textsuperscript{562} \textit{SEG} XXVIII 1116.
\textsuperscript{563} \textit{MAMA} IV 336.
\textsuperscript{564} \textit{IEph} 950.
\textsuperscript{565} \textit{SEG LII} 1342 (after 132-161 AD): Μάρκον Φλάδωνον / Οὐαλεριανόν Τερενον/τολλιανόν ἀρχιερέα / Ἀσίας / Πόπλιος Αἰβούτος / Φλάκκος τὸν ἴδιον / καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς / αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν τέκνων εὐεργέτην.
\textsuperscript{566} \textit{PIR²} F 285; Philostr. VS, p. 265; C. P. Jones, \textit{Epigraphica} IV–V, \textit{ZPE} 124 (2003), 127–130 on Hermocrates and members of his family.
who was probably the *prytanis* and *logistes* known from the coins of Synnada, and the aunt of the sophist M. Antonius Polemo, who served as the *strategos* in the city of Smyrna. Another good example is a marriage of the descendant of a notable family from Tralleis, senator C. Iulius Philippus to one of the daughters of the famous sophist T. Flavius Damianus from Ephesos, either Flavia Phaedrina or Flavia Lepida. Damianus, on his part, was married into the famous Ephesian Vedii Antonini family.

Family ties were very important, important enough to be mentioned in almost every inscription honoring elite members. Reference to illustrious ancestors and living relatives is almost obligatory, especially if they are descendants of Hellenistic royal families or Roman citizens of equestrian rank or higher.

**5.5 Municipal elite**

Urban elite, civic aristocracy, civic magistrates are just some of the expressions describing a group of community leaders and their families. They are very prominent in the inscriptions from Asia Minor, especially honorific ones, and they influence our concept of city life in antiquity. Those inscriptions, important enough to be carved in stone, give us a certain image of the elite, although their everyday lives were probably more ordinary than we imagine.

Wealthy families are known from epigraphic evidence from Roman Asia Minor, and they represent the cream of the provincial and urban elite. Possessing substantial resources, holding the highest civic, provincial and, frequently, imperial offices, making huge benefactions, they managed to hold on to their top position through a combination...
of fertility and clever strategies of marriage, adoption and succession. Other, lesser, elite families are likely to have tried to follow their counterparts in the highest social stratum in terms of style, attitude and appearance, and therefore also in terms of epigraphic representation. Urban centers flourished in Asia Minor during the first two centuries of Roman Empire. From the time of Augustus, Roman emperors preferred self-governing cities, communities that will fulfill one task: to help Empire run efficiently.\(^{574}\) Around the middle of the second century, the Roman Empire experienced a time of relative peace and prosperity and the Greek-speaking elite of the Eastern provinces of the Empire thrived.\(^{575}\) Civic administration was responsible for this imperial task and many of city’s magistracies were not only honorable but financially burdensome, so wealth played a key role in forming this group. Communal behavior and interrelationships were regulated by the institutions of the polis itself.

The city was characteristically the place of residence of the elite, the center of political, social and cultural life. The great landowners, who formed at least the core of these political elite, lived in and played a dominant role in the organization of the town, although they also owned estates in the countryside. The same urban elite which idealized the ancestral values of the land defined its own elite status by its urbane. Many inscriptions are commemorating benefactions members of the city elite bestowed on surrounding villages, probably close to their own estates. Nevertheless, both socially and politically, contact with the commercial world of the towns was inevitable for the elite. It could be assumed that the economic dimension was also vital. Both as patrons of freedmen engaged in trade, and as property owners collecting rents, a substantial portion of the urban elite must have derived at least part of their income from trade, even if they did not actually conducted businesses.\(^{576}\) As we shall see later, there are indications that some leading families in Roman Lydia (especially in Saittai) and Phrygia had been involved, at least indirectly, in the industrial and trade processes with professional associations.\(^{577}\) Many professional associations erected honorific inscriptions for city magistrates or benefactors, either grateful for the help they have


\(^{577}\) Cf. chapter 6.1.
already received or hoping to influence an important individual. Hierapolis and
Laodikeia, true export cities under the Roman empire, were other examples whose
urban elites built up their wealth not only from land but from their specialized
production of luxury goods. As seen before, epigraphic documents rarely give clues to
the honorand’s wealth.

There is much evidence for the development of the provincial and municipal
elite in the first three centuries of Roman rule. Due to hundreds of honorific
inscriptions, detailing names and careers, we can assemble extensive family trees,
connecting fathers and sons, husbands and wives, all of them graced with many glorious
epithets. Some of these families were discussed in the previous chapters. Certain city
magistrates were progenitors of the provincial elite, fathers of equestrians, grandfathers
of senators.

Citizenship and the holding of provincial offices allowed local notables to form
the provincial elite, which was facilitated by intermarriages and adoptions and by the
acquisition of property in different parts of the province.

A very interesting case study of social mobility appears from the inscriptions
concerning M. Iulius Dionysius Aquilianus from Thyateira in the second century AD.
We first meet him around 140 AD as Dionysius, son of Menelaus, a child agonothete. Next he is called M. Iulius Dionysius Aquilianus and is stephanephoros twice and it also
stated he loved fame from childhood. As Robert suggested, he was probably adopted
by his paternal uncle M. Iulius Atticianus, together with his brother, later known as C.
Iulius Celsianus. In another inscription honoring Menelaus, son of Apollonius, the
two brothers join in with boule and demos in honoring their deceased biological
father. Unlike other members of his family, Menelaus has no Romanized name, and
all the titles listed in this inscription are actually those of the siblings, stephanephoroi,
pritaneia and agonothetai. Their paternal uncle (θεός), and possible adoptive father is
also mentioned as he was the one who covered the expenses for this generosity of two

578 Cf. tables 3 - 8.
579 TAM V2 960.
580 TAM V2 965.
581 L. Robert, Hellenica VI, 73-74, esp. n. 1; v. family stemma on the next page.
582 TAM V2 992.
brothers.\(^583\) The last two inscriptions belong to the second generation. C. Iulius Celsianus had a daughter Iulia Juliana, a great benefactor, a priestes of the Mother of Gods for life and agonothete and his titles were listed as well: strategos, agoranomos, hipparchos, dekaprotos and the distributor of τριτείς.\(^584\) Halfmann also speculates that there can be a connection with the well-known Sardian family of Celsii.\(^585\) M. Iulius Dionysius Aquilianus had a son, M. Iulius Menelaus, who was archiereus and boularchos for life and agonothete. In an inscription honoring him,\(^586\) both his parents are mentioned. By now, around 215 AD, Iulius Dionysius was asiarch in Pergamon, agonothete, archiereus and stephanephoros twice in his city and his wife Furia Paulla was prytanis in Ephesus. It looks like the boy Dionysius came to the top of provincial elite through all honorable civil offices and obviously one cannot dispute his φιλοδοξία.

The family stemma of M. Iulius Dionysius Acylianus from Thyateira
(taken from TAM V2 p. 356)

\(^{583}\) TAM V2 992 ll. 10-14: Μάξθνπ / Ἰνπιίνπ Ἀηηηθηαλνῦ ηνῦ ζεί/νπ αὐηῶλ ἐθ ηῶλ ἰδίσλ ηὰ εἰο / ηὰο θηινδνμίαο αὐηῶλ ἀλα/ιώκαηα πνηήζαληνο; cf. Robert, Hellenica VI, loc. cit.

\(^{584}\) TAM V2 963: ἀγαζ῅η ηύρεη / ἟ βνπιὴ θαὶ ὁ δ῅κνο ἐηείκεζαλ Ἰ(νπιίαλ) Ἰνπ/ιηαλήλ, ζπγαηέξα Δ. Ἐνπιίνπ Κειζηαλνῦ / ζηξαηεγνῦ, ἀγνξαλόκνπ, ἱππάξρνπ, δεθα /πξώηνπ, ηξηηεπηνῦ, ἱέξεηαλ η῅ο Με/ηξὸο ηῶλ ζεῶλ δηὰ βίνπ, ἀγσλνζεηήζα/ζαλ ιαλπξῶο θαὶ πνιπδαπάλσο.

\(^{585}\) Halfmann, Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil, 112.

\(^{586}\) TAM V2 969.
5.6 Benefactions of provincial and municipal elite

Like the members of the senatorial order, equestrians were also benefactors in their hometowns and, as such, received honors attested in the inscriptions. They were usually styled évηργήτης τῆς πατρίδος or évηργήτης τῆς πόλεως. Aelius Dionysodoros, a Roman ἵππικός, is known only from a single inscription from Synnada. In this document he is mentioned as the first archon in charge of erecting a monument in honor of his fellow citizen, imperial procurator Aurelius Faustinus.

tὸν κράτιστον / ἐπίτροπον τοῦ Σεβ. / Αὐρ. Φαουστείον / τὸν ἐυηργήτην / καὶ κτίστην ἡ πατρίς / προνοησαμένων / τῆς ἀναστάσεως / τῶν περὶ Αἰλ. / Διονυσόδωρον / ἵππικὸν / πρῶτον ἀρχοντα / τὸ β’ ἀρχόντων.

In addition to being évηργήτης, procurator Aurelius Faustinus in MAMA VI 378 was κτίστης in his native Synnada.

M. Iulius Strenio Antistianus (PhE 17) from Synnada was a καθολικὸς (rationalis) in the reign of Septimius Severus and Caracalla. He is honored by the boule and demos for his “unsurpassed benefactions” (interestingly enough, in spite of this grand claim no specific benefactions were mentioned in the inscription).

Another equestrian benefactor, Aur. Klodios Eutyches, was honored in Temenothyrai. He was honored by the boule and the city (probably an alternative designation of demos) as a benefactor of his homeland:

ἀγαθῇ τῇχῃ ἡ βουλὴ / Αὐρήλιον Κλώδιον / Εὐτύχην, ἵππικόν, καὶ ἡ λαμπροτάτη Τημενο/θυρέων πόλις ἢ πα/τρίς τὸν ἐυηργήτην / ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων πόρων / ἔτειμησεν ἑπιμελησι/μένου τῆς ἀναστάσεως/ος τοῦ ἀνδριάντος / Αὐρήλιου Σκο[π]ηλιανοῦ / Ζευξιδος βουλευτοῦ

587 MAMA VI 373 (Iulius Lycinius), MAMA VI 376 (M. Iulius Strenio Antistianus), MAMA VI 378 (Aurelius Faustinus) and IGR IV 615 (Aur. Klodion Eutyches).
588 IGR IV 883 (Tiberius Cl. Polemon).
589 MAMA VI 378.
591 IGR IV 615.
Their donations were probably similar, although perhaps more modest, than those made by senatorial families. Most of the benefactions were made for festivals, public buildings and distributions.\(^{592}\) One could argue that *hombres equestri censu* had more impact on everyday life and civic society than the frequently absent senators. Except in scale of their achievements (but even this is debatable), the public activity of equestrians is not different than the activity of the other local grandees. It is necessary, therefore, to treat all of the benefactions as manifestations of a single socio-political phenomenon.

Thanks to hundreds of honorific inscriptions (thousands in the terms of entire Asia Minor), we see various social, political and economic aspects of this phenomenon. In spite of it being very important for creating the desired image of the city’s wealthiest, there is no single ancient Greek word for it. Euergetism is a modern term (although derived from an ancient Greek word), and is treated as a serious topic among scholars from the beginning of 20\(^{th}\) century onwards. It represents a display of private munificence in the community. The word derives from the Greek *euergetes*, or benefactor, an honorific title awarded to generous elite individuals, frequent in inscriptions, and also used in the phrase *euergetein ten polin*, making a benefaction to the city. In ancient Greek, *euergesia* was the term commonly used for a benefaction. Benefactions were the subject of 1976 book by Paul Veyne, *Le Pain et le Cirque*, from the socio-economic point of view\(^{593}\) and many other studies discussed this issue.\(^{594}\) Most recent monograph on euergetism is one by Arjan Zuiderhoek in 2009.\(^{595}\) For Zuiderhoek, euergetism was a form of gift-exchange between a rich citizen and his (occasionally her) city/community of fellow citizens, or groups within the citizenry.\(^{596}\) Epigraphic documents from the cities of Asia Minor often testify how rich and powerful individuals bestowed on their fellow citizens new temples, public and utilitarian buildings, and gifts in money, oil wine or food.

---

\(^{592}\) Zuiderhoek, *The Politics*, 76-77.


Euergetism was a complex phenomenon, its many aspects still being subjected to heated debate. Although this has been disputed fairly recently,597 most of the scholars still maintain the opinion that euergetism was essential addition to revenues of every city. In this way, the financial dependence of the cities on the wealthy assured the power of individuals in those cities. Nevertheless, the key features of euergetism seem to have been of a political and ideological nature; as symbolic affirmation of civic social and political ideals, and the elite’s need for affirmation and legitimation of their power and prestige. From the later Hellenistic period the agoras, gymnasiuems, various public buildings and theaters of most Greek cities were already filled with a multitude of statues of benefactors or other honorands. Confronted with this multitude of statues inherited from the past, the new benefactors had to somehow distinguish themselves from the ordinary recipients of honors. This escalation resulted in the commissioning of statues that were oversize, equestrian or gilded, separated at first sight from the ordinary dedications. In certain ways benefactors were no longer seen as ordinary citizens. They were perhaps seen, as Stevenson stated, “as procreative or tutelary figures of singular virtue, resembling the ideal benefactor presented through religion.”598 The epithets used in honorific inscriptions from Lydia and Phrygia seem to support this. Most simply, a benefactor can be described as a good man, ἄνὴρ ἀγαθός,599 good father or a son, πατήρ/φιλός καλός και ἀγαθός.600 Other virtues might be mentioned in a straightforward manner: the honored is then said to possess qualities such as φιλοσοφία (love of honour),601 φιλοποιία (love of fame),602 φιλοπατρία (love of one’s native city), μεγαλοπρέπεια (liberality), μεγαλοφροσύνη603 or μεγαλοψυχία605 (greatness of mind/spirit, i.e. magnanimity, generosity). Alternatively, the virtuous character of the honored might show from the manner in which he (or, sometimes, she) has performed

599 I. Sardis 27; IK Tralleis 73; 109, TAM V2 937; cf. also ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν καὶ φιλόσοφον IK Tralleis 80; CIG 3831=MAMA IX P41; Alt.v.Hierapolis 39; IGR IV 1161=Robert, Hellenica VI, 84, no. 28.
600 TAM V3 1488.
601 TAM V2 950; 989; 1003; TAM V3 1488; 1489; IK Tralleis 81; 90; MAMA IX P 6; 7.
602 I. Sardis 64; TAM V2 965; 989; MAMA IX 35; P42.
603 I. Sardis 47; 61; TAM V2 829; 929; 954 (a woman); 989; 994; 1192; 1193; TAM V3 1488; IK Tralleis 80; MAMA IV 296; MAMA V 6; IGR IV 783=MAMA VI List 146, no. 105; SEG VI, 167=MAMA VI List 149, no. 167; MAMA IX P36; 40; 41.
604 TAM V2 950; 960.
605 I. Sardis 47; TAM V2 993; MAMA IX 27.
certain duties or taken certain actions. He can then, for instance, be said to have acted σεμνώς (in an august or stately manner), ἐνδόξως (honourably), ἑπιφανῶς (lit. shinningly, i.e. conspicuously, famously), λαμπρῶς (splendidly, illustriously). Often, also, one of the virtues mentioned above is used in adverbial form, i.e. someone can be said to have acted φιλοτημος (ambitiously) or μεγαλοπρεπῶς (liberally, generously). Finally, virtues and qualities of character might be implied by certain honorific titles, such as σωτήρ (saviour), κτίστης (founder, mostly in the sense of restorer) or εὐεργετής (benefactor). One example of these greatest honors would be the following inscription:


C. Julius Xenon of Thyateira, who had bestowed great benefits on the whole of Asia and on his own city, was honored as a hero, as well as the σωτήρ, κτίστης and εὐεργετής of his native city in the first half of Augustus' reign with a heroon named after him, and was commemorated by an association also named after him. Unfortunately the specific architectural form of the Xenoneion cannot be determined, but it is presumed to have incorporated his tomb.

All of the moral qualities just mentioned were in fact only aspects of the general ἀρετή (virtuousness) of the καλοὶ καὶ ἔγχαθοι ἄνδρες (honourable and good men) who

---

606 TAM V2 948; Alt.v.Hierapolis 39; TAM V3 1488.
607 TAM V2 829; 942; 943; 946; 950; 983; 993; TAM V3 1489; IK Tralleis 147b; SEG XLI 1017; MAMA IV 130; Alt.v. Hierapolis 39.
608 I. Sardis 27; 89; TAM V2 875; 983; 1001; 1105; TAM V3 1489; IK Tralleis 112; SEG XXXV 1365; MAMA IX 33; P 41; P 43; IGR IV 1161=Robert, Hellenica VI, 84, no. 28.
609 TAM V2 829; IGR IV 1161=Robert, Hellenica VI, 84, no. 28.
610 TAM V2 829; 944; 983; 998.
611 TAM V2 1098; 1194; IK Tralleis 74; IGR IV 570=MAMA P34.
612 TAM V2 1098; IK Tralleis 74; IK Laodikeia am Lykos 40; IGR IV 642; SEG VI, 167=MAMA VI List 149, no. 167; MAMA IX P58.
613 TAM V2 829; 1098; 1194; IGR IV 642; IGR IV 570=MAMA IX P34; IGR IV 577=MAMA IX P40; MAMA IX 17; 22; 25; 26; P56=SEG XXVI 1352; IGR IV 586=MAMA IX P55; SEG XXXV 1365.
614 TAM V2 1098.
615 S. Cormack, The Space of Death in Roman Asia Minor, Wien 2004, 149.
ruled the cities, and who showed their εὐνοία πρὸς τὸν δήμον (goodwill towards the people) by holding public offices, performing liturgies and making public benefactions. Φιλόπατρες could sometimes be seen as an honorific municipal title similar to φιλοκοίσωρ and φιλοσέβαστος and is often associated with them. It was also the world of competition and display, which is summed up in the mentioned term φιλοτιμία, love of honor, and it had a darker side, although it could not be seen from the honorific inscriptions. Literary sources provide the necessary information. In his Precepts of Statecraft Plutarch makes a passing reference of the civil strife in Sardeis because of the rivalry between two of its citizens. He declares τὴν Παρδαλᾶ πρὸς Τυρρηνὸν ἐχθραν, ὡς ὄλγον ἐδέησεν ἀνελείν τὰς Σάρδεις, ἐξ αἰτίῶν μικρῶν καὶ ἰδίων εἰς ἀπόστασιν καὶ πόλεμον ἐμβαλόσσα. We have to take this statement carefully, as it is quite possible that Plutarch was a bit exaggerating.

Some kind of pattern is discernible. The person’s name is mentioned, his/her outstanding character, his/her benefactions which preserve or save those concerned and the praise is elaborated. In time, the inscriptions tend to be more fulsome in praise, specifying a number of virtues which explain person’s ἄρετή. Growing number of benefactions has given new and particular emphasis on the unselfishness of the benefactor. A good example of the honors bestowed on the city benefactor and most of the epithets mentioned is an inscription from Thyateira, end of 2nd or beginning of the 3rd century.

[ἀγ]αζ῅η ηύρεη / [Ἦ] βουλή/ [― — — Λαβιμανδ] τοῦ Καλ/λιστράτου ἀγανοθετήσαν-

---

616 Zuiderhoek, The Politics, 122.
617 Cf. Buckler-Robinson, Honorific inscriptions from Sardis, AIA 17 (1913), 39-40; for a regular epithet cf. I. Sardis 47; 61; TAM V2 829; 929; 954 (a woman); 989; 994; 1192; 1193; TAM V3 1488; IK Trealles 80; MAMA IV 296; MAMA V 6; IGR IV 783=MAMA VI List 146, no. 105; SEG VI, 167=MAMA VI List 149, no. 167; MAMA IX P36; 40; 41; cf. φιλόπολες in SEG XXXV 1365 (Aizanoi) and φιλογέροντα in IGR IV 783=MAMA VI List 146, no. 105.
618 Plut. Praecepts 825D: the enmity of Pardalas and Tyrrenhus, which came near to destroying Sardis by involving the State in rebellion and war as the result of petty private matters; English translation by H. N. Fowler.
619 TAM V2 983.
Adverbs ἐνδόξως and ἐπιφανῶς describe Laevianus’ agonothesia as praiseworthy and splendidly accomplished. Also, charitable distributions to the boule (δια[νο]μαῖς καὶ ἐπιδόσεων) were described by combined adjectives φιλοτείμως and μεγαλοπρεπῶς, ambitiously and generously done. Laevianus completed public sacrifices and festivities ἀφθόνως καὶ ἀνυπερβλήτως (plentifully and incomparably) with public feasts, as well. He also adorned the fatherland with theatrical and gymnastic games and performed all the archai, leitourgiai and hyperesiai obediently and with love and honor for his country.

There are many other adverbs that are frequently used in inscriptions to single out honorand’s exceptional qualities in performing public tasks, such as σωμφερόντως (“profitably”, “benefically”), ἐπιμελῶς (“with care”) or ἀγνῶς (“purely”, “without any guilt”). In most cases we cannot tell the reality behind the phrase, if an honorand actually carried out his duties in a way that was truly exceptional compared to the other magistrates. Frequency of usage by itself speaks against such a conclusion; it is much more likely that even the less efficient official where praised with the same vocabulary. In the following honorary inscription from Sardis a public-minded citizen’s work is praised using exactly these adverbs:620

620 SEG XLVIII 1472 (50 AD).
The phrases μεγαλοπρεπῶς καὶ ἐνδόξως (“brilliantly and with distinction”) are frequently combined in describing a benefactor, as in the following inscription from Attaleia in Lydia: 621

ἡ βουλή [καὶ ὁ δῆμος] / ὁ Ατταλεατῶν ἐτείμησαν Διονύσιον Γλώ/κονος ἀνδρά
φιλόπα/τριν και ἐφεργέτην, με/τέχοντα καὶ τῆς προε/δρίας, ἀρξαντα μεγα/λοπρεπῶς και ἐνδόξως / εἰς ταῖς δυναμιᾶ/των στρατηγίαν τε καὶ παρχίαν καὶ νομοφυλ/α/κίαν καὶ ἀγορανομίαν καὶ σειστονίαν, καθα ἡ πατρί/ες / ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τοῦ πολεμίου ἔτει τῆ/ν / λαμπροτάτην ἀρχήν, ἐν ἀναστάθεισιν τῆς τε/πού καὶ ἐπὶ Μενεκράτους β’ / ἀρχηγοῦντος α’ καὶ ἰερέος τῶν κυρίων αὐτοκρατόρων, γραμ/ματεύοντος βουλῆς δῆ/μου Ἀλυσιαποῦ Ἀλύσι/ποῦ [καὶ ὁ δῆ/μος].

Local patriotism and love of one’s fellow citizens is also the motive most frequently encountered in inscriptions recording gifts by generous members of the urban elite. Therefore when elite donors motivate their gifts by saying that they have ‘loved my dearest homeland from my earliest youth’ or wish ‘to requite the native town that bred and loves me’ there is no reason to doubt their sincerity. Roman citizenship, which became increasingly widespread in the east during the second century AD, never managed to replace local citizenship and it was never supposed to; instead, the two statuses simply co-existed. And this is evident from the fact that cities regarded the grant of their citizenship to outsiders who had done them well as one of the highest honors they could bestow, at least on a foreigner. Members of urban elites, however powerful, wealthy or influential in the wider world of the Empire, probably first and foremost felt themselves to be citizens of their native communities, and, most importantly, fellow citizens of their poorer compatriots. 622 That was one of the reasons why rich benefactors, members of the city’s elite, wanted to donate public and utilitarian buildings. Benefactions mostly consisted of public buildings or donations of public games and festivals or distribution of money, food and oil. Gifts of games and festivals or, for instance, large distributions of money among all citizens, or of oil for

621 TAM V2 829.
the gymnasia, were sometimes quite expensive. Especially if the gift was made in the form of a foundation or a donation of e.g. a whole building; that was reserved for the richest among urban elite. Small-scale money distributions among select groups of citizens, often the council and/or the *gerousia*, suggests that relatively modest gifts predominated.

When elite generosity was displayed through erecting or adorning buildings the emphasis was clearly on those types of public structures that made a city ‘urban’ in the Greco-Roman sense. Temples, stoas, baths, gymnasia, *bouleuteria*, theatres, public buildings which dominate the cityscape of every true polis, were the most favoured objects of munificence in public building. Temples and sanctuaries were the most popular, as many benefactors were often priests of the city’s cults as well. Stoas came in a close second place. Elite benefactors, eager to transform their cities into magnificent civic landscapes, found in the colonnaded avenue their perfect form. Stoas, colonnaded streets, were civic surroundings par excellence. Next were baths and gymnasia. In Roman Asia Minor, these two were usually combined in one single complex, a synthesis of the Hellenistic gymnasium and the Roman bath building. The gymnasium was a perhaps central institution in the life of the civic community and required the financial support of the members of the local elites. After them come also theatres and agoras. Most agoras combined the functions of a local market, place of worship, venue for social interaction and sociability, center of competitive elite display (in the form of monuments and statues) and stage for general architectural and sculptural splendor. Hence, in a very literal sense, the agora was the center of everyday life. Sardeis and Aizanoi are great examples of elaborate civic building benefactions. Perhaps this kind of benefactions was one of the reasons to bestow the epithet κτίστης or even in one place οἰκιστής τῆς πόλεως to a benefactor. In doing so,
the benefactor was equaled with the heroic founders adding a cultic aspect to it.\textsuperscript{627} An interesting example is C. Voconius Aelius Stratonicus from Dorylaion in Phrygia, who was called ‘Ἀκάμας ύεως after the heroic founder Akamantios Dorylaos.\textsuperscript{628}

Games and festivals, therefore, were also a popular form of munificence. In many ways, they precisely fitted the bill of what an oligarchic elite of rich citizens in a Greek city of Roman times needed in order to maintain social harmony. By financing a number of civic institutions which would otherwise have been abandoned or greatly reduced in size, the benefactors performed a great service for their cities. Some offices were costly \textit{leitourgiai}, and their holders were regularly praised for meeting official expenses and making various sorts of benefaction when in office.\textsuperscript{629} For this reason basic features of these offices were similar to those \textit{leitourgiai} which survived into the imperial period from earlier times. They could be performed more than once as well as “for life” and “in perpetuity” and also simultaneously with other offices. The distinction between \textit{archai} and \textit{leitourgiai} was not always clear.\textsuperscript{630} “Highest” and “first” \textit{archai} became part of “other \textit{leitourgiai},” implying that these and similar adjectives designated not so much administratively important offices but those that were primarily socially prestigious.\textsuperscript{631} The coexistence of the two words perhaps points out that their meanings remained distinct in the Roman times, as in this inscription:\textsuperscript{632}

\begin{verbatim}
ἠ βουλή καὶ ὁ δήμος καὶ ἡ γερουσία / ἐπείμησαν Τιβέριον Κλαύδιον Τιβέρίου ύιόν / Κυρίνα ᾽Ιουλιανόν πατέρα καὶ τοὺς ύιοὺς αὐτοῦ / Κλαύδιον Διομήδην ἥρωα, Τιβέριον Κλαύδιον / Χαρέα<ν> ἥρωα, πατρὸς καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν, στρατηγὸν / δῖς καὶ στεφανηφόρον καὶ γυμνασιάρχου, καὶ τὰς / μεγίστας ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς λειτουργίας τῇ
\end{verbatim}


\textsuperscript{628} \textit{MAMA} V Lists I, 181, no. 30 (=\textit{IGR} IV 527): τὸν κτίστην πόλεως / ἀκαμάτον ὄς, Δορύλαον, κοιτῶν ἀρ’ Ἡρακλέους ἢ Ἀκάματον νόος / τὸς ἱδίος ἔργος στεφανοῦμεν, ἀντὶ νυ πολλῶν / ἃν ἔπορεν πατρί, φιλὴ Ἀκαμάτου / ἐπείμησε τῇ ἁγίασταις - Λύρ. - Στέφανος β’ / ὁ φιλόσοφος; his name is attested in \textit{MAMA} V Lists I, 181, no. 22 (=\textit{IGR} IV 526) and \textit{MAMA} V Lists I, 181, no. 33 (=\textit{IGR} IV 525).

\textsuperscript{629} \textit{TAM} V2 964.


\textsuperscript{631} \textit{TAM} V3 1488.

\textsuperscript{632} \textit{TAM} V3 1488; cf. also \textit{TAM} V2 983.
Tiberius Claudius, son of Tiberius, was praised for having performed the “highest archai” and “other leitourgiai”. But here too, although archai counted as leitourgiai (surely because of financial expenditures that their holders had to bear), they were distinguished as a separate group of responsibilities. Leitourgiai also started to be described as “the greatest” or “remarkable” and “estimable”. These designations reflected the mounting cost of holding such offices, which raised their social prestige and turned them increasingly into social functions rather than administrative positions. The eponymous officials were still the most honored ones, but the post of secretary, grammatēj, played a significant, political, role as they were the ones who prepared and summoned the council and acted as intermediaries with Roman government. Gymnasiarchs and agonothetai were prestigious leitourgiai that were bringing festivities and glory to the city. Even so, no analogy with Roman cursus honorum can be made as there is no regular hierarchy of magistracies in Greek cities of Asia Minor.

There is a widespread consensus among the scholars that the real power in Graeco-Roman city lay in the boule. Many have observed the changes of this administrative body in Roman period. Decrees of the Greek cities in the Roman east continue to use the formula “the council (boule) and people (demos) decide/honour” well into the 3rd century. Nevertheless, Mitchell stated that when the council and people took the commonplace action of voting honors to an individual, the council was invariably named first, no doubt implying that it had initiated the action, and the verb describing the action is frequently inscribed in the singular, ignoring the presence of the people altogether. He also noted that in inscriptions of Aizanoi the singular ἔτειμησεν is usual after ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δήμος. It may be true for Aizanoi and few

---


634 There is also a female gymnasiarch in Dorylaion, Phrygia MAMA V List I 182, no. 82=IGR IV 522.

635 Cf. Lévy REG 12 (1899), 263.

636 Lévy, REG 8 (1895), 219-231; M. Sartre, Asie Mineure, 223;

637 Mitchell, Anatolia I, 201.

638 Lemma on MAMA IX 27.
other exceptions from the plural ἐπείμησαν have been observed in these provinces.\textsuperscript{640}

Even if that is a case on quite a number of recorded occasions in cities throughout the Roman east, it is the people (demos) on their own who are stated to have made a decision, without any apparent involvement of the council.\textsuperscript{641} Since by the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD the boule was more or less a closed body of the members of the wealthiest families in any given city, it is only reasonable to assume that any elite activities debated and decided primarily there. However, there is a clear connection between benefactors and wider community; the benefactors were reacting to specific public expectations. The closed bodies such as boule were not an ideal medium for this type of exchange. Therefore it can be assumed that it was in the assembly, not in the boule, that members of the elite wishing to act as public benefactors first made their public promise and negotiated and defended the terms and conditions of their gifts.

Two important groups associated with the boule can be differentiated. Dekaprotai were probably leading members of the city council, usually described as “the first ten of the city”.\textsuperscript{642} They are attested in Lydia in Hierokaisareia,\textsuperscript{643} Thyateira,\textsuperscript{644} Philadelphia,\textsuperscript{645} Tralleis,\textsuperscript{646} Iulia Gordos,\textsuperscript{647} but rarely in Phrygia, only three times.\textsuperscript{648} The dekaproteia was a prestigious leitourgia, exhibiting further evidence that local pride had its monetary value. These officials in Greek cities are generally considered to have corresponded to the decemprimi in the west and they were in charge of collecting of the taxes paid to Rome, for which the civic authorities were responsible.\textsuperscript{649} Until

\textsuperscript{640} MAMA IX 24; 25; 26; 27; 35; P36; P37; P39; P41; P42; P43; P45; P46; SEG XXIX 1380.

\textsuperscript{641} Phrygia: MAMA IV 15 (Akroenos); 124; 128; 129; 131; Ramsey, Cities and Bishoprics 759, 696 (Metropolis); 142 (Apollonia); SEG XXXVII 1099bis (Amorion); Ramsey, Cities and Bishoprics 613, 519 (Temenothyrai); Ramsey, Cities and Bishoprics 378, 204 (Eumeneia); SEG VI 237 (Stektorion); BCH 17 (1893), p. 282 no. 84 (Synamada); Lydia: TAM V2 835 (Attalia); 946; 960; 964 ; 992; 1006; 1013 (Thyateira); 1192 (Apollonis) ; 1323 (Hyrcanis); I Sardis 52; 58.

\textsuperscript{642} For example: TAM V1 604 (Satala); TAM V2 934; 1035 (Thyateira); 1194 (Apollonis); 1264 (Hierocaesarea); MAMA VI List p. 146 no. 110 (=IGR IV 787).

\textsuperscript{643} Jones, Greek City, 139.

\textsuperscript{644} TAM V2 1226.

\textsuperscript{645} TAM V2 930; 939; 940; 942; 945; 946; 947; 948; 963; 982; 989; 991; 999; 1024.

\textsuperscript{646} TAM V3 1459; 1663.

\textsuperscript{647} IK Tralleis 60; 77; 90; 120; 145.

\textsuperscript{648} M. Ricl, H. Malay, Two New Decrees from Iulia Gordos and Lora, EA 45 (2012), 73-87.

\textsuperscript{649} Jones (loc. cit.) states: “The relation of the ‘first ten’ to the collectors (of tax) is obscure; both are stated to have exacted the tribute and both were liable to make good deficits from their own property. The ‘first ten’ seem, however, to have been of higher rank than the collectors, who no doubt worked under their orders"; in n. 85 he quotes Ulpian on the responsibility of dekaprotoi, Dig. L, IV, 3: decaprotos etiam minoris annis XXV fieri, non militantes tamen, pridem placuit; quia patrimonii magis onus videtur esse.
fairly recently the date of introduction of *dekaprotoi* in the province of Asia was somewhat uncertain. Earlier generations of ancient historians and epigraphists, such as Magie, assumed they were not documented before the early second century in Asia Minor.\(^{650}\) However, one inscription from Tralleis mentioning *dekaproteia* was dated to 1\(^{st}\) century AD.\(^{651}\) This inscription, originally published in 1875,\(^{652}\) was dated to 1\(^{st}\) century AD by Bernhard Laum on the basis of the reconstruction of the line Ἰούλιον Κλαυδιανόν as Γ(αϊόν) Ἰούλιον Κλαυδιανόν.\(^{653}\) Assuming the proposed dating was correct this inscription would be the proof that there were indeed *dekaprotoi* in the province of Asia in the 1\(^{st}\) century AD. However, some editors have noticed slight traces of the letter T in the beginning of the line in question, making the abovementioned reconstruction impossible. On these grounds most of the recent authors have also maintained that there are no known *dekaprotoi* in Asia Minor until the 2\(^{nd}\) century AD.\(^{654}\) Recent epigraphical discovery furnished conclusive proof that *dekaprotoi* were present in Asia Minor much earlier. One newly published inscription from Iulia Gordos mentioning δεκάπρωτος roughly belongs to the middle of the 1\(^{st}\) century AD, while the other (the later one) is firmly dated to 69/70 AD. Together they prove that *dekaprotoi* existed in Asia Minor already in the mid first century AD. “The evidence is admittedly scant, but we can now make a suggestion that *dekaprotoi* were introduced at some point in time between 20 and 50 AD, at any rate, before 69/70 AD.\(^{655}\)

As a *leitourgia*, the *dekaproteia* could be held for more than a year.\(^{656}\) The panel of *dekaprotoi* became the representative body of the leading people in the city. Depending on the size of the city, personal wealth of the councilors, the financial burden, and probably some other considerations as well, either ten or twenty “first men” could be easily selected in time of need.

---


\(^{651}\) *IK Tralleis* 145.

\(^{652}\) *Mouseion* I (1873-1875), 126, no. 38; M. Pappakonstantinou, J. R. S. Sterrett, *MDAI(A)* 8, 1883, 328-330, no. 10; J. R. S. Sterrett, *Inscriptions of Tralles* no. 10; M. Pappakonstantinou, *Hai Tralleis* no. 36.

\(^{653}\) B. Laum, *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike* II, Berlin 1914, 99 no. 95.


\(^{656}\) *TAM* V 940 (Thyateira): δεκαπρωτος; Malay, *Researches*, 38–39, no. 22 = *SEG* XLIIX 1702.
Another group were boularchoi. Boularchos was perceived as leader of city council, one who called boule into session and implemented its decisions.657 Boularchoi are not attested before the reign of Hadrian and the title is confined to boundaries of provincia Asia and again not evenly attested throughout the province. They are attested in both Lydia658 and Phrygia.659 The number of sources, almost exclusively honorific inscriptions, peaked in the first half of the third century, up to the times of Gordian III, after whom there are almost no record of boularchoi, but it could be also attributed to the dramatic decrease of epigraphic sources in that period all together. Usual term of office was a year, but Thyateira was an exception as two boularchoi were attested as διά βίου.660 Also, in Hierocaesarea Aurelius Glykon served as boularchos twice.661 The scarce information we have on the responsibilities of boularchoi lead to the conclusion that boularchia was an arche and there are no evidence for their honorary primacy in the council or its presidency.662 On the other hand, one inscription from Thyateira mentions a vice-president of the boule that presumably had some ceremonial duties.663 Their position within city’s society can also be deduces from the inscriptions. They usually performed other duties in the city administration and were related to other city or provincial officials.

The role of leading citizens was also in serving as bridges to the outside world: frequently direct contact was made between polis and ruler by means of embassies, undertaken by leading men of the city, magistrates and/or benefactors, not simply on important occasions, such as a ruler’s accession or in moments of crisis, but on a regular basis. Embassies were paid for by the city though increasingly from Early Imperial period onwards we find individual ambassadors paying their own expenses.664

The question of accumulation of municipal officies has provoked a debate of some intensity. It is stated in a number of scholarly works that one and the same person

658 Thyateira: TAM V2 950; 954; 969; Hierocaesarea: TAM V2 1268; Tralleis: IK Tralleis 66; 73; 145; Philadelphia: TAM V3 1461; 1480; 1484; 1495; Nawotka, Boularchos, 79 also cites IK Eph. 3803e for a possible boularch in Hypaipa but it does not seem plausible.
659 Aizanoi: MAMA IX 29; P41 (=CIG 3831α); SEG XXXV 1365; SEG XLII; Akmonia: MAMA VI List p. 149 n. 174 (=IGR IV 658); Kolossai: IGR IV 870.
660 TAM V2 950 and 954 (M. Aur. Diadochus); 969 (M. Iulius Menelaos).
661 TAM V2 1268: Αὐρ. Γλύκονος β’ τοῦ βουλάρχου.
662 Nawotka, Boularchos, 70.
663 TAM V2 991: ἀντιάρχοντα βουλής δήμου β’.
664 i.e. SEG XXXIX 1290 (Sardis, 44 BC).
could simultaneously hold several offices and that this practice was widespread. However, the epigraphical evidence in the cities of Lydia and Phrygia does not seem to support these claims. It was certainly possible to occupy more than one priesthood in a city at the same time, but the evidence for similar practice regarding the civic offices is lacking. There is evidence for a single person holding many public offices during his lifetime, but there is little to suggest that some of these were occupied simultaneously. Some evidence is offered by a document from Apollonis inscribed at the time when Apollonios, son of Apollonides, was stephanephoros and gymnasiarchos.665 As we have seen in the case of some members of provincial elite, the high priest of the city could simultaneously be the high priest of the province, and it was also possible to occupy more than one priesthood in a city at the same time.666 The same person could simultaneously be the secretary or the gymnasiarch for more than one organization, or for the entire city and some of its social organizations.667 There is an example where the grammateia is documented to have been held simultaneously with the neokoria.668 Other examples are sometimes used as evidence for accumulation of offices, although correct reading of the text would not support this.669 For example, Dmitriev states that “the use of nouns with the connective ‘and’” belongs among “reliable forms of evidence to indicate that offices were held by the same person simultaneously.”670 Thus, whenever offices are recorded in the form of nouns, for Dmitriev this is the evidence for the accumulation of titles.

If accumulation of the titles at the same time is rarely attested with certainty, there are plenty of examples where members of municipal elite hold numerous titles.

---

665 TAM V2 1204: στεφανηφοροῦντος καὶ γυμνασιαρχοῦντος Ἀπολλόνιου τοῦ / Ἀπολλώνιδου; perhaps also TAM V2 1206.
666 TAM V2 976; cf. 950; 951; IGR IV 585=MAMA IX P40; SEG XLVI 1524 (Sardeis); more than one priesthood in a city, I. Sardis 47: Λεύκων Ιούλ. <Δυ>β<ω>ν<ν> / ἄνδρα ἐκ προγόνων μέγαν καὶ φυλάττοντος, / ἀρχηγέα τῆς Ἀσίας ναὸν τῶν ἐν Λυδίᾳ Σαρδιανῶν καὶ ιερᾶ καιριστῆς Πολιούς Δίως δίς, ἀρχηγέα / τῶν τῆς Ἀσίας πολέων καὶ στεφανηφόρον καὶ ιερᾶ / Τιμίου Καίσαρος καὶ στρατηγὸν πρῶτον δίς / καὶ ἀγανθηγέτην διά <β>π<ν>ον ἔνδειας δὲ γενομένης / κατά τὸν δήμον μεγαλουφγία χρησάμενος / ἐκ τῶν ἵδιον εἰς ἐπικοψίσιμον ἐκάστῳ πολίτῃ / ἐξαριστάτου μόνιμον· καὶ πᾶσαι τὰς ἀρχὰς φυλαττόμενοι / τετελεκότα τῇ πατρίδι.
667 TAM V2 829 (Attalea in Lydia): ἐπὶ Μενεκράτους β᾽ / ἀρχηγοῦντος α̣ρ′ καιῦνοις τῶν κυρίων αὐτοκρατόρων, γραμματεύουσας βουλῆς δήμου Αλληπανοῦ Αλλής· τού(?) / IK Tralleis 66: Μιᾶρκου) Λοφθαλίου) Συντρίκτης· … βουλῆς δήμου γερουσίας γραμματίδας·; IK Tralleis 67: Μιᾶρκου) Λοφθαλίου) Οὐνοματής· … / γραμματίδα βολής δήμου / γερουσίας· cf. IK Tralleis 69.
668 IGR IV 1608a. ll. 6–9 (Hypaepa in Lydia).
669 TAM V2 939.
670 Dmitriev, City Government, 226.
during their lifetime. In fact, sometimes the documents state titles and offices held for several generations, one after another, as in Thyateira:671

Examples from Phrygia are, for the most part not as long or elaborate, but they also show members of local aristocracy with numerous offices during their lifetime:672

One way for a benefactor to help his city is to cover all expenses of the office. The gymnasiarch Iollas, son of Iollas, was praised by the city of Sardis for having performed this office “from his own property.”673 Many other gymnasiarchs and

671 TAM V2 976.
672 MAMA IX P43 (LW 984, Aizanitis).
673 I. Sardis 27; MAMA VI 180 I 6–12 and II 7–9 (Apameia in Phrygia, c. A.D. 160).
agonothetai held these offices “from their own resources.” In place of, or in addition to, holding office for free, city officials could make benefactions of various sorts when in office, which were sometimes connected with official responsibilities. Some covered various official public expenditures out of their own funds. Such benefactions tended to become traditional, at least in some places. These activities, in which sacral officials participated as well, were especially helpful to the population in times of bad harvests and high food prices. Aforementioned Laevianus, son of Callistratus, from Thyateira, spared the money allocated by the city for the purchase of grain as agoranomos by covering expenses “brilliantly from his own resources.” This phrase is usually associated with agonothesia as shown in a similar honorific inscription for Iulia Iuliana from Thyateira praised for having performed the agonothesia “brilliantly and extravagantly.” Her compatriot Aurelius Asclepiades was praised by the city for having performed the sitonia for his sons in a similarly generous way.

In the Roman period, due to the elevated costs encountered by the official while in office, four months was the term of office of the gymnasiarch in Tralleis or the nyctostrategos in Laodikeia by the Lycus. Six months was the term of office for the agoranomoi in Thyateira. On the other hand, there were also offices held “for life” in the cities of Lydia and Phrygia as well, including those of the agonothetes, gymnasiarch, strategos, boularchos, stephanephoros, and others. All such offices,
including the eponymous *stephanephoria* in Philadelphia and Sardeis, were costly *leitourgiai* which were sought after by local notables first of all because of their social prestige. The phrases “for life” (διὰ βίου) and “in perpetuity” (διὰ αἰώνος) were not used side by side, but their meanings were probably close.

Those who did not have political rights in the city, such as children, women, and foreigners, including the Romans, had access to these offices as well. The honor and responsibilities of such officials were separated: titles and distinctions of these officials could be given as honors to various individuals who were not obliged to actually hold offices.

There is also a recent debate if there was kind of Roman *summa honoraria* in the cities of Asia Minor.685 Some city councils did establish fixed sums of money for entrance fees and the *gerousiai* also started to require entrance fees.686 Few inscriptions distinguish the councilors and members of their families from the rest of the city population, so that this whole group represented a separate social class.687 From the second century, imperial legislation referred to the special legal position of the councilors and the members of their families, whereas *gerousiai* became, as Sartre puts it, social clubs.688 Special status and honors can also be seen from an inscription from Philadelphia where M. Aurelius Diodorus is said to be ἄνηρ βουλευτης κे γερουσιάστης.689

The social and political world of the cities seems to have been a distinctly hierarchical one, in which some groups of citizens were evidently members of the

---


686 *IGR* IV 642; 657 (Akmoneia); 706 (Synnada); 783 (Apameia in Phrygia); 818; 827; 840; 842 (Hierapolis); *IK Laodikeia am Lykos* 122; I. Sardis.

687 Councilors: Drew-Bear, Naour, *NIP*, 96, no. 33.1 (Eumeneia, imperial period); for members of their families, although not in Lydia and Phrygia cf. προγόνον βουλευτῶν *MAMA* VI 119 (Herakleia Salbake); See also *MAMA* I 284 (Laodikeia Combusta): γένους βουλ. [Σταυρικό] 688 Sartre, *Asie Mineure*, 223–224.

689 *TAM* V3 1495.
higher class than others. In most cities, a very small number of exceptionally wealthy and influential families came to dominate the elite and became the leaders of society. This process of internal oligarchisation of the provincial urban elites seems to be primarily a development of the Roman Principate. The increasing differentiation within the urban elites can also be viewed as part of the broader process of social hierarchization. Their civic identity also manifested itself in the form of a distinct elite lifestyle which became ever more visible during the high Empire. Gymnasial athletics, literature, rhetoric and public benefactions, were some of the features essential to this lifestyle, and they served to create cultural barriers between middle class and elite in addition to the existing social, economic, and political ones. Hereditary nature of the benefactions of the leading families is noticeable. Local elites began to refer to themselves as the βουλετικόν τάγμα (bouleutic order), thus revealing a sense of shared identity as a separate class. In a way, the councilor title did become hereditary in city’s elite families, making a true curial class.

In the Roman period, family benefactions started to include the holding of prestigious offices by the “first families,” who were distinguished from the rest of the city population by this and other similar designations. The children and women from these families started to occupy not only religious but other city offices as well. The growing evidence for offices held by women and children in the provincial period could be possibly attributed to Roman influence. Those offices occupied by women and children in the cities of Roman Asia were the same costly and administratively insignificant positions that other people who did not have political rights in the city, such as foreign city residents, could hold as well. The rarity of the offices and their character show that children/youths did not institutionally participate as municipal magistrates before they reached the legal age. Nevertheless, there were exceptions. As we have previously seen, Dionysius, son of Menelaus (later M. Iulius Dionysius Aquilianus), attested in the inscriptions from Thyatira, held the office of agonothetes as

691 Related to bouleutic order in SEG XXXIII 1123 (Hierapolis), ll. 6-9: πατρὸς καὶ προγόνων τοῦ βουλευτικοῦ τάγματος.
693 Cf. also Lévy, *REG* 6 (1895), 231; being the first in the city MAMA V List I 182; no. 82=IGR IV 522 (Dorylaion, Phrygia): τῆς πόλεως πρῶτος.
Parents held priesthoods and prytaneiai jointly with their children. Parents also performed for their children the gymnasiarchia, the prytaneia, the agonothesia, the sitonia, the agoranomia, the hipparchia, the strategia and possibly some other offices. There is also an instance from Akmoneia (ca. 160 AD) in which a son claims to have held an office and paid all the expenses, while another part of the same inscription declares that a parent undertook all this on his behalf. However, there was also a practice that a child or a young man promised to hold an office later, as in Philadelphia (2nd century AD) where P. Cornelius Preiskos has promised a liturgy “from an early age”.

The actual performance of the office was separated from the honor pertaining to it, as this honor went to the children of loving parents. The expressions as “in childhood,” “still as a child,” and others were applied not only to officeholders but to benefactors in a general sense. This type of the inscriptions is filled with references to those who “from an early age” displayed their zeal for serving the fatherland.

694 TAM V2 960 (Thyateira); cf. Robert, Hellenica VI, 73.
695 TAM V2 828 (Attalea in Lydia); TAM V2 954 (Thyateira).
696 Gymnasiarchia: Ramsay, Cities and Bishoprics, 461, no. 295 (Apamea in Phrygia); Prytaneia: TAM V2 1197 (Apolollonis); Agonothesia: IK Tralleis 120; Sitonia, agoranomia, hipparchia and strategia: TAM V 947.7–10 (Thyateira); There is also one possible, although improbable, example from Akmoneia (ca. 200-250 AD) of an infant nominally performing a public office before the end of its first year, E. Varinlioglu, Five inscriptions from Acmonia, REA 108 (2006), 355-358; C. Claudius Lucianus, member of elite family who held the stephanephoria for three generations, is praised for being agoranomos ἐν τοῖς πρῶτοις τῆς ἡλικίας χρόνοις τετράμηνῳ. Ed. pr. understood these lines as if the honorand performed this duty “when he was four months old. That is, he was initiated into the service of public offices at his own cost, which, of course, the parents paid in his stead.” This would really be a remarkable example of a parent performing duty in the name of his newborn son, but literal translation does not support it. It is far more probable that Lucianus held the office for four months, cf. commentary in SEG LVI 1493.
697 MAMA VI 180; an honorary inscription praises Tib. Claudius Granianos for having acted as gymnasiarch during the conventus iuridicus out of his money, without taking the sum of 15000 denarii out of the public treasury, col. I ll. 6-12: γυμνασιαρχαῖς ἐκ τῶν / ἵδιων τῇ σεμινατητῇ πατρίδι / δίχα τοῦ πόρου ἐκ τοῦ δῆμου διδομένου δηνάριον μυρίων πεντακισχιλίων. Another part of the inscription declares that a father of Granianos, Tib. Claudius Piso Mithridatianos, has promised the gymnasiarchia during the conventus iuridicus on behalf of his son out of his own expense and that he has donated the money to the city, the same 15000 denarii, col. II ll. 6-9: ἐπόσχομεν πάντα ἐν τῇ εὐεργεσίᾳ Κλαύδιον Γρανιανοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ / γυμνασιαρχαῖς ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων καὶ χρηστάμενον / τῇ πόλει τῶν ἐξ ἑσθον διδομένων ὑπ’ αὐτής τῷ γυμνασιαρχαίτι κύριον δηνάρια μύρια πεντακισχιλία.
698 TAM V3 1474 ll. 2-10: Π. Κορν/ήλιον Πρεῖσκον ἄγορας/νομησταντα λομπρός / ἄμα καὶ / πεδιδοχὸς ἐν / διασχηθεὶς καροῦ τοῖς / ἐν πρῶτοις τῆς ἡλικίας / χρόνως τελείαις / φιλο/δοξίας ἐπανεγεγείλόμενον/ ἔλευθρουγιαν. ἐκ παιδίου πεδιδοχοῦ ἐν TAM V2 965; έν παιδί in TAM V3 1441; [άπο παι]δίου ἀρχικόν in TAM V2 998; γυμνασιαρχαίτος Δαμονίκου τοῦ Δημητρίου, τοῦ δὲ αὐτοῦ / καὶ ἐσπηλαμβόντος in TAM V2 1203 (Apolollonis); see J. H. M. Strubbe, Young magistrates in the Greek East, Mnemnosyne 58-1 (2005), 88-111; on πατρίδοντες see also M. Kleijwegt, Ancient youth. The
Another thing was the references to “ancestor benefactors” and members of the elite started to mention their offices, and for the first time one could be seen holding an office “by descent.” There is one expression that actually describes the position of elite descendants, presumably entitled to office “by descent”, πατρόβουλος. It is attested twice in Dorylaion in Phrygia, MAMA V Lists p. 182, 44:700

τὸν πρῶτον πάτρης / Ἀκαμάντιον / εἰκώνει χαλκῆ / φυλῶν ἡ πρώτη / Μητρώας / εἰδρυσάμην / ἐπιμεληθέντων Αὐρ. / Κλαυδίου β’ βουλευτοῦ κέ / Αὐ. Ἀσκληπιάδου Μακαρέως / πατροβουλίου, γραμματευόντος δ’ / Αὐρ. Θεοστοκλέους Ἀλεξάνδρου / πατροβουλίου.

and MAMA V Lists p. 182, 59:


Both Lévy and Robert agree that this phrase designates son of a boularch, a kind of designated successor and associated with the boule from an early age.701 It does not mean that one is immediately “hereditary boularch”, but it certainly is a good recommendation for future offices. One can also deduce that they were emphasizing the fact that they were not homines novi in city’s elite. There is also a possible evidence for hereditary stephanephoria in Philadelphia.702

Being part of the elite did not necessarily meant being in the office. There are, of course, many benefactors who were praised for their virtue and good deeds without detailing all official posts. Their influence was nevertheless high, as seen in MAMA IX P49 from Aizanoi, 6 AD:


700 See Pleket’s commentary on praetextati in SEG XXXVII 1485; cf. also πατρομόστης in IK Smyrna 731 (80-83 AD) and πατρογέροντες in Eph 26 (180-192 AD).


702 TAM V3 1455: άνδρός στεφανηφόρου ἐκ προγόνων; cf. TAM V3 1491.
According to the funeral inscription, Menogenes died in his 70th year after leading a blameless and exemplary life. His body was to be crowned with a golden crown, brought into agora, decorated with a fillet and accompanied in public procession by the ephebes and the youths of the city to his tomb. As Cormack argues, the location of Menogenes' tomb remains uncertain, but he was probably granted the honor of burial within the city walls as this inscription were found within the city, stating that such decrees were usually erected at or near the tomb.\(^\text{703}\) In this way, Cormack maintains, Menogenes was „inscribed in death physically, literally and metaphorically as a citizen, within the city.“\(^\text{704}\) Nevertheless, we should note that the inscription precisely states that Menogenes will be carried from the agora to his tomb, not necessarily within city walls and the inscription could have subsequently been moved.

Looking from the other point of view, in a number of honorific inscriptions from these areas, benefactors were praised for benefactions that explicitly included gifts to a variety of non-citizen groups including foreign residents, freedmen, and slaves.

5.7 Elite women

As we have seen before there are records of a number of influential women from Lydia and Phrygia, members of the highest provincial elite. Among them we find Aurelia Hermonassa, priestess in Thyateira and twice ἀρχιερείας Ἁσίας, priestess of

\(^{704}\) Ibid.
Tyche for life and prytanis seven times.705 She was the daughter of Flavia Priscilla, who was of senatorial origin706 and also performed the duties of ἀρχιτέρετα Ἀσίας twice. Aelia Ammia from Amorion, honored as θυγάτηρ τῆς πόλεως, was archiereia Asias and priestess of the Ionian league.707 Their feminine virtues such as σῶφροσύνη, φιλανδρία and φιλοσοφία are frequently mentioned in their honorific inscriptions.

The social status of women in the cities of Roman Asia changed significantly from what it had been in preceding times. Certain distributions were intended only for women and girls, which was unusual in Hellenistic times. Women could even have their own gymnasiarchs, who also were women, as seen in this example from Dorylaion: Ἀντιοχής Τευθράν[τ]ος σεβαστοφάντης διὰ βίου καὶ ἱέρη τῶν προγε[γρ]αμμένων θεῶν καὶ γυμνασιάρχος τῶν γυναι[κ]ῶν ἐκ τῶν ιδίων.708

References to distinguished mothers and grandmothers began to be used to substantiate claims of noble origin, and mothers were now mentioned alongside fathers of honorands.709 It is not surprising that children’s names became composites of those of both parents.710

As already pointed out, some epithets in the inscriptions were especially used for women such as σῶφρον (prudent) and φιλανδρός (loving her husband).711 Also, some of them were sometimes designated as Mother or Daughter of the city as part of their honorific titles.712 An elaborate example of wifely virtues could be seen in an inscription

705 TAM V2 951, 954.
706 TAM V2 957.
707 SEG XXXVII 1099bis and I Eph. 689.
708 MAMA V List I 182, no. 82=IGR IV 522 (Dorylaion, Phrygia); another female gymnasiarch (although belonging to Ephesos), Nonia Tatein, daughter of neopoios and a priestess of Artemis, is honored by the inhabitants of local katoikia cf. M. Ricl, Current archaeological and Epigraphic Research in the Region of Lydia, 195.
709 For example: TAM V2 944; 952; 966; 976 (Thyateira).
710 i.e. M. Claudius Valerianus Tertullianus, son of M. Claudius Valerianus and Claudia Tertulla from Eumeneia in SEG XXVIII 1115-1116 and MAMA IV 336.
711 Among many others: Ramsey, Cities and Bishoprics 333, no. 146 (Phrygo-Pisidian border); SEG XXXVII 1099bis (Amorion); TAM V2 954 (Thyateira)
712 Mother of the city (μήτηρ πόλεως) is not yet attested in Lydia and Phrygia but see MAMA VIII 492b=I Aph 2007 12.29ii (Aphrodisias); IK Selge 17 (Pisidia); SEG XLIII 954 (Sagalassos, Pisidia); Daughter of the city (θυγάτηρ τῆς πόλεως): TAM V2 976 (Thyateira); Ramsey, Cities and Bishoprics 333, no. 146 (Phrygo-Pisidian border); SEG XXXVII 1099bis (Amorion, 2nd or early 3rd century AD); for similar, Son of the city (οιός τῆς πόλεως): Ramsey, Cities and Bishoprics 641, no. 533 (Akmoenea); SEG LV 1409 (Attouada); cf. also SEG LVII 2196: F. Canali de Rossi, Filius publicus, YIΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΛΕΩΝ e titoli affini in iscrizioni greche di età imperiale, Roma, 2007 (non vidi).
from Iulia Gordos, *TAM* V1 688.\(^{713}\) Stratonike, daughter of Dionysos, wife of Attalos son of Dionysos, has lived a life that was respectable (σεμνῶς) and without reproach (ἀλειέλθησο) in respect to the members of her household (ἰδίων), and since she has displayed herself most generously and benevolently (φιλανθρωπότατα) towards her daughter and son-in-law, and was much distinguished by virtue (ἀρετῇ) and female modesty (σωφροσύνη γυναικῶν) that in her a new model of good-housewifery (οἰκοδεσποτική) has been found, it has been decided by the boule, because of the σωφροσύνην of the deceased and because of her husband Attalos’ zeal towards the demos (which his ancestors before him also displayed) to honor her with a painted portrait (εἰθόλ γξαπηῆ) and a marble agalma, which are to be placed where her relatives choose, and which are to be inscribed thus: ‘the demos honors Stratonike, for her virtue in all things’.\(^{714}\)

Women occupied very few offices in Greek cities, however. One was the *stephanephoria*, usually an eponymous position.\(^{715}\) Several inscriptions from Thyateira are mentioning women as *prytaneis*.\(^{716}\) Apart from Flavia Priscilla and her daughter Aurelia Hermonassa from the illustrious equestrian family, Iulia Menogenis, wife of [Ti.] Claudio Socrates Sacerdotianus, also held *prytaneia* as well as *agonothesia* and *stephanephoria*.\(^{717}\) She also belonged to a renowned family whose other members held prestigious provincial and municipal offices. Also in Thyateira, Iulia Iuliana held the *agonothesia*.\(^{718}\) In Thyateira, where the names of ten female *agonothei* are known, five certainly held their title jointly with their husbands and two probably, while three other women held it in their own name. All three, however, were *agonothei* of one particular festival, in honour of Iulia Augusta, paid for by a fund left by a certain Iulia,
daughter of Iulia and Spurius. All three women set up a statue of Iulia Augusta during their term of office. Iulia Severa, daughter of Gaius, was the high priestess and agonothetis of the whole house of the divine Augusti in Akmoneia. In Sebaste in Phrygia, the list of all the members of gerousia includes three ladies Iulia Teuthrantis, Claudia Teuthrantis and her daughter Iulia Iuliana, obviously members of the same distinguished family.

Women in Lydian and Phrygian cities usually held the priesthoods and high priesthoods. In spite of this seeming prominence, however, there were certain offices which were never held by women, including that of agoranomos, eirenarches, boularchos, grammateus, sitones and presbeutes. Women were also never members of the boule. They never had a direct and formal access to any of the civic bodies or magistracies which entailed (at least in theory) voting, deliberating, decision-making, the supervision of the market place, of buildings, of food provision or the keeping of the public order. As MacMullen pointed out, women are rarely found in roles which would require speaking in public: “they are to be seen, but not heard”. Many of the public offices open to women were financially burdensome, involving, for example, the provision of oil for the gymnasium or animals for public sacrifice, or the expenditure of often large amounts of money on public building and repairs. The bestowal of civic honors such as statues, public funerals, and prominent tombs constituted yet another opportunity to prominence open to women: the erection of a tomb was a socially acceptable means of remaining in the public eye without exceeding the very real boundaries that existed to keep women in their place. As we have seen, terms as philandria (which can in this context mean wifely affection) and sophrosyne (modesty, reserve) appear frequently in the inscriptions, and allude not only to appropriate wifely...

---

719 TAM V2 904-906: ἐκ διαθήκης Ἰουλίας τῆς Ἰουλίας καὶ Σπορίου θυγατρός. Date probably mid 1st cent. AD.
720 MAMA VI 263, ll. 3-9: Ἰουλίαν Γαίου θυγατέρα Σεονή/ραν, ἄρχεραιον κρ[ι] / ἀγονοθέτιν τοῦ / σύνπαντος τῶν / [θ]εὸν Σεβαστῶν / [ο]ικου
721 BCH 7 (1883), 452-455 no. II (= Ramsey, Cities and Bishoprics, 602 no. 475): I ll. 47-48 Ἰουλία Τευθραντίς / Πρόκλου[ν] θυγ[άπτη]; II ll. 21-23 Κλαυδία Τευθραντίς / Γ. Ἰουλίας Προκλῶς νίκος / Ἰουλία Ἰουλίαν θυγάπτης.
722 i. e. TAM V 963; 972 (Thyateira); SNG von Aulock 3988 (Synnada, Phrygia).
723 i. e. MAMA VI 263 (Akmoneia); TAM V 954; 972 (Thyateira).
724 Van Bremen, The Limits of participation, 1996, 56; cf. Ibid, 78-79 for another reading and arguments for removing the notion of female tamias from the lines of CIG III 3871b (from Sebaste in Phrygia) and two female grammateus from Talleis.
behavior in the private realm but also courtesy expected of women who were active in public. As for financial background, from the inscriptions we can see that many elite women, both provincial and municipal, managed estates and property. In Lydia, we have evidence for Flavia Menogenis (113/114 AD) who probably owned a private granary in the area around Kula:

έτους ρής', μη(νος) Δασίου. Ἡδία / Φλάουνίας Μηνογενίδος / δούλη Μη[τ]ρί Αλιάνη
εὐ-
χήν ὑπέρ τοῦ κλαπέντος / ἄργυριοῦ (δην.) υβ' Αγάθιονος / τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς ἐκ
ΔΑ/ΝΑΙΩΣΤΩΝ ἐκ τοῦ σειτοβο/λείου καὶ εὐρεθέντος παρὰ / Κρήσκεντι τῷ Ἀλκίμου
καὶ Ἐκαλογῆς θρεπτῷ

Also, a woman Domitia Tata in Laodikeia on the Lycos bestowed land to the boule to provide for the annual crowning of a family tomb:

tοῦτον τοῦ βωμοῦ κήδετα<ν> ἡ βουλή, κ[α]/θώς ἤσε αὐτῇ στεφανωτικὸν Πυθόδω/ρος
Διοτέιμου (δην.) γ, ἵνα στεφανοῦται ἐκ/κ τῶν τῶν κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν ὀμοίως καὶ /
Μένανδρος Σωσίμου τοῦ Μενάνδρου / τοῦ Θεμίσωνος ὁ τῆς ἀδέλφης αὐτοῦ ὅ/δε καὶ
αὐτὸς καταλέιπει στεφανωτικὸν / τῇ τῆς βουλῆς φυλῆ τῇ Ἀπολλονίδου (δην.) [γ(?)] / ἐν
η σοραί κηδευθῆσαι ὁ Μένανδρος, ἢ ἐς/τιν σοραί κατὰ μεσημβρίαν, μεθ’ ὅ ὁν οὐδένι
ἐ/σέσται κηδευθήναι ἐτέρῳ τινί ὄμοιο[ν] / καταλέλοιπεν καὶ Δομετία [Τ]άτα ἡ
πατρ[α/δέλφη(?)] vac. / vacat / [— — —]νων χορίων τῶν ἄνω[v] / [ἐν — — —]

In Philadelphia, a woman, Cornelia, donated an estate to provide distribution for the members of the boule on her brother’s birthday:

[Ἡ βουλή ἔτειμὴσεν Κορνηλίαν - - - ἐπαινομέ/νην ἐπὶ ἡθεὶ καὶ] ἄξιομα/τι καὶ
ἀνοιχθεῖσαι τῇ κρα(τιστῇ) / [β]ουλ[ή] χ[ωρίον πρὸς τὸ νέ/μεσθαὶ τὴν ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ /

727 TAM V1 257 (no oikonomos was specifically mentioned); J. and L. Robert supposed it was her private granary in BE 1962, no. 294; Flavia Menogenis was also mentioned in TAM V2 274 (113/114 AD?): Φλασίας Μηνογενίδς, Φλαουνίου <Θ>ραυμάχου / καὶ Λαλ... . ἐν κηρατ[ι]δος θυγ[εία, ἐ]τείμη]σαν
ΙΠΙ... ΛΛΕΙΣ.
728 IK Laodikeia am Lykos 84 (1st or 2nd century AD)
729 TAM V3 1475 (2nd or 3rd century AD).
In an honorary inscription from Aizanoi Marcia Tateis was honored by the *boule* and *demos*.

The honorand, whose husband must have been a Flavius, was the mother of two brothers Flavius Iulianus and Flavius Pardalas, both asiarchs. There was another, roughly contemporary, Flavius Iulianus from Ephesos family on record as asiarch, but he is probably not related to the homonymous man mentioned in this inscription. Flavius Pardalas may be related to L. Claudius Pardalas, who possessed land near Aizanoi. A statue of one T. Flavius Lepidus, found near Tavşanlı (area of Aizanoi), was financed by L. Claudius Pardalas:

There could be a slight possibility that he may have introduced the cognomen Παξδαιᾶο into the family via his φιλία-connection with Claudius Pardalas. Marcia Tateis was perhaps also the mother of the Φλαβία Τάτεις who erected in Aizanoi an epitaph for her nurse Ὕγηα around 150 AD. Editors of *MAMA* IX believe that Flavia Tateis was fostered by nurse Hygeia, probably a dependant of the family (also noting that Flavii are not so common in Aizanoi) and in this way repaid the debt to her foster-mother.

---

730 SEG XLV 1712 (c. 150 AD).
731 IEph 4342; cf. also IEph 674 and 712B.
732 *MAMA* IX P46.
733 Cf. commentary in SEG XLV 1712; more on L. Claudius Pardalas and his possible family connections see pp. 131-132.
734 *MAMA* IX 241: Φλαβία Τάτεις Ὕγηα τῇ θρεψάσθη μνήμης / χάριν.
Most of these women were probably influential, wealthy and honored because of their families, but nevertheless sometimes they were able to show their own ambition and independence.\textsuperscript{735}

\section*{5.8 Conclusion}

With all due allowances, the epigraphical trail left by the provincial and municipal elites of Roman Anatolia is vast in its quantity and rich in its contents. Majority of the preserved public documents are inscribed by the members of the municipal elite for the members of elite. This fact is both significant and problematic. Undoubtedly, a multitude of valid information is gained from inscriptions, and they are basis for any attempt at social history of the Roman Anatolia. But, the very selection of information and their presentation are in a way designed as a deception. Through media of public inscriptions and monuments, elites painted a heavily idealized image of themselves. In some aspects it stands in a striking disparity with actual historical reality behind it.

The elites presented themselves as harmonious groups based on cooperation, groups that shared common goals and ideals. Furthermore, their cities are portrayed as stable and unified communities, devoid of any conflict. This picture is certainly false. Perhaps the city elites, with hereditary familial benefactions that expanded to include the holding of costly and prestigious offices, were really best suited as leaders of the community but their role was not always accepted as indisputable. Occasional allusion by ancient authors justify belief that conflict between elites and the rest of population was not unheard of, while the strong rivalries and, sometimes, open animosity within ruling groups were quite common. Praises for ancestors and constant reminder of their merits as well as merits of the descendants highlighted in the inscriptions were perhaps a way to justify social inequalities and established social order. There also had to be some mirroring of the emperor, or at least local benefactors and emperors often contributed the same sort of things, public buildings and festivals, but it was not the

\textsuperscript{735} More on these women see van Bremen, \textit{Limits of participation}, esp. Appendix 2.
main driving force. Those who were in charge of local administrative and social life were essentially those who controlled ideology, including religious beliefs and official accepted versions of myths and foundation-legends. Perhaps the best contemporary insight and commentary was given by Dio of Prusa: οἱ δὲ ἀνθρωποὶ δεόνται καὶ στεφάνου καὶ εἰκόνος καὶ προεδρίας καὶ τοῦ μνεμονεύεσθαι, καὶ πολλοί καὶ διὰ ταύτα ἢδη τεθνήκασιν, ὅπως ἀνθριάντως τύχωσι καὶ κρυώματος ἢ τιμής ἐτέρας καὶ τοῖς άθυτος καταλίπωσι δόξαν τινὰ ἐπιεικῆ καὶ μνήμην έαυτών. The statement is relevant for the whole of Asia Minor, and probably for the Graeco-Roman world in its entirety.

The political and energetic activities of the elite were performed with various goals on various social levels. The successful integration in the power structures of the Empire was the fact they were probably most proud of. For a member of the local aristocracy, most cherished success in his social advancement was to obtain the equestrian rank. In many cases this meant abandoning the Anatolian hometown of one's origin and pursuing military or civilian career in other parts of the Empire. The decentralized and mobile nature of the imperial administration enabled Romanized elite to develop ties and advance their careers in a number of different cities in the province. In Asia Minor, including Lydia and Phrygia, we can see following advancement, within the same family: father, provincial high-priest → son, eques → grandson, a senator. Although the imperial priesthood is considered a means for raising one’s social status, at both local and provincial level, it does not seem to have been, for its holders, a fundamental impulse for a career in Rome. In Phrygia it seems apparent that imperial priesthood was not seen as a prelude to a Roman career, it was in itself one of the most coveted offices for the local notables.

Exact number of the members of equestrian order in the two Anatolian regions remains uncertain. There are only 40 directly attested cases, which leads to a conclusion that Roman equestrians were only slightly more numerous than senators in these parts.

---

736 For the formation of a wealthy ruling-class cf. Magie, Roman Rule, 640-641; Jones, Greek city, 177; H. W. Pleket, Political Culture and Political Practice in the Cities of Asia Minor in the Roman Empire, in W. Schuller (ed.), Politische Theorie und Praxis im Altertum, Darmstadt 1998, 211
737 D. Chr. Or. 31, 16: But when we come to men, they require crowns, images, the right of precedence, and being kept in remembrance; and many in times have even given up their lives just in order that they might get a statue and have their name announced by the herald or receive some other honor and leave to succeeding generations a fair name and remembrance of themselves, English translation by J. W. Cohoon.
However, many of the distinguished individuals mentioned in various inscriptions could be members of this *ordo*, even if they fail to mention it. Furthermore, there is an opinion that all of the confirmed high-priests of Asia were equestrians. On this basis, there is good reason to believe that there were many more equestrians, although the real number remains beyond estimation. But even so, they were only a small minority within the elite that was only a small minority of the entire population.

We should certainly acknowledge the influence of particular families and their wealth on the historical development of the cities of Roman Asia Minor, including Lydia and Phrygia. Some members of these municipal elite families were fathers of equestrians, grandfathers of senators, driving force of families’ social mobility. Others have been involved, through their slaves, freedmen and possible investments, into city’s craftsmanship and trade. It seems they invested their energy and funds both ways: encouraging professionalism and trade and honoring their own members as leading citizens. Once again, the image of the society we get from the honorific inscriptions, insisting that virtue and not property were the basis of political power is certainly a distorted one, especially considering underlying social inequalities. Nevertheless, these honorific inscriptions fulfilled their basic aim; we are discussing benefactors and their grand gestures, even today.
After analyzing higher social groups, we can now look at the population in the cities in Lydia and Phrygia, as well as in the estates and villages around them. Who were the citizens? Who were the members of the so-called “middle class”? The usage of this term requires some explanation. “Middle class” is a term I apply for certain social groups in Roman Anatolia in the deficiency of a better one. This is not done without some degree of uneasiness, but the satisfying alternative is simply not there. The very concept of “middle class” is the product of modern social and political though, it is introduced by the 18th century political philosophy as a convenient way to classify a very large tract of the society.

Classical or Weberian social theory defines the middle class, quite literally, as a social stratum that holds a middle position between “upper class” (the wealthy) and the “working class” (the poor, people whose livelihood is based on direct physical labor). Thus, a lawyer, a teacher or a clerk would belong to the “middle class” but a blacksmith or a carpenter would not. Modern social and political theory often uses the term “middle class” more broadly, to include all the people with steady income and stable living conditions, sometimes treating the term “working class” as obsolete. Ideally, a vast majority of inhabitants in a well-governed modern society would belong to the “middle class”.

The term “middle class” is so embedded in the contemporary sociological concepts that there is hardly any attempt at analysis of the modern social, political or economic systems without using it. However, problems are encountered as soon as

---

we attempt to apply these designations to ancient societies. The ancient Greeks and Romans, as well as the provincial inhabitants of their Empire, viewed society through different lenses and lacked any term that could be correctly translated as “middle class”. Thus, a construct that is clearly modern is introduced into analysis of the ancient world.

In ancient history the use of the term was justified by the works of M. I. Rostovtzeff. It is one of the most overused terms in his venerable Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire. It remains in vogue until present day, unlike other (equally anachronistic) terms Rostovtzeff employs, such as “bourgeoisie” and “proletariat”. In spite of many possible objections, the term “middle class” is used by historians of antiquity. It ought to be noted, however, that there is much ambiguity and inconsistency about the way the word is used. Different modern authors use this term to refer to different strata of the society. When writing about “middle class”, Rostovtzeff used it as synonymous with “bourgeoisie”, which means both the class of large landowners that are not directly engaged in any physical work (“the upper class of the city bourgeoisie”, i.e. the municipal aristocracy) and the “petty bourgeoisie” that consisted of craftsmen, small merchants, teachers and the like. In a work that was once very relevant for the subject, H. Hill used “middle class” even in the title, but was actually referring to the equestrian order. This usage was rightly criticized but was (and still actually is) fairly common.

742 M. I Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire I, Oxford 1957, 190: “The importance of the upper class of the city bourgeoisie cannot be exaggerated. It was this class that gave the Empire its brilliant aspect, and it was this class that practically ruled it... One step below on the social ladder stood the petty bourgeoisie (i.e. the middle class), the shopowners, the retail-traders, the money-changers, the artisans, the representatives of liberal professions, such as teachers, doctors and the like. Of them we know but little. We cannot say how large their numbers were as compared to the municipal aristocracy on the one hand and the city proletariat on the other. The ruins of ancient cities of Italy and the provinces, with their hundreds of smaller and larger shops and hundreds of inscriptions, mentioning individual members of this class and their associations, lead us to believe that they formed the backbone of municipal life.”


744 Most energetic opposition to the notion of the “middle class” in the ancient world came from M. I. Finley and his followers, with their “primitivist” visage of ancient society and economy: M. I. Finley, The Ancient Economy, Berkley-Los Angeles 1974, 48-53 (there is no such thing as ancient “classes”, the word itself is wrong in ancient context, a proper expression is “status”, “an admirably vague word”); cf. ibid., 50: “A vast fictitious edifice, erected on a single false assumption about classes, still passes for Roman history in too many books.”


746 H. Hill, The Roman Middle Class in the Republican Period, Oxford 1952.

747 Cf. H. H. Scullard, JRS 45-1/2 (1955), 181-182: “It may be doubted whether ‘The Middle Class’ is a very happy choice”; and “Middle Class’ is most misleading because in general the Equites belonged to the same social class as the senators.”
The Greek term *demos* (δῆμος) partly overlaps but is in no way equivalent to the modern notion of “middle class”. It is usually translated as “people” (but never in the all-encompassing sense of “inhabitants”) or “citizens”, or, if context demands it, as “popular assembly”. *Demos* is based on legal and cultural distinction between citizens of a *polis* and everyone else. It does not signify any particular social group, there are many different social strata within the body of *demos*. Strictly speaking, the *demos* incorporates both the humblest of the free inhabitants (if they possess the citizen status) and the wealthiest elite, although a rich immigrant (even a Roman of a high-status) without the citizenship remains outside of the *demos*. However, it is to be noted that ancient writers often contrast the *demos* with the rich ruling elite. In this particular sense, *demos* signifies all of the non-elite citizens, i.e. moderately wealthy proprietors, small landowners and farmers, craftsmen, minor merchants, as well as mass of paupers whose living depended on the raw physical labor and the generosity of the elite. When used in such a way, the meaning of the word *demos* approaches the modern concept of “middle class”.

6.1 Professional associations in Lydia and Phrygia

Some historical sources are more useful than others when dealing with the middle class of population in the cities of Roman Anatolia. The most informative in this regard are the honorary and funerary inscriptions mentioning various associations. They give us a glimpse of their organization, as well as citizen’s everyday life. In this section I will try to discuss the juridical status and honorific practices of professional associations, their role in ancient festivals, public feasts, parades and processions and distributions, as a new model of society was constructed, based no longer on the equality of citizens, but upon a hierarchy of status groups, effectively and symbolically integrated into an imperial framework. Terminology will be also mentioned (σύνοδος, ἔργασία, τέχνη, κοινόν, πλατεία, συνέδριον, φυλή, συμβίωσις), internal organization, membership (as well as status of members, mostly freeborn, some slaves), professions. Social status of craftsmen and traders is not that of the poorest members of society but rather of the *plebs media*. Epigraphic representation was a way the ancient
guilds reflected their place in the social order. Inscriptions give us a testimony to the respectability of associations of craftsmen and traders in urban societies as well as self-respect which craftsmen show in inscriptions erected by or for them. In this respect there is a striking difference between the Lydian and Phrygian cities. Phrygian associations are for the most part mentioned in the third party inscriptions: monuments erected by the associations themselves are very rare. For example, in Hierapolis there are only few such inscriptions. On the other hand, there is a vast multitude of Lydian inscriptions erected by or on the behalf of associations. Unlike the situation in Phrygia, here we have the direct evidence of how the professional groups wished to be perceived.

According to Debord, professional and other voluntary associations in Lydia continue the pre-Hellenistic tradition in guild organization and activities. When Lydia is concerned, there are a number of intriguing theories that seek to explain the high level of development and the origin of the professional associations. Some scholars tend to see their origin in (from the perspective of the High Empire) distant past, perhaps in the Achaemenid period or the time of the Lydian kingdom. However, while interesting, these theories have very little bearing on the issues of society in Roman Lydia.

In Lydian Thyateira twelve different professional groups are known (nineteen references, predominantly for oi βαφεῖς, the earliest one from the beginning of the first century AD); at Saïttaï, there are 52 references to professional associations all dated in the period between the middle of the second century AD and the end of the third century AD, while in the rest of Lydia, there are around 90 epigraphic attestations of collegia, spanning the period from first to the third century AD. Inland, in Phrygia there are around forty references to professional associations, dated from the first to the third century.

Inscriptions from Lydia and Phrygia give plenty of information on professional associations in these regions. Terms for these groups are diverse as σύνοδος, ἐργασία, τέχνη, πλατεία, συνεδριον, φυλή, συμβίωσις and although they have different original meanings they are all used to describe guilds and some of them are also used for cult associations (σύνοδος, συμβίωσις, συντεχνία).

748 IGR IV 816; 821; 822.
750 TAM V2 978.
The term σύνοδος is attested twice in Saittai in the second century AD, for the association of cobblers and association of carpenters. It also designated a group of podarii (ποδάροι) in Saittai, perhaps a tempo specialists in theatre or pantomime as well as the association of musicians (μουσικοί) in Satala, not attested elsewhere.

The term ἔργασία is much more frequent in Phrygia, designating various associations in Hierapolis, Laodikeia on the Lykos and Tralleis in Lydia. In Hierapolis the expression was used for groups of βαφείς, θρεμματικοί, ἐριοπλύται, πορφυροβαφείς, λινοται and κηπουργοί, in Laodikeia on the Lykos for γναφείς and ἀπλουργοί and in Tralleis for βαφείς. The term deriving from ἐργασία, συνεργασία is very characteristic of Asia Minor and especially Saittai in Lydia. There, it has been attested 18 times for the groups of γναφείς, λαναριότη, λινουργοί, πιλοποιοί, ἐριουργοί, χαλκεῖς and σιππιναριότη.

---

751 SEG XXIX 1183.
752 SEG XXIX 1186.
754 SEG XLIX 1683 (170/171 AD); cf. commentary of ed. pr. H. Malay, Researches, no. 145; for a deceased buried by the θίσσω τῶν μουσικῶν SEG LV 1311 (Lydia, 239 AD); for an association of πυθκοί as an organisation of solo musicians in Saittai cf. SEG XXIX 1200 (Imperial period).
755 Full list of associations in Hierapolis is given in SEG XLV 1747.
756 CIG 3924 (1st-2nd century AD); Altertümer von Hierapolis 195 (2nd-3rd century AD), but cf. a new edition in SEG LIV 1315 where the earlier restoration has been changed to τέχνη τῶν βαφέων.
757 Alt. v. Hierapolis 227 (second half of the 2nd century).
759 IGR IV 822; IGR IV 816 (both 3rd century AD).
760 SEG LV 1501 (end of the 2nd/first half of the 3rd century AD).
761 SEG LV 1313 (3rd century AD)
762 IK Laodikeia am Lykos 50 (3rd century AD), but the actual term ἐργασία is a previous restoration in IGR IV 863.
763 IK Tralleis 6*.
764 for a possible restoration and new ἰ ψιλαγνάφων συνεργασία in Yeşilova, Lydia cf. commentary on SEG XLVI 1540.
765 SEG XXIX 1184 (152/153 AD).
766 SEG XXIX 1184 (152/153 AD).
767 SEG XLIX 1664 (170/171 AD).
768 SEG XXIX 1191 (183/184 AD); SEG XLVIII 1460 (183/184 AD); SEG XLIX 1667 (183/184 AD); SEG XXXII 1234 (192/193 AD); SEG XLVIII 1461 (192/193 AD); SEG XL 1088 (194/195 AD); SEG LV 1299 (196 AD); SEG XXXI 1036 (202/203 AD); TAM V 83 (205/206 AD); SEG XLIX 1670 (209/210 AD); TAM V 84 (211/212 AD); SEG XLIX 1672 (233/234 AD).
769 SEG XXIX 1195 (194/195 AD).
770 SEG XXIX 1198 (223/224 AD).
771 SEG XLIX 1669 (208/209 AD).
772 SEG XLVIII 1464 (208/209 AD).
expression is also present in one inscription from Temenothyrai,\textsuperscript{772} one from Akmonia\textsuperscript{773} and two inscriptions form Laodikeia on the Lykos.\textsuperscript{774}

Another phrase used for associations is τέχνη but in that form it is attested only twice in Hierapolis, once for associations of dyers\textsuperscript{775} and another for purple-dyers.\textsuperscript{776} The derived term τὸ ὀμότεχνον was used rarely and usually in the area of Saittai, although the earliest record is from Iulia Gordos (142/143 AD). It is used during the second century for different kind of textile workers: γυαφείς,\textsuperscript{777} λανάριοι,\textsuperscript{778} λινομαγιοι\textsuperscript{779} and ωφάνται.\textsuperscript{780} A variant was also used in an inscription in Aizanoi for associations of gardeners, ὀμοτεχνία τῶν κηπουρῶν.\textsuperscript{781} Unlike τὸ ὀμότεχνον, the designation συντεχνία is not used only for textile workers and is attested in various areas, including Tralleis and Hierapolis. In Tralleis, the association of linen-workers (λινώφοι) honoured an agoranomos\textsuperscript{782} and in Hierapolis in two funerary inscriptions there are four associations: nail smiths (ηλοκόποι), purple dyers (πορφυροβαφείς), coppersmints (χαλκείς)\textsuperscript{783} and millers (υδρολέτοι).\textsuperscript{784}

In Thyteira, the noun τὸ πλῆθος (great number, multitude) was used twice to designate guild or association of βαφείς.\textsuperscript{785} Another noun ἡ πλατεία (an avenue with colonnade)\textsuperscript{786} had perhaps a broader meaning of guilds or associations, probably implying there were whole streets or quarters of craftsmen existed and organized. It is attested once in Phrygia, in Apamea\textsuperscript{787} and five times in Saittai, constantly related to coppersmints (ἡ πλατεία τῶν σκυτέων).\textsuperscript{788}

\textsuperscript{772} SEG V1 167 (2nd century AD): ἡ γυαφέων συνεργασία.
\textsuperscript{773} IGR IV 643 (2nd century AD): ἡ γυαφείων συνεργασία.
\textsuperscript{774} IK Laodikeia am Lykos 32 and 33, for seats in the theatre for associations, both from the imperial period. The first inscription is perhaps for an association of carpet manufacturers.
\textsuperscript{775} SEG XLI 1201 (first half of the 2nd century AD): ἡ τέχνη τῶν βαφείων.
\textsuperscript{776} SEG LVII 1367 (206-209 AD): ἡ τέχνη τῶν πορφυροβαφείων; cf. Labarre, Dinahet no. 65.
\textsuperscript{777} SEG XL 1045 (Iulia Gordos, 142/143 AD); TAM VI 186 (154/155 AD).
\textsuperscript{778} TAM VI 85 (145/146 AD); SEG XLIX 1663 (168/169 AD).
\textsuperscript{779} TAM VI 82 (183/184 AD).
\textsuperscript{780} SEG XXXIII 1017 (256/257 AD); previously unattested in Saittai.
\textsuperscript{781} MAMA IX 49 (date unknown); for another possible restoration cf. MAMA IX 66.
\textsuperscript{782} IK Tralles 79 (imperial period).
\textsuperscript{783} Alt. v. Hierapolis 133 (2nd-3rd century AD).
\textsuperscript{785} TAM V2 1029 (2nd-3rd century AD); TAM V2 1081 (3rd century AD).
\textsuperscript{786} L. Robert, Études anatoliennes, Amsterdam 1970, 532-534; OMS I 424, n. 85; “l’expression qui désigne à la fois une rue et une corporation.”
\textsuperscript{787} IGR IV 790 (middle of the 2nd century AD): οἱ ἐν τῇ Σκυτικῇ Πλατείᾳ τεχνείται.
\textsuperscript{788} TAM V1 79 (152/153 AD); TAM VI 80 (153/154 AD); TAM V1 81 (173/174 AD); TAM V1 146 (166/167 AD).
The terms συνέδριον and προεδρία (as term for governing body of the association) are rarely used, twice in Hierapolis. Hierapolis also has one distinction more. On several inscriptions professional associations of gardeners, purple-dyers and the ones who wash raw flax are described as σεμνόστατος, honorable, respected. This expression of respect was considered as some kind of attribute of the establishment, although it was probably not official nomenclature. It was usually used as an epithet for gerousia and is often assigned, but not only, to the purple-dyers. However, it is not the purple-dyers who use the adjective in their documents, but individuals on their tombstones. In practical terms, it could mean that the association of purple-dyers enjoyed the image of a revered organization equal (or almost equal) in social standing to the gerousia.

From the Augustan period onwards the textile industry and trade flourished in the cities of Asia Minor. Strabo remarked that the rise in number of sheep was important in increased production of textile and that the black wool of Laodikeia on the Lykos was much esteemed: ἐφέρει δ’ ὁ περὶ τὴν Λαοδίκειαν τόπος προβάτων ἄρετὰς οὐκ εἰς μαλακότητα μόνον τῶν ἐρίων, ἣ καὶ τῶν Μυλησίων διαφέρει, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὴν κοραξῆν χρόαν, ὡστε καὶ προσοδεύονται λαμπρὰς ἀπ’ αὐτῶν, ὡσπερ καὶ οἱ Κολοσσηνοὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁμοιώμου χρώματος πλησίον οἰκοῦντες. Phrygian votive inscriptions and tombstones also give an impression of the importance of this industry as presented in Waelkens’ article listing the representation of sheep, shepherds or their tools in these areas. Some of this production was of course for domestic use, as we can see on stone representation of wool baskets and distaffs. But many products were manufactured in specialist workshops. In Lydia, most of these were in Saittai and Thyateira, and in Phrygia Hierapolis was the textile center. To be precise, Hierapolis and Laodikeia
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790 Pennachietti, no. 25; AE 1994, 1660; IGR IV 822; IGR IV 816; IGR IV 821.
791 This adjective is also frequently attested in funerary inscriptions; occasionally in honorary inscriptions concerning euergetes, for these and other examples (not in Lydia and Phrygia) cf. C. Zimmermann, Handwerkervereine im griechischen Osten des Imperium Romanum, Mainz 2002, 41-42.
792 Strabo 12. 8, 16: “The country round Laodicea produces sheep that are excellent, not only for the softness of wool, in which they surpass even the Milesian wool, but also for its raven-black color, so that the Laodicceans derive splendid revenue from it, as do also the neighboring Colosseni from the color which bears the same name.” translation taken from H. L. Jones (ed.), The Geography of Strabo, Cambridge, London, 1924.
793 M. Waelkens, Phrygian Votive and Tombstones as Sources of the Social and Economic Life in Roman Antiquity, Ancient Society 8 (1977), 286.
together formed probably the most important centre of textile production in Asia Minor, maybe even the whole eastern Mediterranean. It seems that the civic economy of Hierapolis was entirely based on textiles. In the case of Hierapolis, there is perhaps a connection between the local priesthood and the craftsmen involved in the dying of wool.\textsuperscript{794} It is also important to note that all these textile centers are situated in the river valleys of Hermos and Meandros. Saittai’s territory is suited for the cultivation of linen (flax) and for sheep-rearing; the textile-production must have largely contributed to the city’s prosperity. The hilly countryside was good for raising sheep and for cultivating flax while abundance of water helped irrigation and washing, fulling and dying the linen.\textsuperscript{795} The spatial proximity of resources necessary for textile industry encouraged an intense concentration of specialized craftsmen activity in this area. The combination of these factors could explain how those middle and small cities developed this production more than others and the success of textile industry allowed craftsmen to climb the social ladder. Textile industry in Lydia and Phrygia functioned on three levels. On the local level they met the needs of the major part of the community and proved to be self-sufficient. Thyateira and Saittai produced textiles of average quality and had surpluses distributed to other towns in the province, especially to Sardeis and Ephesos.\textsuperscript{796} The high quality textile goods and luxury garments were produced in Hierapolis and Laodikeia and then distributed all over the Empire.\textsuperscript{797} Laodician hooded cloak (and probably any wool garment from that area) was labeled as luxury good in Diocletian’s Edict on prices in 301 AD.\textsuperscript{798}

The textile professionals mentioned in the inscriptions are\textsuperscript{799}

- ἐτηρογός or wool worker (in Saittai and Philadelphia),

\textsuperscript{795} Cf. Strabo 13. 4. 14: έστι δὲ καὶ πρὸς βαθὴν ἐρύον θαυμαστῶς σύμμετρον τὸ κατὰ τὴν Ἱερὰν πόλιν ὅφερ, ὅστε τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν βαπτισμώνα ἐνάμελλα ἐναι τοὺς ἑκ τῆς κόκκου καὶ τοῖς ἀλουργησιν: οὕτω δ’ ἐστὶν δρόμον τὸ πλήθος τοῦ ἱεροῦ ὅστε ἡ πόλις μεστὴ τῶν αὐτομάτων βαλανειων ἐστί.
\textsuperscript{796} Thonemann points out that, although the direct evidence for Philadelpia as a centre of textile production is not as abundant, some association were attested there, and the later Turkish name of the ancient city (Alasehir or ‘red city’) probably reflects the city’s reputation for the fabrication of red textiles in particular, P. Thonemann, The Meander Valley. A Historical Geography from Antiquity to Byzantium, Cambridge 2011, 187.
\textsuperscript{797} Labarre, Le Dinahet, 56.
\textsuperscript{798} Ch. XIX, 26-27: byrrum Laodicen[um Χ quattor milibus quingenisen]; byrrum Laodicenum [η η similitudinem Nervi Χ decem milibus]; βιβρὸς Λαδικηνός Χ διφ; βιβρὸς Λαδικηνός ἐν ἡμιούτητη Νεφυκοῦ Χ Μ; taken from T. Frank, Rome and Italy of the Empire V, Baltimore 1940, 374-375; f. CIL III pp. 801-904.
\textsuperscript{799} For detailed information on inscriptions see Tables 9 and 10.
• ἰκνάριος or linen worker (Thyateira and Saittai),
• ἐριοπλύται, the ones who wash wool (Hierapolis)
• λινουργός linen worker (Saittai)
• λεντίσσων for linen cloth maker (Philadelphia, Eumeneia)
• ωριόπλοται, the ones who wash wool (Hierapolis)
• γναφευς or fuller (in Saittai, Iulia Gordos, Akmoneia and Themenothyrai)
• βαφευς or dyer (in Thyateira, Philadelphia, Laodikeia on the Lykos and Hierapolis) and πορφυροβαφευς (purple-dyer in Hierapolis)
• ἀπλουργοί, the ones who make clothes out of one piece of fabric (in Laodikeia on the Lykos)
• πιλοποιός, maker of felt hats (at Saittai)
• ῥάπτης or tailor (in Aizanoi)
• θεονιοπώλης, linen merchant (Eumeneia)

The inscriptions from all these areas also give testimony for other occupations, artisans and professionals. In Tralleis, we have two characteristic terms; one is a banker, ὁ τραπεζεύτης, and also an expression for co-workers, συνεργάται. In Philadelphia we have an artisan specialist, a gem cutter, ὁ δακτυλοκοιλογιλήφος. In the Phrygian highlands, stone-masons or sculptors (λατύπος) are very common as well as a few architects, a green-grocer (ὁ λαχανοπώλης), a knife-maker (ὁ μαχαροποιός), a coiffeur (or perhaps one who plaits reed mats: ἐμπλέκτης) and a perfume seller in Hierapolis (ὁ μυροπώλης). In the area of Aezanitis there is

800 SEG XLVI 1436 (Imperial period).
801 IK Tralleis 169.
802 TAM V3 1901 (2nd century AD).
803 i.e. MAMA VI 275 (Akomoneia, imperial period); 321 (Akomoneia, imperial period); MAMA IX 61 (Aizanoi, imperial period); 451 (Aizanoi, late 2nd century); SEG XL 1236 (Upper Tembrys Valley, 2nd or 3rd century); SEG XXI 1171 (Akomoneia, 249 AD); SEG XXVIII 1176 (Nakoleia, imperial period).
804 MAMA X 137 (Appia, 3rd century AD); IK Laodikeia am Lykos 58 (imperial period).
805 SEG XXVIII 1140 (Eumeneia, undated).
806 MAMA X 428 (Synaus, imperial period); for the possibility of plaitsing reed mats, an industry around Simav lake cf. lemma in MAMA X and L. Robert, Documents d’Asie Mineure, BCH 106-1 (1982), 352-359.
807 Alt. v. Hierapolis 262(150-200 AD); cf. SEG LIV 1302.
paths̄ attested, an association of gardeners (δύοτεχνία κηπουρών) that dedicated an inscription to Zeus Bennios. There are also several smiths/blacksmiths (χαλκεύς) attested, not attached to an association.

Funerary inscriptions are illustrative on internal organization of the associations. They protect their deceased members against those who do not respect the interdiction to reuse the tomb as, for example, in Hierapolis and for any misuse a penalty was to be to be paid to the association. Sometimes the association had an obligation of crowning the tomb on the anniversary of death, of making feasts or sacrifice. Professional associations are in three cases designated as recipients of fines for tomb desecration together with the treasury; in two cases they are to use the fine as the capital of an endowment, while in five cases they appear as beneficiaries of a legacy. This role has not only social consequences; it also gives a clue as to the legal treatment of these organizations. As van Nijf strongly argues, we can see from “the inscriptions that mention fines as expressions of how men of middling wealth and status perceived the social hierarchy, and of how they saw the place of collegia therein.”

Another question concerns the compulsory character of the ritual performance; what would have happened if the association was unable or unwilling to perform the ritual? For this contingency, there is information from three inscriptions; in Alt. v. Hierapolis 133 the testator designates three different associations as recipients of 150 denarii to perform the laying of a wreath over his tomb; if the nail-smiths fail, then the coppersmiths will take over, and if they fail, then the purple-dyers are to take over. In Alt. v. Hierapolis 227, in case the purple-dyers do not perform the ritual of burning poppies on the tomb of M. Aurelius Diodorus Corescus, the association of cattle breeders will assume the task and the money. The more important question remains,
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808 MAMA IX 157.
809 MAMA IX 49.
810 I. e. I Sultan Dağlı 627; SEG LI 1808 (Phrygia, 180-220 AD); SEG XXXIII 1155 (Phrygia); SEG XXVI 1356 (Akmonia, Phrygia).
814 Pennachietti, AAT 101 (1967), 297, no. 7; Alt. v. Hierapolis 218.
815 Alt. v. Hierapolis 195; Alt. v. Hierapolis 227 Pennachietti, AAT 101 (1967), 317-319, no. 45; SEG LIV 1313; SEG LIV 1315
816 O. van Nijf, The civic world of professional associations in the Roman East, Amsterdam 1997, 59.
why is there such a concentration, especially in Hierapolis, of this particular practice? Maybe it could be considered as a part of the local *euergetism*. Saïttau produced the largest number of epitaphs mentioning guilds and thus gave us a lot of new information but also raised more questions. Was there an obligation of the association to provide burial for all their members or only for those without any relatives left? Were all of the deceased members? Could the association afford to erect monuments for all the members? Taking into account the well-known custom in Lydia to erect funerary monuments for a deceased listing all his/her family members, we could perhaps assume that the epitaphs made by associations were meant for those members with no surviving relatives, or simply too poor to afford such a funerary monument.

What about the living members? Epigraphic texts display solidarity, mutual help and celebrations among the artisans of the same association and illustrate their place in the society. Some associations had an *epimeletes*817 or *epistates*818 in charge, as in Thyateira and Hierapolis, where we have the *proedria* as a leading group.819 It seems that associations were modeled on the institutions of the *polis*, thus creating their civic space within the city (showing structural and terminological similarity in constitution (νόμος), offices (ἐπιμελητής, ἐπιστάτης), organisation of assemblies, issuing of decrees and award of honors to distinguished members or benefactors in traditional vocabulary, and perhaps displaying excessive polis imitation included subdivisions of members into φυλαί820 and annually held ὀγιάνες.821

The association of textile professionals bestowed honors on illustrious persons and benefactors. They dedicated statues,822 funerary altars823 and honorific

---

817 *TAM* V2 991.
818 *TAM* V2 945.
820 As in Philadelphia *TAM* V3 1490; 1491; 1492.
821 We can perhaps deduce from two inscriptions from Thyateira, that the association of dyers had a building, ἔργον, or some other place to gather; *TAM* V2 991 (Thyateira) ll. 2-8: [οἱ] βαφεῖς έπέμβαιναν / Μήλικον Μενίάνδρου, [ἀν]άφα φιλότειμον καὶ λε[ι]½τουργόν, έπιμεληθὲν τα τῶν βαφῶν ἔργας / πολλάκις καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν τε/κ]')ννον: 945 (Thyateira) ll. 2-7: οἱ βαφεῖς / Ἀλ. Ἀρτεμί[γ]νον / Γλύκκονος ὕλων στρατηγὸν έπεμβαιναν ἐπαύσαμένον τοῦ ἔργου / βαφῶν ; cf. L. Robert, *OMS* IV, 254; nevertheless, the term can also be applied to the association itself.
822 *TAM* V2 989; 991; 972; 978; 1029; 1019; 945; *TAM* V3 1490; *SEG* XLI 1201 (Hierapolis); *IGR* IV 816 (Hierapolis); *SEG* VI 167 (Thememouth, Phrygia).
823 *IK* Traileis 6* (Hierapolis).
inscriptions. As we can see, the highest number of honorary inscriptions issued by craftsmen comes from Thyateira and the association of dyers is the most active one.

There is only one inscription made by professional associations honoring an emperor, as the potters from Thyateira honored M. Aur. Severus Antoninus with a statue commissioned and erected at their own expense.

Guilds were usually bestowing honors on city officials: ambassadors, einarchos, agoranomos, strategos, first strategos, sitones, gymnasiarches, xystarches, agonothetes, lampadarches, dekaprotos, grammateus of the boule, stephanephoros.

Some of the honorands were involved in the imperial cult. Claudia Ammion, from a distinguished family, honored by dyers in Thyateira was a priestess of the imperial cult, άρχιερεια τῆς πόλεως for life and a generous agonothetes. She is also the only woman being honored by professional associations. Tiberius Claudius Socrates, also honored by dyers in Thyateira, was άρχιερευς τῆς Ἀσίας τοῦ ἐν Περγάμῳ ναοῦ and euergetes who helped with the reconstruction of many buildings, graced the city with new edifices and also endowed his polis with a generous exemption from taxes, and T. Flavius Montanus honored by fullers in Akmoneia was άρχιερευς τῆς Ἀσίας ναοῦ τοῦ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ κοινοῦ τῆς Ἀσίας and one of the flamines augustales. Tiberius Claudius Zotikos in Hierapolis, honored by both purple-dyers and wool-cleaners, was γραμματεύς ναῶν τῶν ἐν Ἀσία and also euergetes of his patria.
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824 TAM V2 965; 933; IK Laodikeia am Lykos 50; IGR IV 822 (Hierapolis); IGR IV 821 (Hierapolis).
825 For Zimmermann’s view on honorary inscriptions, patronage and “honorary members” cf. Handwerkervereine, 105-108.
826 TAM V2 914.
827 TAM V2 966; 1002; 1019; IGR IV 822 (Hierapolis); IGR IV 821 (Hierapolis).
828 TAM V2 989.
829 TAM V2 966; 989; 991; 1002.
830 TAM V2 989; 991; 945.
831 IGR IV 822 (Hierapolis); IGR IV 821 (Hierapolis).
832 TAM V2 991.
833 TAM V2 972; 978.
834 TAM V3 1490.
835 TAM V2 972; 978; IGR IV 822 (Hierapolis); IGR IV 821 (Hierapolis); IGR IV 643.
836 TAM V2 945.
837 TAM V2 989; 991; 945.
838 TAM V2 991.
839 TAM V2 965.
840 TAM V2 972.
841 TAM V2 978, also mentioned in TAM V2 976 and 980.
842 IGR IV 643 (= MAMA VI List 164).
843 IGR IV 822; IGR IV 821.
Annianus in Thyateira was *philosebastos*, twice asiarch, priest of the imperial cult, as well as a rhetor and jurist and one of the best men in Asia. Bakers in Thyateira honored and erected a statute of C. Iulius Iulianus Tatianus, a descendant of asiarches; he himself served his *polis* as *agonothetes*, chief priest for life, *triteutes* and *agoranomos*, as well as an ambassador to the Emperor (at his own expense) and is called οικιστής. In Philadelphia, wool workers honored Aurelius Hermippos as *euergetes*, he was a *xystarches*, a priest of the imperial cult and the priest of Artemis, and helped gladiatorial games and made other numerous money donations. Another elaborate example is an inscription where the fullers honor a renowned athlete C. Perelius Aurelius Alexander, a well-known person who lived in Thyateira in the 3rd century AD and played a major role in the political life of his town. The text of this honorific inscription is almost identical to *TAM* V2 1018, except that this time linen workers appear in the last line. He was also honored by the wool-workers in *TAM* V2 1019 and his career is documented in *TAM* V2 984, *TAM* V2 1017-1020.

Professional associations honored people who performed almost all official duties in the city and they belonged to the *polis* finest, some of them being even a part of the provincial elite. Bestowing honors on them could have allowed craftsmen to build relations of trust, making a network of influence in the center of local power.

Some honorands had careers in the imperial army, as Alfenus Arignotus, an equestrian, with a distinguished military career who held various administrative posts, from an illustrious family in Thyateira, L. Egnatius Quartus from Temenothyrai designated as *ktistes*, T. Flavius Montanus in Akmoneia and unnamed imperial procurator in Hierapolis. Apart from the Emperor Caracalla, the highest ranking person honored by professional associations was the famous jurist M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus, honored by the

---

844 *TAM* V2 933.
845 *TAM* V2 966.
846 *TAM* V3 1490.
847 SEG XLIX 1669.
848 *TAM* V2 935, and cf. also 913: *prefectus cohortis II Flaviae Numidarum* (Dacia), *praepositus cohortis II Flaviae Bessorum* (Dacia Inferior), *tribunus cohortis I Cilicum et praepositus cohortis I Gaetulorum* (Moesia Inferior), *praefectus alae II Flaviae Agrippianæ* (Syria), *procurator Augusti arcae Livianae*, νεκτόρα τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ, priest of Apollo Tyrimnos.
849 SEG VI 167, cf. also IGR IV 64; SEG VI 174; *AE* 1977, 802; *AE* 2006, 1425: *praefectus cohortis II Claudiae, curator alae Augustae Geminæ (Cappadocia), tribunus militum legionis VIII Augustae (Germania Superior), praefectus equitum alae Augustæ (Britannia or Syria).
850 IGR IV 643: *praefectus fabrum* twice.
851 IGR IV 816, Alt. v. Hierapolis 42.
tanners,\textsuperscript{852} gardeners\textsuperscript{853} as well as his home city of Thyateira.\textsuperscript{854} Arnaoutoglou argues, following van Nijf, that by honoring high ranking man professional associations became socially visible and projected their identity in the eyes of their fellow citizens. In that way, they enforced social hierarchy and current system of social value.\textsuperscript{855}

Financial interest was presumably the main reason for honoring benefactors as well as large land owners, the ones who owned great herds (important for those in textile industry), the ones who will invest in the trade of the final product, or the ones who can help them with the market or taxes. An interesting example is a 1\textsuperscript{st} century inscription where shop-keepers in the slave market and the προξενηταί of slaves honored and dedicated a statue of Alexandros, son of Alexandros, a slave-dealer (σωματέμπορος), because he acted with integrity during his four-month tenure as agoranomos and donated money to celebrate lavishly the festival days of the Emperors.\textsuperscript{856} The honorand was active in the same trade as the group honoring him and probably his duties as agoranomos involved him in supervising market practices. Associations could be seen as contenders for economic support (as presumably benefactors’ resources were not limitless) and benefactions and for the honor and prestige that such connections with the elites generated.\textsuperscript{857} In fact, participation in monumentalizing was one important means by which associations made claims about their place within society in relation to other groups and institutions. Furthermore, associations were, in a way, competitors for potential supporters and for the allegiances of members.

Most of the people mentioned in these inscriptions seem to be free, as it is also unclear whether craftsmen employed slaves or not. There are attestations of a slave and another possible freedman in Saittai, belonging to the same family\textsuperscript{858} and few other examples, also in Saittai, as three persons Ammianus,\textsuperscript{859} Attalianos\textsuperscript{860} and Iulianus\textsuperscript{861} do

\textsuperscript{852} TAM V2 986.
\textsuperscript{853} SEG XLVII 1656.
\textsuperscript{854} TAM V2 988.
\textsuperscript{855} I. Arnaoutoglou, Craftsman associations in Roman Lydia – A Tale of Two Cities?, Ancient Society 41 (2011), 270.
\textsuperscript{856} TAM V2 932.
\textsuperscript{858} TAM V1 85; SEG XXIX 1186; cf. also Zimermann, Handwerkervereine, 93-95.
\textsuperscript{859} TAM V1 84: epitaph made by συνεργασία τῶν λιοφόρων.
\textsuperscript{860} SEG XXIX 1195: epitaph made by συνεργασία τῶν πιλοκοί.
not indicate their patronymic. Based on this we cannot conclusively determine whether or not these persons were slaves, but it could be a solid indication. Part of the textile production was probably in the hands of women, but we have only one inscription, an epitaph in Philadelphia, for a female linen worker named Trophime. She was not part of any association.

One aspect concerning the ethnic affiliation of members in associations is seen from the tombstone of P. Aelius Glykon Zeuxianos Ailianos in Hierapolis who endows the association of purple-dyers and the assembly of carpet makers with 200 and 150 denarii respectively in order to perform celebrations at two Jewish festivals (Passover and Pentecost) and at the Roman festival of Kalendae. While there is a certain amount of evidence about Jews in Hierapolis and their corporate organization, there is no compelling reason to assume that there were exclusively Jewish craftsmen associations.

A question whether craftsmen were considered to belong to a lower class is a complex one, as their world was not homogenous and there were social differences between industries. Judging by the types of the inscription and their information (as seen in Tables 5 and 6), linenworkers would be at the lower part of the hierarchy as they have produced mostly simple epitaphs for their members in Saittai, stating only the name and age of the deceased. Dyers are more prominent in the middle-sized Thyateira and their inscriptions are usually honorific: they are dedicating statues, honoring their epimeletai and epištatai who hold numerous official positions in the city and perform (and finance) liturgies. In Hierapolis ή τέχνη τῶν βαφέων is dedicating a statue to the boule. On the top were purple-dyers, making them among the notables in the city. At the beginning of the 3rd century ή τέχνη τῶν πορφυρωβαφέων contributed to the decoration of the first and second levels of the theater skene in Docimean marble, as well as the adjoining part 635 feet long. It is clear that corporate purple-dyers had access to capital funds that enabled them simultaneously to contribute to the decoration
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861 TAM V1 83: epitaph made by συνεργασία τῶν λινουργῶν.
862 TAM V3 1790.
865 TAM V2 991.
866 TAM V2 945.
867 SEG XLI 1201.
868 SEG LVII 1367.
of one of Hierapolis’ symbols, display their attachment to civic ideology, and raise themselves above the status of the average craftsmen and enter the ranks of local benefactors. Another good example is Marcus Aurelius Alexandros Moschianos from Hierapolis, πορφυροπόλος, who is also bouleutes.\(^869\) The purple dye was not easy to obtain and it was considered luxury good. It is no wonder that funerary inscriptions of these traders in Hierapolis are usually inscribed on lavish sarcophagi and have measures against reusing the tomb as well as donations to the associations.

In Hierapolis there were members of the proedria of the association. The term denotes almost consistently the privilege to be seated in the front rows during theater performances, musical or athletic contests, granted to distinguished citizens and foreigners. One inscription in particular could give decisive evidence:”…and if anyone opens (the sarcophagus’ lid), either heir or relative, he shall pay to the proedria of the purple-dyers or to the yearly epimeletai a fine of 400 denari”.\(^870\) Proedria does not designate the association as such but most probably the board of the group. In particular, proedria is equaled with the annually elected epimeletai;\(^871\) the fine for tomb violation will be paid either to the proedria of the group or to its annual epimeletai. Therefore, proedria and epimeletai enjoy some sort of equal status, and proedria cannot denote something entirely different from epimeletai but it should be exercising a similar function. Nevertheless, there was a distinction based on the status enjoyed by those included in the proedria. Whether epimeletai enjoyed ex officio the privilege of proedria, remains an unanswered question. The proedria of purple-dyers may possibly originate in the honorary places at the theatre allocated to the leading and prominent members of the association, such as the linourgoi seats in Saittai or ergasia kl[---] in the neighbouring Laodikeia on Lykos. Nevertheless, this could also imply some sort of informal hierarchy among purple-dyers. It might mean that they were the annually selected epimeletai and a body of, perhaps previous officials (ex-epimeletai) constituting the proedria, which could perhaps convene as a separate organ.\(^872\) It is, therefore, possible to consider proedria as some sort of executive committee,

---

\(^{869}\) Alt. v. Hierapolis 156.

\(^{870}\) SEG LIV 1323, 5-8: εἴ τις δὲ ἀποκορακῶσει ἢ τε κληρονόμος ἢ τι συγγενής θήσει τῇ προεδρίᾳ τῶν πορφυραβάρων ἢ τοῖς κατὰ έτος ἐπεμεληταῖς προστείμων (δήν) ν’.

\(^{871}\) Zimmermann argues that these epimeletai were responsible for the financial administration; cf. Zimmermann, Handwerkervereine, 52-53.

\(^{872}\) Alt. v. Hierapolis 227: τὸ συνεδρίον τῆς προεδρίας.
comprising all the serving magistrates of an association; or proedria could be seen as a board of senior, prestigious, wealthy and distinguished members of the group. Some associations had their designated seats in the theatres and stadiums, showing their social position, as attested in Laodikeia on the Lykos. It seems there are also seats of the stadium in Saïttau mentioning phylai.

It seems needless to say there is no wool-seller or linen-seller whose social status comparable to that of a boularchos, and weavers are generally considered were men of limited resources. As we have seen in previous chapters, the elites mostly drew their wealth from land-owning. But there are indications of an involvement of local elite families in financing craftsmen workshops and trade. It seems there is no evidence that wool-sellers depended directly on landlords who owned flocks, but since professional associations had members of both free craftsmen and slaves or freedmen, there is a possibility that landowners had some interest in crafts and trade. In Saïttau a certain Octavius Polykleites is one of the local lanarioi. The Octavii Polliones are known as one of the most prominent families in the city. It seems the person mentioned in the inscription is either their freedman or his son. Incidentally, the same family had a slave Philetairos as a member of the association of tektones. Pleket raised the question, giving an example from Antiochia, that town councillors derived profit from urban shops. Should we assume then that prominent families in Saïttau derived profits from the sale of wool and the finished product, through slaves, freedmen and free workers?

There is still no definitive answer, although there is indirect evidence. In Thyateira, there is an honorary inscription for Aurelius Artemagogas, one of the dekaprotoi of the city and also ἐπιστησάμενος τοῦ ἔργου βαφέων ἀπὸ γένους τὸ ἀκτον or hereditary president of the association of dyers, which may imply his involvement in the industry. It seems that either way simple textile workers, most numerous in Lydia and Phrygia, were on a lower level of social hierarchy. The only exemption would be traders of luxury goods and garments originating from Laodikeia and Hierapolis. Another

873 IK Laodikeia am Lykos 32 and 33 (both from the imperial period); one inscription is perhaps for an association of carpet manufacturers
874 SEG XL 1063 (second half of the 2nd or 3rd century).
875 H. W. Pleket, City elites and economic activities in the Greek part of the Roman Empire: some preliminary remarks, ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ του Η’ διεθνούς συνεδρίου ελληνικής και λατινικής επιγραφικής, Αθήνα, 3-9 Οκτωβρίου 1982, vol. 1, Athens 1984, 139.
876 TAM VI 85 (145/146 AD).
877 SEG XXIX1186 (165/166 AD).
878 Pleket, City elites, 140.
example showing us, perhaps, how the production process and trade were organized is an epitaph of Flavius Zeuxis, ergastes, who sailed 72 times to Italy.879

Φλαουίος Ζεύξις ἐργαστῆς / πλεύσας ὑπὲρ Μαλέαν εἰς Ἰ/ταλίαν πλόας ἐβδομήκοντα δύο κατεσκέύσαν τὸ μνημεῖόν ἑαυτῷ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις Φλα/ουίῳ Θεοδώρῳ καὶ Φλαουίῳ / Θεοδή καὶ ὃ ἦν ἐκεῖνοι / συνχωρήσωσιν.

As he has no other honorary titles, we can deduce he was not at first a member of the rich municipal elite, but one merchant who did gruesome work of sailing back and forth and selling some sort of products in Italy. Coming from Hierapolis he probably transported woolen cloth. His lavish tomb was prominently situated next to the city’s north gate.

There is a sentiment in modern historiography that Romans did not tolerate any collegia or associations, especially in the East. During the early Empire, Augustus indeed reinforced Cæsar’s regulations and all the new association required the approval of the Senate or the Emperor. Other emperors followed, but closely observed these bans always have a local and temporary focus.880 A general ban on associations was never implemented. The nature of our epigraphic sources, consisting, as we have seen, of honorary inscriptions, epitaphs and dedications, does not support these references to public prohibitions, since we have inscriptions mentioning various associations, either professional or religious during the entire imperial period. Trajan’s policy on associations is well documented in both epigraphic and literary evidence. His opinion on voluntary associations is well known from the correspondence with Pliny the Younger; he ordered Pliny not to authorize a guild of firemen in Nikomedea (Bythinia).881

Our sole testimony for Roman intervention in associative life in Asia Minor in the imperial period concerns the bakers of Ephesos as attested in IEph 215. From the proconsul’s orders we gather that main offenses of the bakers’ associations were: holding seditious meetings which had led to riots; reckless disregard of public

879 Alt. v. Hierapolis 51.
regulations; and a “labor strike” which had reduced the bread supply. In order not to aggravate this shortage of bread, the proconsul did not resort to arrests or trials – a leniency which he emphasizes. But he promises to punish any repetition of such acts, and threatens any offender caught in hiding and to anyone who would hide him.\textsuperscript{882} Buckler argues that in the large cities of Asia Minor, during the period from 2\textsuperscript{nd} to 5\textsuperscript{th} century, strikes occurred from time to time, but that their causes and aims remain obscure, although it could have been a fight for higher wages.\textsuperscript{883} There are some other minor disturbances in Miletus\textsuperscript{884} in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century, but we have no clear evidence for Lydia and Phrygia. Actually, what we can deduce from our epigraphic sources is that professional associations accepted the dominant set of social values and the existing social hierarchy. Their practice and patterns of bestowing honors testify that they subscribed to the socio-political order. Resorting to or instigating disturbances would irreversibly damage their image and undermine their position in the world of polis.\textsuperscript{885} In the late second century, Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus re-enacted a law to the effect that it was not lawful to belong to more than one guild.\textsuperscript{886} Regardless of the reasons behind, or success of, such imperial legislation, what is clear from such actions is the commonality of one person belonging to more than one association. In other words, membership in a guild or association was often non-exclusive; belonging to one group did not hinder the possibility of belonging to or affiliating oneself with another. In that way, associations became competitors both for new members and for the allegiances of the members they had.\textsuperscript{887}

We have also seen there were other professionals and artisans, not attached to an association. Many of the inscriptions are simple, but there are few that could give us some information about their work. An illustrative example is an epitaph of a young architect from Phrygia:\textsuperscript{888} he had carried out at least one prestigious building commission entrusted to him by a praefectus, made influential contacts, been released

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
from imperial service and returned to Phrygia, where he died young and unmarried, aged 25, to be buried by his relatives. Another glimpse into everyday life of craftsmen is given by votive dedications some of them made. In SEG XXXIII 1155 from Phrygia, for example, a blacksmith Andreas is making a dedication to Zeus Thallos because of his shoulder, probably an occupational disease.\textsuperscript{889} Craftsmen of all kinds (stonemasons, blacksmiths, mint masters, knife makers, etc.) set up high-quality funerary monuments proclaiming, and often visually depicting, their particular skills, and itinerant Docimean stone-masons are a common presence in Phrygian epigraphy. Perhaps even more than words of the inscriptions, visual presentations on tombstones and votive reliefs show the world of lower classes. For example, an anvil, hammer and pair of tongs are presenting us a blacksmith,\textsuperscript{890} two chisels wood carving and a saw for carpenter.\textsuperscript{891}

Perhaps the most vivid description of an urban life for artisans and others is the one in Dio Chrysostom’s discourse in Apamea in Phrygia: πρὸς δὲ τούτοις αἱ δίκαι παρ᾽ ἐτος ἀγονται παρ᾽ ύμιν καὶ ξυνάγεται πλῆθος ἀνθρώπων ἀπειρον δικαζομένων, δικαζόντων, ἤτορον, ἥγεμόνων, ὑπηρετῶν, οἰκετῶν, μαστροπόλων, ὅρεωιμών, κατηλών, ἐπαρχόν τε καὶ βαναύσων: ὡστε τὰ τε ὅννα τοὺς ἐχοντας πλεῖστης ἀποδίδοσθαι τιμὴς καὶ μηδὲν ἄργον εἶναι τῆς πόλεως, μήτε τὰ ζεύγη, μήτε τὰς οἰκίας, μήτε τὰς γυναίκας, τοῦτο δὲ οὐ συμκρόν ἐστι πρὸς εὐδαμονίαν.\textsuperscript{892} As we can deduce from this passage, the presence of the Roman court was an advantage for every city. It can be assumed that these court sessions coincided with various festivites and agones, thus emphasizing the economic growth in the city.

\textsuperscript{889} Ἀνδρέας Κοτσαίης χαλκεύς περὶ Ὥμου Δἰ Θαλλωνίῳ εἰχήν.
\textsuperscript{890} i.e. MAMA X 86 (Appia, imperial period); 417 (Synaus, imperial period); SEG XLI 1172 (Akmoneia, 150-200 AD); SEG XLV 1640 (Saittai, 234/5 or 288/9 AD)
\textsuperscript{891} MAMA X 162 (Appia).
\textsuperscript{892} Dio Chr. 35, 15: "And what is more, the courts are in the session every other year in Celaenae, and they bring together an unnumbered throng of people – litigants, jurymen, orators, princes, attendants, slaves, pimps, muleteers, hucksters, harlots and artisans. Consequently not only can those who have goods to sell obtain the highest prices, but also nothing in the city is out of work, neither the teams nor the houses nor the women. And this contributes not a little to prosperity; for wherever the greatest throng of people comes together, there necessarily we find money in greatest abundance, and it stands to reason that the place should thrive." An English translation by J. W. Cohoon and H. Lamar Crosby; for Apameia as a great emporium see also Strabo, 12. 8. 15.
6.2 Other voluntary associations

A common feature in civic society in Lydia and Phrygia were various voluntary associations, small unofficial groups that gathered together for organized social and religious purposes. They were mostly religious or athletic groups. The phrase “voluntary” point to the nature of membership in such organizations, whose activities were primarily social rather than economic or political and which often functioned as extended or "fictive" families for their largely lower-class members, providing an intermediary between family and city. Diverse by nature and organization, we can distinct several terms for describing these groups.\(^\text{893}\)

- *symbiosis*\(^\text{894}\) as “associations amicales”
- *hieros doumos*\(^\text{895}\)
- φρατρες / *phratra*\(^\text{896}\)
- *thiasos*\(^\text{897}\)
- *mystai*\(^\text{898}\)

Those are several types of groups drawing their membership from social connections associated with common ethnic or geographic origin, the neighbourhood, and common cultic interests. There are diverse cult activities within these local, unofficial associations, which are often viewed as “private” and represent a variety of social levels among the population. Membership in a private religious association was based primarily on the attraction of the particular deity or deities worshiped. As such,

---

\(^{893}\) For list of epigraphic evidence and brief overview see M. Riel, Society and Economy of rural sanctuaries in Roman Lydia and Phrygia, *EA* 35 (2003), 92-93.

\(^{894}\) TAM V1 187 (95/6 AD); TAM V1 87 (Saittai, 151/2 AD); TAM V1 88 (Saittai, 194/5 AD); TAM V1 89 (Saittai, 224/225 AD); TAM V1 537 (Saittai, 171/2 AD); SEG XXIX 1188 (Saittai, 170/171 AD); SEG XXXI 1010 (Saittai 166/167 AD); SEG XXXI 1016 (Saittai, 293/4 AD); SEG XLVI 1540 (Yeşilova II/III century AD), also in SEG XLIX 1777 (Stratonikeia on the Kaikos, Mysia). Also attested in Akmoneia, Phrygia in 215/216 AD: MAMA XI 110 (=SEG XL 1192).

\(^{895}\) TAM V1 179 (Saittai, 172/172 AD), 449 (Ayazviran, 223/224 AD), 470a (Ayazviran, 96/7 AD), 483a (Ayazviran), 536 (Maeonia, 171/172 AD); Drew-Bear, Thomas, Yıldızturan, *Phrygian Votive Steles* 137, no. 167.

\(^{896}\) TAM V1 762; I. Manisa Museum 244 (96/7 AD); MAMA IV 230 (Tymandos, 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD).

\(^{897}\) MAMA VI 239 (Akmoneia, cult of Dionysos); SEG XXXIII 1135 (Hierapolis, 2\textsuperscript{nd} or 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD), perhaps a thiasos of the imperial cult; TAM V1 144 (area of Saittai).

\(^{898}\) TAM V2 1055 (Thyatera); SEG XXIV 1232 (Saittai, 190/191 AD)); SEG XXXII 1236 (Sardeis, 26/25 BC); MAMA IV 167 (Apollonia, 1\textsuperscript{st} or 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD); MAMA VI 239 (Akmoneia); MAMA V Lists I 183, 153 (Dorylaion); SEG XXVIII 1187 (Nakoletia); SEG XL 1223 (Sebaste, 2\textsuperscript{nd} or 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD).
they had a tendency to attract persons from all classes of society, although the elites of society were probably not as numerous in such associations as were the urban poor, slaves, and freedmen. Religious associations were generally admitting both male and female members. From the inscriptions we can deduce that they were organizing gatherings, communal meals and festivities. Belonging to an association often offered opportunities to participate in the organizational structure of the association. We also find, however, a degree of hierarchy in associations in so far as there are levels of leadership and honors to which members may aspire.\textsuperscript{899} Voluntary associations did not have a uniform structure.\textsuperscript{900} In many ways they were structured like the professional associations, taking care of their members in life as in death. They had very good relations with local administrations and municipal elite. Almost all voluntary associations performed some cultic activities: offering sacrifice, make dedications to gods, commission statues of gods and taking care of the sanctuaries. Rituals had the function of bringing together individuals into a collective, thus strengthening group identity and the attachment of individuals to the group and society. Most of the epigraphic evidence for these groups is, in fact for religious associations.

From the first century there is IGR IV 1348 (Mostene, Lydia) mentioning a cult group of Καυσαρίοσται. They honoured a man for his contributions to the association (koinon) in connection with its sacrifices for the Sebastoi and accompanying banquets. During Trajan’s reign we have an altar in Phrygia dedicated to Zeus Bennios and the bennos,\textsuperscript{901} as well as an honorary inscription for T. Flavius from Sardis issued by mystai and therapeutai of Zeus.\textsuperscript{902} As we have seen, συμβιοσεις were rather popular in Roman Lydia. An ambiguous term on epitaph erected by friends for a friend of...[...] of the association’s meeting place for the men and “evil curses” for the women.

\textsuperscript{899} For regulations of a private cult association see the well-known inscription from Hellenistic Philadelphia TAM V3 1539 (late 2\textsuperscript{nd} - early 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC) and further commentaries in SEG XXXI 1002 and SEG XLIX 1690; for example, men and free women were prohibited from having sexual intercourse with anyone other than their spouse on penalty of restricted access to the association’s meeting place for the men and “evil curses” for the women.

\textsuperscript{900} On internal organization, membership and possible a treasury of the associations cf. C. Zimmermann, 46-66; cf. πρόσωποι in TAM V3 1521 (2\textsuperscript{nd} or 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD) probably for the revenues from a foundation; γραμματεῖς in TAM V1 490 (near Thyateira, 159/160 AD), ναρθηκοφόρος in TAM V1 817 (near Thyateira, 165/166 AD), 822 (near Thyateira, 198/199 AD); ἱερεῖς, ἱεροφάντης, σπειράρχες in SEG XXVIII 1187 (Nakoleia).

\textsuperscript{901} SEG XL 1229 (Upper Tembris Valley, 102-117 AD).

\textsuperscript{902} SEG XLVI 1529.

Public religious associations are most often connected to a public sanctuary and fell under the administration of the city. More prevalent religious groups are the ones that explicitly identify themselves with particular patron deities. There were associations in connection with, for example, Attis,\footnote{\textit{I. Sardis 17.}} Zeus,\footnote{\textit{I. Sardis 22; P. Herrmann, Mystenvereine in Sardeis, \textit{Chiron} 26 (1996), 315-341 no. 4}} Apollo,\footnote{\textit{SEG} XLVI 1520 (Apollo Pleurenos); P. Herrmann, Mystenvereine no. 2.} and Dionysos\footnote{\textit{SEG} XXVII 1187 (Nakoleia); \textit{SEG} XL 1223 (Sebaste, 2nd or 3rd century AD); cf. also C. H. E. Haspels, Relics of a Dionysiac Cult in Asia Minor, \textit{AJA} 66 (1962), 285-289, especially inscriptions on pages 285, 1 and 286, 3 (= \textit{MAMA} V Lists I 183, 153).} and the emperors.\footnote{\textit{I. Sardis 62.}} In Lydia we also have worshippers of Herakles.\footnote{\textit{SEG} XXXV 1264 (Thermai Theseos, 151/152 AD); I Manisa Museum 36 (area of Kula, 123/124 AD).} Some inscriptions refer to “initiates” (\textit{mystai} or \textit{archenbatai}) without designating the deity in question, one of which is also a group of athletes.\footnote{\textit{P. Herrmann, Mystenvereine no. 5; cf. also SEG XLVI 1532.}} There are other monuments that vaguely refer to other associations using common terminology, making reference to the \textit{koinon} or

\begin{flushleft}
mentioning the meeting hall of the *symbiosis*. An alternative term attested in Lydia is φρότορες designating members of an unspecified association as in *SEG* XLVII 1649 (Hyrkanis, Lydia, 2nd century AD). An alternative expression is φρότορες φίλοι also mentioned in Lydia.

The question of religious beliefs and overall cult practice in Lydia and Phrygia is a vast subject and will not be discussed in particular in this thesis. Apart from the other deities and related associations, the imperial cult had a special place in the cult practice in Asia Minor. We have already seen the organization of the imperial cult at the provincial and elite level. Certain scholars believed that imperial cult was clearly discerned from social and religious life associated with other deities at the local level, and really not involved in the lives of the non-elites, while others argued that cultic honors for the emperors were, in many respects, well-integrated within religious life in Asia Minor and important to all social levels of the population.

Aside from the religious associations, there were also associations of wine lovers attested in both Lydia and Phrygia. In Phrygia we have one testimony of φιλοπόλοι, and in both provinces there are several attestations of various athletic groups.

Local Jewish communities and Christian groups in Lydia and Phrygia were organized in the same way as voluntary associations, at least judging by their terminology.

---

915 I. e. Keil-Premerstein, *Dritte Reise* no.14: τὸ κοινὸν; *SEG* XL 1192 (Akmonia, 215/216 AD); συμβίοσις; *TAM* V1 537 (Maenonia, 171/172 AD): ιερο Συμβιοσις.
916 *TAM* V 1 762; 1148; *TAM* V 1 451: cult association of Asklepios cf. also *TAM* V 2 1320 (Büyükbelen; late 2nd or 3rd century AD); dedication of a statue of Ζεὺς Φράτριος on behalf of the Αυξανότερον.
917 *SEG* XXVIII 893 (Ayazviran, Lydia, 96/97 AD); *SEG* XLIX 1673 (Saittai, 238/239 AD).
920 *SEG* LV 1291 (Philadelphia, 161/162 AD); *SEG* LV 1418 (Kotiaion, 3rd century AD).
921 *SEG* LVI 1501 (Hierapolis, end of the 2nd, early 3rd century AD).
922 I.e. Φολονίκοι (association of the ‘friends of victory’) *TAM* V3 1521 (=*SEG* XLVI 1540); πεξηπνιηζηηθαὶ ζύλνδνη: *SEG* LVII 1221 (Silandos, reign of Severus Alexander);
As we have said before, inclination to belong to some group is part of the human nature. Voluntary associations were the most flexible way of congregating, creating substitute families for their largely lower-class members,\(^{924}\) simulating civic organization and providing an intermediary between family and city. Although we have many evidences regarding associations in Lydia and Phrygia, there are no explicit inscriptions regulating their membership. Nevertheless, there is a lengthy inscription from Philadelphia dated to the 2\(^{nd}\) or 1\(^{st}\) century BC that contains the norms that Zeus transmitted through a dream to Dionysios, the founder or reformer of an older private association.\(^{925}\) This inscription was subject of many studies, most recently by Maria Paz de Hoz.\(^{926}\) She argues that this particular inscription could easily belong to the first centuries AD. The leader of the association seems to be an educated man with philosophical ambitions who wanted to make his association a model one.\(^{927}\) One of the first prohibitions concerns δόλος, treachery and every kind of harmful action, especially committed in secrecy. These regulations mention harmful magic, abortions and adultery. Clauses on sexual offense are the most explicit and detailed. Another aspect was also highlighted, namely offences were not only forbidden, their planning was a crime as well. Persons joining the association had to make an oath, obliging themselves to follow these regulations. This association was probably similar to other Lydian associations. De Hoz also argues that the members were asked for eunoia towards the community like the citizens of a polis and that “Dionysios’ main objective was to contribute to the society creating a well ordered community where respect for the gods and respect for civil law went hand in hand.”\(^{928}\)

---


\(^{925}\) TAM V3 1539.


\(^{927}\) Pleket remarked that the austerity of these regulations seems rather atypical, *SEG* XXXI 1002.

\(^{928}\) *Ibid*, 10.
6.3 Cult personnel

Saying that religion played a major part in the life of ancient people is probably an understatement. A prominent aspect of social prestige was drawn from piety and fulfilment of the obligations that humans owed to the gods. To be regarded as impious, on the other hand, might lead to prosecution and a loss of social position in any community. Versnel has demonstrated that the background of many curses was the feeling of a person that his or her actions were being carefully observed (and criticized) and that this resulted in a loss of face and dishonor. The feeling of personal dependency on the god obtained additional weight amongst the faithful, the call for help and rescue became ever more frequent. Not just individuals but entire communities turned publicly to the sanctuaries requesting divine prosecution of culprits, exactly as they turn to gods to ask for fertility of the fields and the protection of livestock. The religion was perhaps also a way to express their other views as in inscription from Sardes, a dedication to the Lydian mother of the Gods. Robert pointed out that the Lydian mother of the gods was explicitly distinguished from her Phrygian counter-part, the meter theoon par excellence, because of “Lydian nationalism”.

The question of religious beliefs and overall cult practice in Lydia and Phrygia is a vast subject and will not be discussed in particular in this thesis. Nevertheless,

931 SEG XXXII 1238 (1st century AD).
certain issues, such as cult personnel should be briefly mentioned because of other obvious social significance.

Senior cult personnel were priests and priestesses. As Riel pointed out, priests outnumbered the priestesses, especially in Phrygia. Husbands and wives sometimes shared an office, whereas women occurred as single priestesses usually in the cults of goddesses. Hereditary life-long priesthoods were not uncommon. Non-hereditary priesthoods lasted a year or longer. In the sanctuaries of larger cities, like in Thyateira and Aizanoi, it is not unusual for the members of the municipal elite to be life-long priests. According to Dignas, priests who served διὰ βίου are likely to have developed more power and to have identified themselves more intensely with their cults.

Priests had many responsibilities in their sanctuaries. They performed daily rituals, made sacrifices, celebrated festivals; they were involved in setting up altars and statues as well as administrative work concerning sanctuaries’ property and people.

Developed cultic hierarchy is documented in two Lydian funerary inscriptions erected by the members of the same extended family. Two young deceased relatives were designated as ὁ εἰερεύς ὁ νεότερος and Riel supposes that “this priesthood was probably hereditary in their family, their fathers serving as chief priests.”

Other expressions used in the inscriptions from Lydia and Phrygia, in both village and urban sanctuaries, are πρῶτοι ἱερεῖς or πρωτοιερεῖς. In a dedication to Zeus, Men and the Mother of Men dated after 212 AD from the area of Dorylaion one ἱερεύς κωμητικός is attested. A distinctive category would be hereditary priests

---

934 M. Ricl, Society and economy, 81.
935 E. g. TAM V1 432-433 (Kollyda); 449 (Kollyda); SEG XLIV 977A (southwest of Daldis); SEG XLI 1572 (Hierokaisereia, late Hellenistic, early Roman imperial period); MAMA IV 265 (Dionysopolis, 1st-2nd century AD); MAMA IV 302bis (Dionysopolis, 100-150 AD).
936 E. g. TAM V1 484 (διὰ βίου); 488 (two years); TAM V2 1316 (yearly appointments); SEG XXXV 1261 (25 years in service at the time of death, perhaps a life-long priesthood); MAMA I 14 (possibly annual priesthood).
937 E. g. TAM V2 951; 954; 963; 996; 1025; in Aizanoi MAMA IX 34; SEG XXXV 1365 (Aizanoi, first half of the 2nd century AD).
939 For more see Ricl, Society and Economy, 84-85.
940 TAM V1 432 and 433 (Kollyda, 214 and 183 AD, respectively).
941 M. Ricl, Society and Economy, 83-84.
942 TAM V1 449 (Kollyda); MAMA V 170 (Dorylaion); SEG XLIV 1051 (Dorylaion).
943 SEG XLIV 1037; cf. also SEG XXXVIII 1307 from the same area.
(magoi) with an archimagos at their head in the practicing Persian cults in Asia Minor.944

Other temple personnel comprised neokoroi, epimeletai (curators), prophets, treasurers and others. Ricl remarks that “the term neokoros is applied both to the modest servant charged with the task of keeping the temple clean and to the respectable administrative head of the lower temple personnel.”945 In the Roman period life-long and hereditary neokoroi were comparatively common.946 In some instances, it looks that this office could be annual, as in case of neokoros in Aizanoi who was elected for the tenth time.947 However, it seems that from the early Imperial period the office of neokoros was transformed into a costly liturgy.948

The responsibilities of neokoroi were many and varied. Their main obligation was to reside at or near the sanctuary at all times.949 According to Ricl their other activities include financial management,950 policing activities for the protection of the sacred property and the inviolability of the shrine, administrative and secretarial duties,951 organization of external manifestation of the cult.952 They were probably also responsible for sacrifices. In return for their services, neokoroi were granted compensations in both cash and kind and, as all other public officials, they could be held accountable for their actions.953

Neokoroi were people of some influence and had good reputation in their communities. In Phrygia the title of neokoros, as well as the municipal honors for them by boule and demos are frequently attested in Aizanoi:

944 Cf. SEG LV 1288 (Hypaipa, 2nd century AD); part of the violation of the tomb is to be paid to Persian Artemis in Hypaipa. Anahita’s sanctuary in Hypaipa, whose foundation date remains unknown (some time before Alexander), exhibits some blend of Persian, Lydian and Greek cultural influences noticeable in this cult elsewhere in Asia Minor. The cult had hereditary priests (magoi) with an archimagos at their head, IEph 3817A, 3820, 3825; for more see M. Ricl, The Cult of the Iranian goddess Anāhitā in Anatolia before and after Alexander, ŽA 52 (2002), 197-210.

945 M. Ricl, Society and Economy, 86.

946 Cf. MAMA IX 33 and 88; see also M. Ricl, Neokoroi in the Greek World, BIG 2 (2011), 13.


948 Cf. MAMA IX 416 (150-175 AD), 172/173 AD: neokoros sets up a bomos out of the funds provided by the doumos.

949 TAM V1 269 (northeast Lydia); also M. Ricl, Neokoroi, 14.

950 SEG XLIX 1676 (Sardis, 188/189 AD).

951 TAM V1 179 (172/173 AD): neokoros sets up a bomos out of the funds provided by the doumos.

952 M. Ricl, Neokoroi, 14-15.

953 M. Ricl, Neokoroi, 15-16.
Another example of *neokoros* in Aizanoi is on dedication to Zeus Anadotes and the Sebastoi Theoi, dated to 53/54 AD:956

[Δι] Άναδότητι καὶ Σεβαστοὺς Θεοὺς καὶ τῷ δήμῳ θεὸς ἔχθει Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Ξ / Ναννᾶ ὑπὲρ Κυρείνα Μηνογένους / φιλοσεβάστου ἱερέως τοῦ Δίως τῷ δεύτερῳ καὶ Κλαυδίας Ἀπρίας τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ Κλαυδίας Ἀπρίας τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῶν, καθηρωσάντων τῶν βωμῶν τοῦ τε Μηνογένους / καὶ Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Μηνογένους Ξ / τοῦ φιλοπάτριδος καὶ ἀρχινεωκόρου / καὶ νεοποιοῦ Δίως διὰ βίου καὶ τῶν νεωκόρων Δίως τοῦ Σέλευκος Ἀπολλώνιου ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀνέθηκεν / ἐτοὺς ἤλπη ἡλίω, μηνὸς / Δαισίου τ’ ἀπι(όντος)

The dedication Σεβαστοὺς Θεοὺς and the titles φιλοσεβαστος καὶ φιλόπατρος seem to suggest that Tiberius Claudius Menogenes was honored for his contributions to the imperial cult at Aizanoi. Both Menogenes and Menophiles held high positions in the cult of Zeus, Menogenes held a priestly position for the second time and Menophilos was ἀρχινεωκόρος, together with the life-long office of νεοποιός. According to Wölle, this is a new title for Aizanoi so far and possibly a temporary function created for specific building operations.957 The college of the νεωκόροι was probably presided over by an ἀρχινεωκόρος who managed the more noteworthy sanctuaries. It seems that this

---

954 SEG XLV 1713 (Severan period); the honorand is also known from the statue base MAMA IX 34: [—— ——] Διόρθιλον / [——3-——]πον Εὐπο/χοῆς νεωκόρων / τοῦ Δίως καὶ ιερέα / Διονύσου διὰ βιόν.
955 MAMA IX P36.
956 SEG XLV 1719.
temple hierarchy led to increasing social prestige of the office during Roman Imperial period.\textsuperscript{958}

There are cases that office of \textit{neokoroi} was used to date documents concerning shrines and dedications, as in northeast Lydia, together with the prophet of Apollo Pandenos:\textsuperscript{959}

\begin{verbatim}
\end{verbatim}

In several instances in Lydia, prominent provincial and municipal elite members also held the position of \textit{neokoros}, usually of the Emperor cult, such as Aurelius Athenaios (\textit{LAA} 15), an archon, \textit{neokoros}, \textit{prytanis} and rhetor (ἀσιάρχος καὶ νεωκόρος καὶ πρύτανις καὶ ρήτορος)\textsuperscript{960} and his son M. Aur. Priscillianus (\textit{LE} 9) is named ἵππικός and \textit{neokoros} of Augustus.\textsuperscript{961}

As we have seen from the epigraphic material the social position of \textit{neokoroi} is not easily deduced. Those who were active in the emperor’s cult were usually members of the provincial and municipal elite, but others seem to be part mostly of the municipal context.

The financial responsibilities concerning the temples were the task of \textit{epimeletai}, curators. They administrated sacred revenues, using them for construction and repairs.\textsuperscript{962}

\begin{verbatim}
Μητροφάνης Παπάου ἐπιμελητής ναοῦ / θεᾶς Ἀρτέμιδος/ ἀγαθή τύχη / μετακατασκευάσαν τοὺς ἑ βαθροῦν κοίντου / Λουκκίου Κλαύδιανοῦ / ἐπιμελητοῦ ἐκ τῶν προσόδων τῆς θεοῦ. / ἔτους στὸν·
\end{verbatim}


\textsuperscript{959} \textit{TAM} V2 1411.

\textsuperscript{960} \textit{TAM} V2 954, 957.

\textsuperscript{961} \textit{TAM} V2 957.

\textsuperscript{962} \textit{TAM} V1 242 (Kula, 209/210 AD).
Male and female prophets are also attested in the cities and sanctuaries of Lydia and Phrygia. One dedication from Dorylaion is perhaps documenting a treasurer of the temple’s money.

Αυρ(ήλιος) Θάλλος / Ἀσκληπάς / αύτῷ ζῶν / καὶ Δί βρον/τόντι / ὁ ταμίας.

In a dedication to Apollo and Artemis from Nisyra, dated to 48/47 BC certain σημεαφόροι as bearers of standards with portraits of deities are attested. In Maionia, there are also συνβολαφόροι indicated.

In the temples and sanctuaries throughout Lydia and Phrygia there were also cult members in the lower hierarchy. According to Riel, those would be diakonoi, doulai ton theon, hierodouloi, hieroi. Their legal status and activities in the sanctuaries are still not completely understood. Some issues concerning their position will be discussed in the next chapter.

6.4 Soldiers

Distinctive elements of the middle class were soldiers. From the very beginning of the Empire, Asia Minor contributed large numbers of soldiers to the Roman legions. Recruitment was generally confined to mountainous regions (mostly Galatia and Cappadocia), while the urbanized areas of western and northwestern parts of the peninsula usually substituted recruitment with cash payments, as is suggested by an inscription found in Tiris in the province of Asia. There are just five soldiers attested in Lydia, but many more, around thirty, in Phrygia. Many inscriptions do not document the legions or places where those soldiers served. They are usually designated as

---

963 E. g. TAM V1 185; SEG XLIX 1624 (Nisyra, 2nd century AD); MAMA IX 60; IK Laodikeia am Lykos 67 (141/142 AD?); MAMA IV 121 (Metropolis, 2nd or 3rd century AD).
964 MAMA V Lists I(i):182,114; see also M. Riel, Society and Economy, 87.
965 SEG XLIX 1623.
966 TAM V1 576.
967 M. Riel, Society and Economy, 87.
968 See chapter 7.5.
969 IGR IV 1664; cf. S.Mitchell, Notes on military recruitment from the eastern Roman provinces, in E.Dabrowa (ed.), The Roman and Byzantine army in the East, Kraków 1994, 145.
στρατιώτης or οὐστρανός. The majority of the inscriptions that mention them are epitaphs where they also mention other family members.\textsuperscript{970}

Most of these soldiers from Lydia and Phrygia are mentioned in inscriptions as veterans. Twenty to twenty-five years of service in remote camps perhaps made most veterans forget their native cities, and the great majority of them did not return, but spent their years of retirement in the province where they had served. Nevertheless, some veterans returned to their hometowns and their numbers should not be underestimated. The decision for a soldier whether to return or not has been rightly linked to the prospects of an elevated social status that awaited him at home, as opposed to the opportunities afforded by the newly opened frontier areas. A possible explanation could be that the ones that did return to their hometowns were of a better financial status, with families waiting for them at home. Such an example would be an honorary inscription for the Roman veteran Aurelius Attikos from Sebaste:\textsuperscript{971}

\[\text{Καὶ τὰ πολλάκις [δόξα/αντα τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τ[δ] / δήμῳ Λύκρηλιον} \text{ Αττικόν οὖ/ετρανόν ληγμόνος δὲ/κάτης Γεμίνης ἐκ προγόνων ἀρχι/κόν καὶ βουλευ/τήν ἐ πατρίς τὸν vacat ἐαυτῆς / [ἐφι]ρέτην.} \]

Legio X Gemina was based in Vindobona in Pannonia, but some units participated in the Parthian wars of the Severi. Attikos probably held those municipal offices after his discharge from the army.

Another interesting example is from Eumeneia:\textsuperscript{972}


\textsuperscript{970} E.g. MAMA IV 237 (Tymandos); MAMA IV 341 (Eumeneia); Alt. v. Hierapolis 267; TAM V1 297 (Kula); I. Manisa Museum 387.
\textsuperscript{971} SEG XXX 1489.
\textsuperscript{972} MAMA XI 45; for another veteran, bouleutes of Eumeneia see IGR IV 735.
The main point of interest in the inscription is the list of status-designations in lines 4-7. The titles of councilor (βουλευτής) and soldier (ιστρ[α]τιώτης, presumably as an auxiliary in the Roman army) are reasonably common. Far more remarkable are the two status-designations κληρούχος and τρειακοντάρχης. It is very likely that both of these titles go back to the Hellenistic period, and reflect the existence of a Hellenistic military colony, either Seleukid or Attalid, at Eukarpeia. For the editors of MAMA XI it seems possible that the τρειακοντάρχης was a middle-ranking officer in the colony, with authority over a group of thirty κληρούχοι, but in the absence of further evidence this is pure speculation.973

Several soldiers from Phrygia were veterans of the legio VII. Most probably, this was legio VII Claudia, stationed in Viminacium from the mid-1st century AD. One veteran is attested in a funerary inscription in Tymandos,974 M. Aurelius Asclepiades from Kotiaion erected a votive dedication on behalf of the village to Zeus Kikidiassenos (Kikidiassos in Hellenized form),975 a centurion, Valerius Iulianus, reused a heroon in Apameia for himself and his wife,976 and another centurion, L. Varius Fabius Maximus, buried a homonymus son in the same town.977

One active soldier of the same legion is attested in Lydia, but he was probably not from the province. In an honorary inscription dated to 11/12 AD a centurion of legio VII, C. Aemilius Geminus is honored by the village Nisyra for all of his virtues and with gratitude for everything he did for one of the villagers.978

In mid-2nd century Sardeis a veteran of legio III Gallica is attested. L. Valerius Teidia was buried there after twenty-four years of service.979 In 114-117 AD this legion was part of the army sent against the Parthians and in 132-135 AD it took part in the

973 See the commentary on MAMA XI 45.
975 SEG XLII 1196 (183/184 or 237/238 AD); the epithet of Zeus is so far unattested and is of Hittite origin. On continuity in Anatolian cults see M. Ricl, Continuity and change in Anatolian cults: the case of Lydian confession-inscriptions, BIG 5 (2014), 7-21.
976 SEG XLII 1194 (after 170/171 AD).
977 CIL III 366; for one more fragment of an epitaph mentioning the same legion in Apameia see AE 2011, 1336.
979 I. Sardis 141.
suppression of Bar-Kokhba’s revolt in Judaea. The cognomen Teidia perhaps indicates north Italian origins. One frumentarius acting as custos armorum in the legion X Gemina was also buried in Sardes. In votive inscriptions for Hosios and Dikaios from Kollyda, Aurelius Papias designates himself only as an equestrian soldier. Another equestrian soldier, in the rank of principalis, Aurelius Iulianus is attested, together with his wife and children, in an epitaph in Philadelphia.

In Hierapolis we have Aurelius Magnus a veteran of legio XIV Gemina. This legion garrisoned Mogontiacum and Vindobona, but from the reign of Trajan it was stationed in Carnuntum. His fellow citizen C. Seios Atticus was optio in legio VI. Most probably, the legion was legio VI Ferrata, stationed in the East, in Egypt and Syria. Another, but less probable option would be legio VI Vitrix stationed in Germania and Britannia. In an inscription from Akmoneia, dated to the end of 2nd century AD, there is a veteran of legio III Cyrenaica. This legion was stationed in Arabia and was also part of the army that crushed Bar-Kokhba’s revolt in 132-135 AD. In Temenothyrai, there is a funerary inscription for a child, 55 months old. He was the son of Aquila, a signifer in legio I Italica. This legion was founded by Nero and sent to Gaul. It participated in the battle of Bedriacum and followed Vitellius to Rome. Vespasian sent the legion to Novae.

Increased recruiting of provincials for the praetorian cohorts after the reforms of Septimius Severus is attested in an inscription from Kotiaion. In Aizanoi we have two
brothers, both praetorians. The boule and demos honor the veteran (παλαιστρατιώτης) Calpurnius Trophimianus. The statue was erected by his brother, the praetorian veteran and evocatus, Calpurnius Rufinus. Most probably they were natives of Aizanoi. Evocati were the soldiers in the Roman army who had served their full time and obtained honorable discharge but had voluntarily enlisted again at the invitation of the consul or other commander. One evocatus Augusti, M. Aurelius Epictetus, is attested in Synnada probably during the reign of Severus and Caracalla. In Eumeneia in Phrygia there are several inscriptions recording soldiers of cohors I Raetorum, confirming it was a garrison town. One Latin inscription explains how the camp was rebuilt in 196 AD after the earthquake:


Two of the soldiers were designated as custos armorum or ὅπλοφύλαξ of this unit. A very fragmentary honorary inscription is most probably shows the boule and demos honoring P. Aelius Faustianus, tribunus militum of both cohors VI Hispanorum and cohors I Raetorum:

[ἡ Βουλή καὶ οἱ δήμοι ἔτει]/[πα]ραιστίου [II. Αὐ/λίαν Φα[υ]στίαν] /[


---

991 MAMA IX P37.
992 L. Robert, Hellenica II (1946), 128.
994 MAMA VI 376.
995 CIL III 14192 = MAMA IV 328 = AE 1995, 1511.
997 IGR IV 728.
It is interesting to note that, so far, there is only one military diploma mentioning *cohors* I Raetorum found in the province of Asia.\footnote{RMD 100 (148 AD).}

In Phrygia there is also evidence of soldiers acting as *beneficiarii*, usually protecting the roads. M. Aurelius Athenio is attested on a sarcophagus from Apameia, (end of 2\textsuperscript{nd} or 3\textsuperscript{rd} century), as *ex leg(ione) IIII Fl(avia) ex b(enе)fficiario*.\footnote{CIL III 13663; cf. CBFIR 674.} The legion was stationed in Singidunum at the time. [M?] Iulius Capito was designated as *beneficiarius Galli praefecti miles* in his epitaph in Dionysopolis.\footnote{CIL III 7051 = IGR IV 757.} He served either in Galia Narbonensis or in southwest Germania superior.\footnote{CBFIR 678.} The last one, Iulius Theodorus was buried by his mother in Aizanoi: Κιά. Ἰνπ/ια Ἰνπ/ἰα Ἰνπ/ἰῳ Θε/νδωξ / βελεθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά / ξηλ /ήκεο ρ /ξή /κεο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλῳ κ/εο ρά /ξηλ/ηθη/α ξίῳ γιπ/θπη α/η / ηέθλω
There is no doubt that the embassy of the magistrate, council and people of Tabala approached the emperor. It seems that soldiers in transit, on their way to Aizanoi, would sometimes wander off the main road to take the *supplementa*, probably ‘illegal exactions’\(^{1006}\). The specific allowance for soldiers en route to Aizanoi should indicate a regular military presence in the area, but whatever its nature, it has not left epigraphic records. Hauken supposes that the soldiers were perhaps sent to monitor the religious festival and other public gatherings at the famous sanctuary.\(^{1007}\) Seemingly the emperor did not himself write to the proconsul to inform him about his decision. This had to be done by the people of Tabala themselves. The representatives of Tabala would ordinarily have presented the letter to the proconsul during his stay at Sardeis, the center of the local *dioecesis*.

Another case of military harassment is documented in a letter of a tribune quoting a governor’s *subscription* from Pentapolis.\(^{1008}\) The owner of the estates had sent a *petitio* to the governor of Asia, forwarding complaints against at least two administrative and military units. He received a specific reply (*subscription*; ὑπογραφή) directed at two different authorities; these must have been named in the petition. The owner entrusted his estate manager with the task of approaching one of the authorities

---


specifically mentioned in the *scriptio*. He has in turn complied with the proconsul’s decision by writing a fairly elaborate letter.\textsuperscript{1009}

In this case private estates were harassed by soldiers and it is directed against the soldiers of a regular military force; all other petitions contain complaints from villages, towns and imperial estates. The activities of soldiers in this area could be possibly connected with the presence of a permanent garrison of an auxiliary cohort in Eumeneia. Hauken pointed out that it is tempting to suggest that the soldiers that are causing trouble belong to two different units.\textsuperscript{1010} We can thus explain why the tribune emphasized that his orders concerned the soldier placed under his command; and it implies that the other commander probably would have to take similar responsibility for the behavior of his soldiers. The position and duties of Ligys are hard to define; there is a possibility he is also attested in Apameia as Ἰούλ. Λίγυς ὁ κράτιστος π(ρεμιτ)π(ῦριος).\textsuperscript{1011}

The complaints against military oppression and extortion are more frequent from the early and middle 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD. In the area of Saittai a magistrate issued an order to prevent requisition and extortion by *stationarii*, *frumentarii* and *colletiones*.\textsuperscript{1012} The difference between the *frumentarii* and *colletiones* and the auxiliary soldiers, whether stationed at the Eumeneia garrison or detached to procuratorial duty in Ephesos was not one of command, as they both had the proconsul as their supreme commander. The difference was rather one of principal assignment. Hauken believes that the *frumentarii* and *colletiones* had status as *beneficiarii* recruited from regular legionary soldiers.\textsuperscript{1013} A village in Katakekaumene sent a petition to the emperors in 247/8 AD against *frumentarii*, *colletiones* and praetorians, who treated the inhabitants as wartime enemies: προφάσει εἰρήνης[ζ — — — — — — — — — ἀλλὰ] / πολέμων τρόπων.\textsuperscript{1014} The petition started explaining that the so-called *frumentarii* and *praetorians* generally make no trouble. However, singled out for particular complaint are the notorious *colletiones*. The petitioners accuse them for claiming peaceful intentions, while proved greedy in confiscating the common reserves of the community, by illegal exactions and

\textsuperscript{1009} Hauken, 192.
\textsuperscript{1010} Ibid, 194.
\textsuperscript{1011} IGR IV 786.
\textsuperscript{1012} TAM V1 154.
\textsuperscript{1013} Hauken, 72.
\textsuperscript{1014} TAM V1 419.
harassing the villagers. Similar grievances were recorded in Satala\textsuperscript{1015} and the territory of Philadelphia,\textsuperscript{1016} elsewhere in Lydia\textsuperscript{1017} as well as in Phrygia.\textsuperscript{1018}

All these petitions should be seen as symptoms of military anarchy and the failure of the state to control the armed forces.\textsuperscript{1019}

6.5 Villages on civic territories

Village communities are the essential social units of countryside in Asia Minor. Village is therefore important but understudied. This contradictory sentence, valid for many years, could be retracted after a number of important studies were published in the last decades. The works of Stephen Mitchell, Christof Schuler and A. P. Gregory brought some voice into that “silence of the village”.\textsuperscript{1020} In Lydia, and even more in Phrygia we can see the “rural Anatolia par excellence”\textsuperscript{1021} but they were different in the aspect of country life outside the cities. And geography, archaeology and epigraphic habit have much to do with it.

The term \textit{kômê} appears in numerous epigraphic documents, originating in both the cities and the villages and was the standard designation for village settlement, so Gregory claims \textit{kômê} was shorthand for rural or non-urban.\textsuperscript{1022} In our inscriptions villages are indeed usually called \textit{kôma}, sometimes \textit{dêmos} or \textit{katoik…ai}. Although the terminology seems simple, villages across Asia Minor were different in the aspect of size, organization and population.\textsuperscript{1023} Legal status of village dwellers was not the same everywhere nor was the terms of ownership. Landownership in Roman Asia Minor is a

\textsuperscript{1015} TAM V1 611.
\textsuperscript{1016} TAM V3 1417 and 1418.
\textsuperscript{1017} SEG XIX 718 = I. Manisa Museum 21 (Güllüköy in Lydia, 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD ?).
\textsuperscript{1018} MAMA X 114 (Upper Tembris Valley).
\textsuperscript{1019} For many of these petitions see a comprehensive study of T. Hauken, \textit{Petition and response: an epigraphic study of petitions to Roman Emperors 181-249}, Bergen, 1998.
\textsuperscript{1021} Mitchell, \textit{Anatolia} 1, 178.
vast subject and will not be presented here; it is sufficient to say that the village status differ according to the land ownership (city lands, private estates in city territory, imperial properties of the Roman period, temple lands and land belonging the villages themselves). Around most cities villages were incorporated in city’s administrative territory.1024

Given the present limited state of archaeological investigation of rural sites in Asia Minor it is somewhat premature to attempt to describe the physical appearance of the village. Until we have further area surveys and some fully excavated rural sites, our knowledge of the appearance of villages, their layout, their component parts, and their relationship to other settlement, will remain largely hypothetical. The presence of an agora in a village, epigraphically attested, is a reflection primarily of its commercial function; a periodic market may have been held there, but it was also public space. There are traces of pyrgoi in certain villages; most had sanctuaries and some even baths. Bath was effectively a Roman cultural import, though in Asia Minor a distinctly local form of structure evolved, and in time the feature spread to the countryside, but only in limited areas: Lydia and Ionia are the regions where most of the village bath–houses are found.1025 As far as we know, theaters were non-existent in rural communities. Larger houses were rare, but certain differences and social hierarchy can be seen in these communities as well.1026 Village magistrates, κώμαρχοι, are widely attested in Lydia and Phrygia.1027 There are also attestations for the “first villagers”, πρωτοκομήται,1028 and we cannot treat village population as a homogenous group. The term βραβευτής can also be found in certain inscriptions, although his functions are not clear.1029 In Lydia there are also λογιστής1030 in some villages, as well as ἄργυρος τμήμας.1031

There is no doubt that social life in villages followed the patterns of the neighbouring cities.1032 Luxurious houses and villas in the countryside were probably owned by local city elites, landowners. Tensions between town and country were

1024 Schuler, Ländliche Siedlungen, 273-278.
1025 Gregory, Village Society, 60; cf. also Mitchel, Anatolia I, 216.
1026 Gregory, Village Society, 46-64.
1027 i.e. TAM V2 868 (Thyateira, Lydia); IGR IV 592 (Phrygia); MAMA IX 68 (Aizanoi).
1028 TAM V1 822 (Kömürçü, Lydia, 198/199 AD).
1029 TAM V1 234 (Kula); 515 (Maionia); TAM V2 903 (Thyateira); 1269 (Hierocaesarea); 1316 (Tyan(n)ollus); IGR IV 1348 (Mostena Lydia); 1497 (Lydia); SÉG XXXVIII 1303 (Dorylaion, 2nd/3rd century AD).
1030 TAM V1 515.
1031 IGR IV 1657.
1032 Schuler, Ländliche Siedlungen, 278-286.
evident, but the picture is much more complex. There is evidence of city residents offering benefactions to villagers; two villages (κόματα) near Thyateira jointly honored Tib, Claudius Amphimachus with a statue for “defending their rights and restoring property to villages”.1033 Another inscription from Thyateira is showing a katoikia honoring an asiarch C. Iulius Iulianus Tatianus, as euergetes.1034 The villagers of Moschakome, on the territory of Magnesia ad Sipylum, honored a man who had been hereditary benefactor of their village.1035 Numerous inscriptions attest the widespread existence of private estates on or near civic territory. Scattered property holding within the chôra was also typical of both large and small landowners. Very revealing is the Lydian inscription recording the will of a certain Epikrates in the 1st century AD.1036 This man owned land in the territories of both Nakrasos and Thyateira, which included an olive grove, five plethra of vines, an unspecified plot near the village of Tibbe, seven plethra of uncultivated land (ψεύλης χώρας) in the village itself, and a further six uncultivated plethra in the plain around Kormos. He was clearly prosperous and he also had freedman to maintain his tomb.

Most of our knowledge on village life comes from the inscriptions. As we have seen, villages had certain institutions and they seem to mimic the features of the cities. In Phrygia, and probably elsewhere, the men on whose shoulders the entire textile industry ultimately rested were the shepherds, cattle-breeders who are almost invisible, like an obscure stratum of ancient society. Many, but not all, were perhaps slaves. Most of the evidence for the shepherds/herdsmen comes from the Phrygian highlands. Their votive stelai, from the rural sanctuary near Amorium, dedications to Zeus Petarenos and Zeus Alsenos, dating to the 2nd century AD give some information. Their exceptional interest is that they can perhaps demonstrate the literacy of the lowest social classes, perhaps even shepherds and peasants and give us a glimpse into their daily lives and their concerns in the communications with their gods. The importance of the individual not only in the funerary but also in the religious context is remarkable. Even simple farmers and peasants represent themselves publicly before the god as proud and grateful

1033 TAM V2 974: ἐπὶ τῷ ἐκδικήσαι καὶ ἀποκαταστήσαι τὰ τῶν κοιμών.
1034 TAM V2 967.
1035 TAM V2 1408 (also SEG XL 1052); cf. also TAM V2 1316-1317 (Tyan(n)ollus, Lydia).
dedicants of gifts in the sanctuary. There has been much scholarly discussion about the legal and social status of the rural population. The city or suburban population of most of the Anatolian poleis was sufficiently diverse in terms of status, including the paroikoi, metoikoi, xenoi, freedman and slaves. One should neither overlook the informal ways of access to power by suppressed groups. The non-urban and non-citizen population were also designated by the term πάροικοι, and it appears in a variety of inscriptions throughout Asia Minor, whether citizens or foreign residents (metoikoi). In this particular case, as seen in votive stelai, there are very few Roman citizens; most of the dedicants are presented cloaked in thick sheepskin capes with pointed hats. This collection of dedications is unique as it offers us a glimpse into this class that is usually not epigraphically attested. It is probably due to availability and cheap Docimean marble in the area. Entire classes of ancient society, mostly silent in other parts of the ancient world, here speak with their own voice: shepherds with their flocks, stewards of the great Imperial estates and ranches, winegrowers and wool-merchants. The religious life of these Phrygian villagers is known to us in extraordinary detail. Another source would be numerous representations of peasants and shepherds that offer valuable information on their mode of dress and family groupings, information that is often hard to come by in literary sources. Men were dressed either in the shepherd’s cape with a pointed hood or in a typical himation and chiton and all women were veiled. The difference in the male dress could represent an occupational distinction between shepherd and peasant and perhaps even a slight social distinction, as men in the shepherds’ clothes on the inscriptions are represented with a single name and those in tunics also have patronymics or demotics given. From an onomastic point of view the inscriptions from these Phrygian rural sanctuaries show an intermixture and coexistence of three cultures: Greek, Phrygian and Roman.

1037 In Asia Minor paroikoi were free indigenous inhabitants resident in the territory of the city, but lacking political rights; although we don’t have attestations of paroikoi in Lydia and Phrygia (but cf. MAMA X 114 from Appia in Phrygia 244-247 AD), we could probably assume that there was no major difference between these provinces and the rest of Asia Minor; for the elaborate analysis on laoi and paroikoi cf. F. Papazoglou, Laoi et paroikoi. Recherches sur la structure de la société hellénistique, Beograd, 1997; also A. Sugliano, Cittadini, pareci, stranieri: la categorie giuridiche e sociali nelle città greche d’Asia Minore fra III e I secolo a.C., Mediterraneo antico IV-1 (2001), 293-324; L. Gagliardi, I paroikoi delle città dell’Asia minore in età ellenistica e nella prima età romana, Dike 12/13 (2009/2010), 303-322.

Thonemann argues that even during the Roman Imperial period, when a façade of civic institutions and urbanization, mostly for cultural reasons, was founded in parts of inner Anatolia, Phrygian society remained largely decentralized and ‘underdeveloped’. At first sight Roman Phrygia may look like a highly urbanized society, with dozens of independent polis territories, each with its own civic institutions, monumental urban centers, but one should mention that even the largest and most lavish funerary monuments to survive from this region – doorstones and relief stelai – almost invariably depict the tools and values of agricultural and pastoral labor (farm tools, beasts of burden, sheep, vines, and ploughs) alongside more familiar Romanizing elements (writing paraphernalia, toga and pallia). For example, east of Aizanoi agricultural tools occur: the plough \(^{1040}\) and pruning hook. \(^{1041}\) But they could appear together with tablets, scrolls and other writing objects. \(^{1042}\) Women’s gravestones display mirror, comb, perfume, jar, wool basket, spindle and distaff. \(^{1043}\) Could we deduce that the men were literate; the women had time and money for themselves? The answer is most probably affirmative.

There were also shepherds in the cities, or attached to them. In Laodikeia on the Lykos there is an epitaph of Papias Klēxos, ὁ ποιμήν, finely decorated tombstone as a stark contrast to North Phrygian votive stelai. Should it also mean that those closer to the cities were of a higher social status? Nevertheless, their world was not the one of civic society, but one of nature and open spaces. They were marginal within city’s society and outside city walls shepherds were antagonist to agriculturalists. As Thonemann argues, in antiquity settled agriculture was seen as the best and most highly civilized mode of production, as opposed to shepherds who were most primitive and barbaric. \(^{1044}\) On the other hand, the settled and the nomadic world were closely knit. Conflicts between neighbouring villages over land, boundaries, grazing rights are an ageless theme of village life, as well as family disputes. \(^{1045}\) The significance of the

\(^{1039}\) Thonemann, Phrygia: an anarchist history, 3.
\(^{1040}\) MAMA IX 430.
\(^{1041}\) MAMA IX 363; 391; 437.
\(^{1042}\) MAMA X 5 (Appia, early 3\(^{rd}\) century AD); 34 (Appia, early 3\(^{rd}\) century AD); 155 (Appia, second half of the 3\(^{rd}\) century AD).
\(^{1043}\) MAMA X 2 (Appia, beginning of 3\(^{rd}\) century); 148 (Appia, early 3\(^{rd}\) century AD); 155 (Appia, second half of the 3\(^{rd}\) century AD); 219 (Appia, late 3\(^{rd}\) century).
\(^{1044}\) Thonemann, Meander Valley, 192.
\(^{1045}\) For example MAMA IV 297 and TAM V1 317 (area of Kula, Lydia)
passable land and possession of cattle is evident from one funerary imprecation from Lydian:

"Ως ἄν δὲ προσαμαρτήσαι θελήσει καὶ ἀναστείλαι τὸ μνημεῖον τὸ Μενάνδρου, μήτε / αὐτῷ γῆ βατῆ, μή θάλασσα πλωτῆ, μήτε / τέκνων σπορά, μήτε θρεμμάτων ὑπαρξίς

The rivalry in the pastoral economy can also be seen in one inscription from the Hieropolitan area. The main agricultural product in Hierapolis was the wine as rich red soil was well suited to viticulture. This inscription is presumably the decree of Hierapolis trying to protect the vineyard owners against the damage from the grazers and herds:


1047 MAMA IV 297 (3rd century); If anyone acts contrary to this, [it is permitted] to the owners of the vineyards, and likewise to [any one of their household] to whom they have entrusted their affairs, [to seize] all of the cattle or sheep in their vineyards, to carry them off and keep them in recompense for the harm, [doing with them] whatever they wish. (The vineyard-owner) may have the shepherds whipped, if they are slaves, once they have been reported to those appointed as paraplykhes for the year, in order that they may refrain from persistent [theft?]. As for the masters of the flocks, and free shepherds, and [headmen?] of the villages who do not prevent shepherds from herding their sheep into vineyards and breaking off vine-branches, (the vineyard owner) is permitted to make exactions from their other property, and to take sureties from them. . . exacting from them. . [Apollo] archegetes . . any inhabitant of the place . . slave or shepherd; translation taken from Thonemann, Meander Valley, 194.
Village disputes can take on a variety of forms and could originate from a multitude of causes. From modern perspective the details of these disputes are often unclear. This is the case with the argument mentioned in an inscription from the wider area of Kula initiated when three pigs, owned by villagers Demainetos and Papias of Azita, had strayed into the cattle herd of their neighbors, two brothers named as Hermogenes and Apollonios, from the village of Syrou Mandrai. The other details are missing, except the fact that brothers’ herd was at the time pastured by a five year old boy, perhaps a slave.\textsuperscript{1048}

Although civic society would like to present shepherds as a different class from sedentary peasants, everyday life was much more complex and intertwined. As various animal products were the dominant element in urban economies, any city needed both shepherds and agriculturalists. In the Phrygian Highlands and on the western fringe of the Axylon some Phrygians proudly describe themselves as ‘farmers’ (γεωργικός) in their funerary inscriptions.\textsuperscript{1049} Apart from them, there is also Aurelius Epiktetes, a pig-seller (χωρεμπόρος) from Saittai, attested at Sardis in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD and we also have a funerary relief from Colossae of around 200 AD, presumably of another pig-seller, decorated with three curly tail pigs.\textsuperscript{1050} Pastoral economy, unlike agrarian economy, is necessarily characterized by mobility and exchange. Going from pasture to pasture, linking territories of different cities, herdsmen made a kind of pattern of social relations. On the other hand, we could also assume that cult activities served as contact

\textsuperscript{1048} TAM V1 317 (early 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC).

\textsuperscript{1049} Haspels, Highlands of Phrygia I 314 no. 41: γεωργός ἄνηρ; Ibid, 311–12 no. 37: τὸν ἐπιχθονίους γεωργόν; SEG I, 459: ἄν δὲ γεωργός. Cf. also Haspels Highlands of Phrygia I 360, no. 135, in which Agathon, a δοῦλος γεωργός, erects a votive monument to Zeus Bronton on behalf of his master C. Cornelius Longinus ‘and his flocks’.

\textsuperscript{1050} I Sardis 159; visual representation from Kolossai MAMA VI 50.
between the bucolic and sedentary worlds. Either way, mutual help and exchange had to be an essential feature of village life and a way to survive.

It is hard to perceive village life without the comparison to the cities. In his study, Mitchell concluded that city and village lived in different world, with villages bound to the cities but not in partnership with them and cities being essentially parasitic. He argued that most peasants lost much of their surplus through rents, taxes or extortion and fell outside monetarized economy, as opposed to Levick who believes that a low level of city development in a productive Phrygian highlands does not favor the notion of “parasite” city. On the other hand, Ricl also pointed out that “in many parts of Lydia and Phrygia the cities were so ill defined as to be hardly distinguishable from the larger village communities.”

We should also assume that the countryside was, at least in part, self-sustainable having higher proportion of what it produced. The village diet is also observed in comparison to the food in the cities, for example, while the townspeople ate ochra and beans, country people ate lathyrai, a type of pulse. The high quality wheat was mostly taken to the cities leaving only inferior products for the country people. In Dorylaion they grew a crop called zeopyron. Yoghurt and cheese were main diet when all cereals were eaten. Radishes were eaten with bread and other herbs and wild vegetables and garlic were frequent. Meat was a rare luxury in villages, while pork was favored in the city. Pigs were raised in the country and driven to the towns; pig-herding was a common profession for the very poor and small children. Green beans and cabbage were often cooked with pork, and in the country they had to make it with

---

1051 For analysis of rural sanctuaries frequented by villagers and their numerous vows see M. Ricl, Society and Economy of rural sanctuaries in Roman Lydia and Phrygia, *EA* 35 (2003), 77-101, for epigraphic evidence esp. 78, n. 4.
1054 Ricl, Society and Economy, 79.
1056 Gal. *De alim. fac.* 1.2.6
1059 *TAM* V1 317 (area of Kula, Lydia, 114/115 AD).
goat or mutton. We have to presume most people grew their own vegetables, nuts as well as wheat and fruits. The most useful plant was olive.

As we have already seen, the Roman peace allowed and encouraged the political, social and economic advancement of the city elites, with the result that spectacular public and private construction was undertaken all over Asia Minor. Mitchell believes that in assessing the nature of Lydian society and settlement in the Roman period it seems more helpful not to insist on the organizational differences between the two types of communities. The gradual transformation of some Lydian κόμαι and κατοικία (mostly villages, not military colonies) into poleis was a result of general prosperity, and the urbanization process continued into the 3rd century AD. The cities were composed of an urban core, usually a fortified settlement, with administrative and commercial buildings, and in many cases defined suburbs, and finally a fixed territory; the territory (chora) might be further sub-divided. We can study the polis firstly as an administrative or civic unit, and its history written in terms of political and social institutions (constitution, offices, citizenship); alternatively the polis can be seen as an urban unit, and its development traced in the terms of urbanization, the construction of public and monumental buildings. The city could not be separated from its territory; nor could a village be separated from its cultivated land. As Price argued we must “be dealing with a whole spectrum of communities ranging from the most complex of cities down to the simplest of hamlets. Within this spectrum there are no doubt recognizable contrasts but no simple polarities.” Language, diet, lifestyle, cults, all seemed to point out that towns and villages were perhaps indeed worlds apart.

6.6 Family

Even the most common modern concepts such as “family” need to be scrutinized if they are to be applied to the ancient world. Our most important sources for collecting data on family and demography are funerary inscriptions, thousands of them in Lydia and Phrygia. These documents do not contain any definition of family, either for so-

---

1060 Gal. De alim fac. 3
1063 Price, Rituals and Power, 82.
called ‘nuclear’ family nor extended family or kinship family and we shouldn’t expect one. But there is the Roman legal definition and it is quite precise: “The term ‘family’ has reference to every collection of persons which are connected by their own rights as individuals, or by the common bond of general relationship. We say that a family is connected by its own rights where several are either by nature or by law subjected to the authority of one; for example, the father of a family, the mother of a family, and a son and a daughter under paternal control, as well as their descendants; for instance, grandsons, granddaughters, and their successors.”

The legal definition carries its own problems and, apart from that, there is the question of how applicable is the Roman legal thought for defining the kinship communities in Lydia and Phrygia were many regional and cultural distinctions are present. Perhaps the modern social theory can offer a solution? Sociological studies of the family have been dominated by functionalist definitions of what the family is and what “needs” it fulfills in the society. But, what definition of “family” should we use when we look for a “family” in the ancient society? Anthropologists and historians increasingly recognize that “family” and “household” are artificial, theoretical categories. Kinship is also a social creation but it allows the variability and extension. Also, sociological and historical studies of the family have tended to mostly observe the so-called vertical relationships, between parents and children and less attention was paid to the lateral relationships between siblings. There are defining factors that can be used and are equally important: biological kinship (and consciousness of it on the part of the persons involved), common residence, economic cooperation, legally recognized unity etc. But common residence, to single out only one of the variables is also a questionable feature. Some sociologists argue that ‘household’ is defined by constant activity.

---

1064 Ulpian, Dig. 50. 16, 195 (2): Familiae appellatio refertur et ad corporis cuiusdam significationem, quod aut iure proprio ipsorum aut communi universae cognationis continetur, iure proprio familia dicimus plures personas, quae sunt sub unius potestate aut natura aut iure subjectae, ut puta patrem familias, matrem familias, filium familias, filiam familias quique deinceps vicem eorum sequuntur, ut puta nepotes et nepetes et deinceps; translation in English from S. P. Scott, The Civil Law, XI, Cincinnati, 1932.


1066 See also Glossary of anthropological terms in M. R. Flood, Epigraphic evidence for family structures and customs in Asia Minor during the early Roman Empire, 1978 (unpublished MA thesis), 160-162.

1067 Buchler, Selby, Kinship, 21.
together, including slaves or freedmen, it cannot be the only outlining indication of a family. We could also suppose that many members of upper classes lived in multiple residences with social ties in every place. On the other hand, economic cooperation is a very broad term and it is not specific only to families but to all levels of society. We have already seen the “familial” bonds between members of various associations in Lydia and Phrygia. The terms for relationships used in the inscriptions, our main source for demography, like σύμβιος, ἀνήρ, γυνή do not necessarily indicate if the couple was legally married or not.

The “nuclear family” is another expression frequently used by the historians of antiquity. It too is a borrowing from the vocabulary of the modern social theory. It could be described as any combination in the relationship between father, mother and child(ren).\textsuperscript{1068} It usefulness for study of the families in Roman Lydia and Phrygia is obvious: it seems to fit well with a widespread type of family. The funerary inscriptions from the Roman period display some new characteristics, not so prominent in the classical or Hellenistic period, recording not only the deceased but the ones commemorating him, usually the members of his or hers family.\textsuperscript{1069} Generally speaking, most of the families we see in these inscriptions are comparatively small, with no more than two sons and one daughter and designation “nuclear family” fits them perfectly. When extended family members are included, it is usually only one and two. Nevertheless, there is also a tendency in the inscriptions from Lydia and Phrygia towards inclusiveness of extended members of the family/household.\textsuperscript{1070} While the “nuclear family” may well be the most typical, inscriptions show a diversity of family types, from single parents to multi-generational households.

In the late 20\textsuperscript{th} century there was a significant scholarly debate on demography and the composition of the ancient family. At first, Saller and Shaw studied tombstones from the Roman West trying to see if the emphasis in the funerary inscription were on

\textsuperscript{1068} For the shifts in the definitions of a nuclear family see Buchler, Selby, Kinship, 23-24.
\textsuperscript{1069} More on this change in the epigraphic habit cf. E. Meyer, Explaining the Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire: the Evidence of Epitaphs, JRS 80 (1990), 75.
\textsuperscript{1070} Elaborate examples in Lydia are TAM V1 764 (Iulia Gordos, 171/172 AD) and TAM V1 704 (Iulia Gordos, 75/76 AD); in Phrygia MAMA VI 353 (Diokleia) and Buckler, Calder, Cox, Monuments from the Upper Tembris Valley, JRS 18 (1928), 33 no. 249.
the nuclear family or more extended family. Their conclusion implies that the nuclear family was the main type of familial organization in the Latin West. More than a decade later D. B. Martin tried the Saller and Shaw method on few examples of funerary inscriptions from Asia Minor. Criticizing their method Martin argued, analyzing a vast sample of 1161 inscriptions from seven cities in Asia Minor, that families that emerged from his study of Asia Minor do not fit either the nuclear or extended structure well and that they had “nucleated center” surrounded by numerous other familial relations.

So far, there is no one comprehensive study of the demographic data from Roman Asia Minor, as the one Bagnall and Frier did for Roman Egypt. We have to acknowledge the fact there are no similar sources in Asia Minor like the Egyptian census returns, at least not enough for statistically significant research. Brulé analyzed some of the data from the list of citizens of Milet and Ilion from the Hellenistic period. In 2007 Scheidel summarized the questions and methods of using epigraphy for studying demography. Questions for further research should be how many members are there in a family and how many births, and what is the age expectancy among children? Funerary inscriptions cannot tell us about average life expectancy or age specific mortality samples, but some of them provide valuable information on the seasonal distribution of deaths as well as births. The ancient funerary inscriptions recorded the measurable scope of one’s life in this world, naming the years, months and days, thus perhaps indirectly celebrating life.

1072 Saller, Shaw, Tombstones and Roman family, 137; 145-146.
1076 P. Brulé, Enquête démographique sur la famille grecque antique: étude de listes de politographie d’Asie mineure d’époque hellénistique (Milet et Ilion), *RE* 92 (1990), 233-258.
The familial vocabulary in both Lydia and Phrygia has more than 60 terms for describing relationship between members of the family, some from the world of poetry: ἀδελφή / ἀδελφος, ἀδελφιδεός / ἀδελφιδῆ, ἀλοχος, ἀνεψια / ἀνεψις, ἀνήρ, γάλας, γαμβρός, γαμετή, γενετήρ, γενετής, γονεύς, γόνος, γνωσκαθέληρη / γνωσκαθέλας, γυνη, δαίρα, ἐκγνος / ἐκγνον, ἐκυρά / ἐκυρὸς, ἐνάπτηρ, ἐξάδελφος, θεία / θείος, θυγάτηρ, θυγατριδή, κασιγνήτη / κασιγνήτος, κούρη, κάμμη, κήτη, κητράδελφος, κητρινα, κητρισόπτωρ, κήτρως, νόμιφη, ὀρφανός, παιδιόν, παις, πάππος, παράκοιτος, πατήρ, πάτρα, πατροποίητος, πάτρως, πανθέρα / πανθέρος, πενθερίδισσα / πενθερίδεις, πόσις, πρόγονος, πρόθειος, συγγενής, σύμβιος, σύνκοιτος, συννύμφη, συνόμαιμος, συνομενικά / συνομενικος, τέκνον, τεκούσα, τοκεύς, νίος, χήρα.

This richness of familial language is quite characteristic for these areas, unlike the rest of the Roman empire. As Flood observed, the terminology was descriptive rather than classificatory. Apart from the usual terms for mother (μήτηρ) and father (πατήρ), parents together (γονεύς) or grandparents (μήμητος και πάππος) and siblings (ἀδελφή, ἀδελφος or rarely κασιγνήτη or κασιγνήτος) our inscriptions are displaying nuanced relationship within the extended family. The term πατρός and μήτρος, designating paternal and maternal uncle respectively, is attested numerous times. We also have θεία and θείος. The term πρόθειος, meaning great-uncle is attested in Laodikeia on the Lykos. First cousins are also indicated.

1079 Flood, Epigraphic evidence, 30.
1080 In Lydia: TAM V1 636 (Daldis); TAM V1 653 (Daldis); I. Sardis 93a (1st-2nd century AD); in Phrygia more frequent, attested almost 50 times.
1081 In Phrygia: MAMA IX 552; Ramsey, CB 743, no. 682 (Dokimeion); not attested in Lydia.
1082 In Lydia there are only two attestation SEG XXIX 1203 (Saittai) and TAM V1 208 (Tabala); in Phrygia: MAMA IV 83 (Synnada, 1st-2nd century AD); MAMA V 29 (Dorylaion); MAMA X 12 (Appia, 3rd century AD); MAMA X 169 (Appia, 305/315 AD); MAMA X 203 (Appia, 225-235 AD); MAMA X 540 (Tiberiopolis); MAMA IX 73 (Aizanoi, 2nd-3rd century AD); MAMA IX 74 (Aizanoi, 2nd-3rd century AD); SEG LII 1277 (Aizanoi, 2nd-3rd century AD).
1083 E. g. πατρός: TAM V1 483a (Iaza); SEG LI 1557 (Upper Tembris valley, 250-260 AD); SEG XXII 1231 (Saittai); SEG XXVII 930 (Sardeis, Roman period); SEG LVII 1175 (Iaza, 164/165 AD), in the same inscription attested paternal aunts, πατρέητα; SEG XXXIII 1016 (Saittai, 103/104 AD), also paternal aunt πατρός; SEG XXVIII 899 (Iaza); SEG XXXV 1160 (Katakekaumene, 214/215 AD); μήτρας: SEG LIV 1265 (Northeast Lydia, 93/94 AD); μήτρας: SEG XLVIII 1433 (Northeast Lydia, 246/247 AD); both maternal and paternal uncles SEG LVII 1244 (Lydia, 175/176 or 229/230 AD); SEG XXXI 990 (Iaza, 217/218 AD); SEG XLIX 1620 (Maonia, imperial period); cf. also μητροδέλφος I Saltan Dağı 612 (Neapolis).
1084 i.e. MAMA IV 245 (Tymandos); μητρική (maternal aunt): TAM V1 433 (area of Kula, 183/184 AD); SEG XLIX 1732 (Lydia, 167/168 AD); πατρίσθα (father’s sister, aunt): TAM V 1 782 (Yayakırılıdık, 120/121 AD); SEG XLIX 1660 (Saittai, 150/151 AD).
1085 IK Ladofkeia am Lykos 83 (first half of the 2nd century AD).
The term ἐξάδελφος is attested only in Phrygia,\(^{1088}\) as well as γυναικάδελφος.\(^{1089}\)

In-laws were also important part of the extended family circle, so we have phrases ἰτεύθρα/ἰτεύθρας and ἐκυφρά/ἐκυφρός for mother and father-in-law.\(^{1090}\) It seems that the former were originally used by the husband to refer to his wife’s parents.\(^{1091}\) The latter terms, ἐκυφρά/ἐκυφρός, was used by wives for their husband’s parents. The universal and proverbial image of bad relations between parents and their child’s spouse could be perhaps a bit improved with epitaphs such as

Ναννας Ἀμμία πενθερά γλυκυτάτη μνήμης χάριν\(^{1092}\)
or

ἐτοὺς τύτ’, μη(νός) Λῶου δ. / ἐτελεύτησαν ὀνόματι / Ἐυκάρηπη Ἐπίκηπτος κα/τεσκέύασαν τῇ γλυκυτᾷ/τῇ γυναικὶ συνβιωσάσῃ / ἔτη πάντε, μνείας χά/ριν καὶ ὁ ἰκερὸς Ἱτροῦ/μος ἐτίμησεν’ / καὶ πᾶσι λέγω χαίριν τοῖς πα/ροδείταις\(^{1093}\)

In Lydia we have evidence of additional terms for in-laws. The term πενθεριδίσσα meaning sister-in-law is attested in Silandos and Northeast Lydia,\(^{1094}\) as well as πενθεριδεύς/πενθερίδης for brother-in-law (wife’s brother).\(^{1095}\)

---

\(^{1086}\) άνεψις: MAMA VI 285 (Akmonia); MAMA X 85 (Soa, 2\(^{nd}\) or 3\(^{rd}\) century AD); MAMA X 105 (Soa, beginning of 2\(^{nd}\) century AD); MAMA XI 137 (Pentapolis, 2\(^{nd}\) century AD); SEG LVI 1493 (Akmonia, 200–250 AD); I. Sultan Daği 237 (Hadrainopolis); I. Sultan Daği 308 (Tyrainon); I. Sultan Daği 514 (Mepolis); interestingly, άνεψις is only recently attested in Lydia, SEG XLI 1660 (Saittai, 150/151 AD).

\(^{1087}\) CIG 4137=MAMA V Lists I (ii) 183, 1 (Dorylaioin).

\(^{1088}\) MAMA IX 143 (Aizanoi); MAMA VI 324 (Akmonia); MAMA VII 150 (Hadrainopolis); MAMA X 221 (Appia, 3\(^{rd}\) century AD); Ramsey, CB 520, no. 361 (Eumeneia); Waelkens, Türsteine 624 (Drya, late Imperial period); SEG LIII 1533 (Upper Tembris valley, ca. 170 AD).

\(^{1089}\) MAMA IV 24 (Prymnoessaos, 1\(^{st}\)-3\(^{rd}\) century AD); but the restoration is uncertain.

\(^{1090}\) i.e. πενθερά/πενθερός: TAM V 704 (Iulia Gordos, 75/76 AD); TAM V 768 (Iulia Gordos, 78/79 AD); I. Manisa Museum 521 (west of Daldos, 150/151 AD); SEG XXVIII 1158 (Eumeneia); SEG XL 1244 (Upper Tembris valley, 220–230 AD). MAMA XI 201 (Axylon, c. 212 AD); ἐκυφρά/ἐκυφρός; TAM V 704 (Iulia Gordos, 75/76 AD); SEG LVI 1265 (Northeast Lydia, 93/94 AD); SEG XXI 1007 (Saittai, 136,137 AD); Hermann-Malay, New documents no. 95 (Northeast Lydia, imperial period); SEG XLI 1607 (Maionia, imperial period).

\(^{1091}\) Flood, Epigraphic evidence, 34; cf. one exception, MAMA V 22 (Dorylaioin, Phrygia) where M. Claudius Polemo Maximus set up an epitaph for Κλαυδία Θεμελίω καὶ Κλαυδία Λυ[μάρλινα] ἐκουράδος.


\(^{1093}\) TAM V 631.

\(^{1094}\) TAM V 65 (Silandos); Hermann-Malay, New documents no. 94 (Northeast Lydia, imperial period).
Characteristic and rare terms, originating from the Homeric period, documented in both Lydia and Phrygia are δούρη, designating brother-in-law and ένάρη for either brother’s wife or a wife of husband’s brother. Usage of these old expressions in the Roman imperial period seems to indicate the importance of these specific familial relations. Another attested phrase for husband’s sister or brother’s wife is γάλως. An expression designating step-father, πατροπόστος, is very rare, as well as stepmother, μητροίδα. There is also an interesting and rare expression for a wife, παρακοίτηδα, attested in Phrygia. Another term attested twice in Phrygia, but not yet in Lydia, indicating a widow, is χήρα.

The nuclear family is usually represented in an inscription on a shared family tomb, father, mother and the children. The number of children may vary, usually three, but many inscriptions only refer to τὰ τέκνα. However, few inscriptions from Phrygia are stressing the position of a first-born child, presumably a son, using the term...

---

1095 TAM V1 707 (Iulia Gordos, 70/71 AD); TAM V1 701 (Iulia Gordos, 12/13 AD); TAM V1 625 (Daldis, 167/168 AD); SEG XLIX 1726 (Lydia, 96/97 AD); SEG XLIX 1620 (Maonia, imperial period); I. Manisa Museum 521 (west of Daldis, 150/151 AD); SEG XL 1044 (Iulia Gordos, 69/70 AD).
1096 TAM V1 483a (Iaza); TAM V1 704 (Iulia Gordos, 75/76 AD); TAM V1 1782 (Yayakırılıdük, 120/121 AD); SEG XXXII 1223 (Saittai, 79/80 AD); SEG XXXIV 1208 (area of Maonia, 111/112 AD); SEG XXVIII 899 (Iaza); SEG XXXV 1247 (area of Saittai, 61/62 AD); SEG LVI 1265 (Northeast Lydia, 93/94 AD); also in Phrygia SEG XXVIII 1096 (Altıntaş, 3rd century AD); SEG XL 1241 (Upper Tembris valley, ca. 200 AD); MAMA IX 387 (Aizanoi, middle of 2nd century AD).
1097 Mostly in Phrygia: MAMA IX 188 (Aizanoi, early 2nd century); MAMA X 43 (Appia, late 2nd century AD); MAMA X 85 (Soa, 2nd or 3rd century AD); SEG XXVIII 1096 (Altıntaş, 3rd century AD); SEG XL 1241 (Upper Tembris valley, ca. 200 AD); SEG XL 1244 (Upper Tembris valley, 220-230 AD); SEG XLIX 1846 (Phrygia, 180-220 AD); in Lydia ιδερεύομαι in SEG XLIX 1660 (Saittai, 150/151 AD); TAM V1 682 (Characipolis, 161/162 AD) and 754 (Iulia Gordos).
1098 S. Desteplan, Familles d’Anatolie au miroir des MAMA, EA 43 (2010), 144.
1099 TAM V1 775 (Iulia Gordos, 46/45 BC); SEG XXXI 1004 (Saittai, 101/102 AD); SEG LVI 1258 (Northeast Lydia, perhaps Iulia Gordos, 149/150 AD).
1100 MAMA VII 58 (Laodikeia Katakeakumene); 330 (Vetissos) and 351 (Vetissos?); SEG LV 1308 (Lydia, 168 AD).
1101 MAMA IX 446 (Aizanoi, mid-2nd century AD).
1102 SEG I 455 (3rd century AD); MAMA X 540 (Tiberiopolis); cf. σύνκοιτος in MAMA I 301 (area of Axylon); see also ἀλοχός in Lydia SEG XL 1037 (northeast Lydia); SEG XL 1065 (Saittai, 198/199 AD) and in Phrygia: MAMA IV 20 (Prymnessoss); MAMA IV 133 (Metropolis, 2nd century AD); MAMA V Lists II 183,1 (Dorylaion); MAMA X 76 (Appia, 2nd-3rd century AD); MAMA X App III 191,1 (Appia); SEG XXVIII 1171 (Metropolis, 2nd century AD); Haspels, Highlands of Phrygia, 312, no. 38 (north Phrygia).
1103 CIG 3827h (Kotiaion, 2nd-3rd century AD); MAMA IV 20 (Prymnessoss) Flood also indicates a possibility that these women could be divorced or simply deserted, Epigraphic evidence, 43.
1104 In some cases four children are precisely named, cf. TAM V1 705 and 737 (Iulia Gordos) and TAM V2 1076 (Thyateira), five children in Buckler, Calder, Cox, Monuments from the Upper Tembris Valley, JRS 18 (1928), 33 no. 249 and MAMA VI 353 (Diokleia); six children in SEG XXVIII 1100 (plain of Altıntaş, 3rd century AD); seven children in SEG XL 1249 (Upper Tembris valley, 3rd century AD) and Buckler, Calder, Cox, Monuments from the Upper Tembris Valley, JRS 18 (1928), 25 no. 237; eight children in MAMA X 169 (Upper Tembris valley); ten children in SEG XXVIII 1104 (Appia, first half of the 3rd century). Most of these Phrygian families with many children are Christians.
This was probably due to the precedence in the inheritance. From one verse epitaph we can perhaps deduce that male children were valued higher than girls.\textsuperscript{1106}

\begin{verbatim}
Γεναδίῳ τῷ πάσι ποθήτῳ / [ν]ήπιος ὀκταέτης ἔθανον / τοὺς δὲ ἐλεεινοτάτους / [γ]ον[ίς
μ]ου ἐσα ἐν ΥΛΑΙC[— — —] / [ο]ἷς διὰ τὴν περί ἐμοῦ λύπην / ὁ ἡλιος λαμπρὸς
οὐκέτι λάγη / κλαοῦντον κέ ζητοῦντον τὸ τέκνον / τὸ ποθήτον. Ἄυρ. Δαδῆς κέ Ἀριανῆς
Γεναδίῳ κέ Ρουφίνη κέ Εὐτυχιανῆ / τέκνοις γλυκυτάτοις νηπίοις / κέ ἑαυτοῖς ἐτί ζῴντες
μνήμης / χάριν. / Δαδῆς κέ Ἐ[λπί]ζων Δαδῆ πατρὶ κέ Κυρίλη / μητρὶ κέ Τ[ρο]φίμῳ
\end{verbatim}

Enlarged families typically include grandchildren and daughters-in-law. Thonemann, analyzing the inscriptions from the Upper Tembris valley, argues that this commemorative practice aimed to represent the entire household, “extended multiple-family household”.\textsuperscript{1107} In most inscriptions relatives are distributed by age group, by gender and then by degree of kinship. Another family group could be including siblings and their relation, as in inscription from Tymandos in Phrygia:\textsuperscript{1108}

Πόπλιος Αἰλιος Κάνδιος τοῖς ἰδίοις προγόνο<ις> Άτα / πάπω / [καΐ] Άτα θείω καὶ
Ἀπολονίω θείῳ καὶ τῇ ἄδελφῃ Βαβεὶ Ἀρτεμιδόρου / μνήμης χάριν.

Some of these inscriptions perhaps indicate joint households of brothers, possibly through an inheritance, as we have, for example, seen earlier in joint ownership of animal herds.

An inscription from Iulia Gordos is displaying some of the other particular features, such as the words καμβεῖν (καμβίον/καμβίν, presumably a grandson),\textsuperscript{1109} πάτρα and πάπποι οἱ μεγάλοι, in Lydia.\textsuperscript{1110}

\begin{verbatim}
1105 CIG 3827hh (Kotiaion, 2nd-3rd century AD); IGR IV 539 (Kotiaion).
1106 MAMA X 219 (Appia, late 3rd century AD).
1108 MAMA IV 245.
1109 Cf. Robert, Hellenica VI, 96-98.
1110 TAM VI 706: ἔηνπο ξιβʹ, κε(λὸο) αʹ ζηʹ. / Μελεθξάηεο θαὶ Σαηεηο / Δὔμελνλ ηὸλ πἱόλ, Γην/λύζηνο,
Μελεθξάηεο ηὸ/λ ἀδειθόλ, ἟ κάκκε ηὸ / θακβεηλ, ὁ πάηξσο θαὶ ἟ π/άηξα, ἥξκ῅ο, ὦξβαλά, Εσ/ῒο ηὸλ
\end{verbatim}
We have no information from the inscriptions on forms and customs of marriage.\textsuperscript{1111} There are indications in the inscriptions that girls tend to marry at an early age, in their teens\textsuperscript{1112} and men probably around the age of twenty.\textsuperscript{1113} So far, there is no epigraphic evidence for a divorce in these provinces. We also do not know whether a woman after the divorce or a widow returned to her family. One could presume that a widow with children stayed in the husband’s house.\textsuperscript{1114} Remarriage was common for men as well as for women, although to a lesser extent.\textsuperscript{1115} One of the wife’s virtues was obviously fertility, explicitly displayed in an inscription from Akmoneia:\textsuperscript{1116}

\begin{quote}
Λουκίος γυν[α]ίκια ἱδίᾳ σεμνο/τάτη, γεννηθεὶς ἔτους ῥέα'/ ζήσασα γησίως, ύστερ γῆς/ἀπολυποῦσ[α] τέσσαρας καὶ θυγατέρα, / ἐτελευτησὲν ἔτους ρήσι'
\end{quote}

The cross-cousin and parallel cousin marriages are attested in Asia Minor;\textsuperscript{1117} most likely as means to control economic resources and estate.\textsuperscript{1118} It is interesting to note that most inscriptions documenting numerable terms for familial relations display no evidence of endogamous marriages.\textsuperscript{1119}

One different aspect of the household relationships is contained in the group called θρεπτοί, foster children who were raised by other individuals then their biological parents. The question of their origin and status, similar to Latin \textit{alumni} was discussed in the literature, most recently by Marijana Ricl.\textsuperscript{1120} In Lydia and Phrygia

---

\textsuperscript{1111} Cf. Ramsay’s stance on marriage in Asia Minor and his opinion on prevailing Roman customs, W. M. Ramsay, \textit{The Social Basis of Roman Power in Asia Minor}, Amsterdam 1967, 57-58.

\textsuperscript{1112} I. e. MAMA VI 205 (Apameia): died at the age of 18 after less than three years of marriage; MAMA IV 319: died aged 16, married only five months; MAMA V KB.3 (Dorylaion): died aged 16 at childbirth; MAMA I 301 (area of Axylon): died aged fifteen and a half at childbirth.

\textsuperscript{1113} Thonemann, \textit{Households}, 135.

\textsuperscript{1114} Most probably attested in SEG XXVIII 1206 (Soa, early 4\textsuperscript{th} century); MAMA I X 272 (Kotiaion).

\textsuperscript{1115} Second marriage for women, for example MAMA V 66 and 67 (Dorylaion); MAMA IV 339 (Eumeneia); bilingual inscription I. Manisa Museum 231 (=SEG XLIV 963; Philadelphia, Augustan period); SEG XXXV 1167 (together with SEG XLVIII1453; Maionia, 242/243 AD); cf. MAMA IV 221 (Apollonia): a second wife help to erect an epitaph for her husband and ‘his first wife’ (τῇ γυνεκὶ αὐτοῦ τῇ πρώτῃ); possible separation SEG LVI 1501 (Hierapolis, end of the 2\textsuperscript{nd}/first half of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD).

\textsuperscript{1116} MAMA VI Lists 193* (= Ramsay, \textit{Cities and bishoprics}, 656 no. 590; Akmoneia, 114 AD).

\textsuperscript{1117} I.e. MAMA IV 160 (Apollonia); MAMA VI 353 (Diokleia).

\textsuperscript{1118} More on this feature see Flood, \textit{Epigraphic evidence}, 43-48.

\textsuperscript{1119} Possible exception is MAMA VI 353 (Diokleia).

\textsuperscript{1120} M. Ricl, \textit{Legal and social status of ΘΕΠΤΟΙ and related categories in the Greek world: the case of Lydia in the Roman period}, in: \textit{Sobria ebrietas}. У спомен на Мирона Флешара, Зборник Филозофског
there are more than 400 inscriptions, mostly epitaphs, mentioning these persons. The important question about θρηπτοί is their legal status. Ricl’s research shows that more than quarter of all attested θρηπτοί were slaves beyond any doubt. There is also a group of 25 inscriptions from Phrygia (dated from 140 to 257 AD) documenting θρηπτοί in the process of being manumitted and/or consecrated to gods.1121 On the other hand, in Lydia and Phrygia there are complete slave families integrated into their masters’ homes. Slave θρηπτοί with their own families are mostly attested in northeast Lydia. Ricl pointed out that Lydian θρηπτοί were well integrated into their foster-families and “treated as humble members of their masters’ extended families.”1122 Duty and affection kept them close to their nurturers even after manumission and some slave θρηπτοί were especially praised for their virtues.1123 However, it is to be noted that not all of θρηπτοί followed the moral norms of respect and dutifulness to their nurturers.1124 Another group of θρηπτοί were freed slaves and natural children, foundlings and perhaps adopted freeborn orphans.1125 In the case of one Phrygian family, both Aurelius Nouna and Matrona were free and refer to themselves as father and mother of a child described as τρεπτός γλυκύτατος.1126

In some Lydian inscriptions a large number of θρηπτοί reared by individuals or married couples could perhaps indicate educational purposes or the position of apprenticeship.1127 Most of the inscriptions documenting free θρηπτοί are epitaphs set up for them by their patrons, nurturers, adoptive or step-parents, or grants for the admission to the family tomb.1128 These inscriptions are also very indicative of the affections and bonds between them.1129 Some of these θρηπτοί are mentioned together.

1121 Ricl, Legal and social status, 96.
1123 SEG XXXV 1167 (Maionia, 242/243 AD) II. 2-7: Αὐξ. Προκόπτοντα / καλῶς ζήσοντα καὶ ύπηρε/τήρ<ω>ντα Τατιανό τό συντρό/φω, ὡς μνημεονίςας ἰδ ἔσχεν / εἰς ἐ<ω>ντὸν οἴνοιαν τελευτών / κατέλαβε αὐτὸν ἐλέοθιρον.
1124 TAM V1 492 (near Kollyda, 124/125 or 224/225 AD); SEG XXXIV 1218 (Saittai, 209/210 AD); cf. Ricl, Legal and social status Lydia, 309.
1125 Ricl, Legal and social status, 103.
1126 SEG XXXV 1218 (Saittai, 209/210 AD).
1127 Ricl, Legal and social status Lydia, 309.
1128 Ricl, Legal and social status Lydia, 309.
1129 Cf. an epithet φιλότρεψ in TAM V1 815 (near Thyateira, 149/150 AD).
with their own families. As Ricl pointed out it is important to note that “the position of ὑπερπτόι and σύντροφοι within a family was officially recognized”, evident from two census records from Lydian Hypaipa, dated between 293 and 305 AD. Thonemann also remarked that these children were reared by families of both higher and lower status then their natural parents, without difference in terminology. Lydia also has another distinct feature; it is the only region where the term σύνὑπερπτος designating ὑπερπτοι raised in the same household. In Lydia are also attested ὑπερπτοι who later brought up other people.

Different group of inscriptions are the ones documenting nurturers and foster parents (οἱ ὑπερψωντες and τροφεῖς). In northeast Lydia, there are several inscriptions mentioning seven, eight or in one case even 34 people reared by the same couple or individual. A couple in Tomara who nurtured eight ὑπερπτοι were slaves of one Antistius Priscus. Ricl suggests the possibility that there were couples and individuals specialized in bringing up and training other people’s slaves or exposed and rescued children. This possibility is sustained by the attestation of two Phrygian male educators designated as ἀπαμαξ. There are also inscriptions documenting children, both free and slave, who were consecrated and reared in sanctuaries. In Phrygia there are cases of slaves and freeborn children vowed to gods in their early infancy or in illness.

---

1130 Parents: TAM V1 150 (Saittai, 204/205 AD); MAMA X 35 (Appia, 220-225 AD); brothers and sisters: TAM V1 167a (Saittai, 98/99 AD), 711 (Iulia Gordos, 108/109 AD); spouse and children: TAM V1 167a (Saittai, 98/99 AD), 473b (Kollyda, 193/194 AD), 475 (Kollyda, 232/233 AD), 629 (Daldis, 248/249 AD), 753 (Iulia Gordos); MAMA I 44 (Laodikeia Katakekaumene); MAMA IX 272 (Aizanoi, cca 135-140 AD); brothers in law: TAM V1 711 (Iulia Gordos, 108/109 AD), 804 (area of Tomara); nephews: TAM V1 804 (area of Tomara).
1131 IEph 3804-3805.
1132 Thonemann, Households, 140.
1133 TAM V1 753 (Iulia Gordos).
1134 TAM V1 167a (Saittai, 98/99 AD), 753 (Iulia Gordos).
1135 Cf. also ἄνθρωπος ὑπερπτοι in SEG LV 1288 (Hypaipa, 2nd century AD).
1136 SEG XLI 1620 (Maionia, imperial period).
1137 TAM V1 764 (Iulia Gordos), 782 (Tomara, 120/121 AD); SEG XL 1093 (Lydia, 175/176 AD).
1138 TAM V1 786 (Tomara).
1139 TAM V1 782 (Tomara, 120/121 AD).
1140 Ricl, Legal and social status, 108.
1141 TAM V1 782 (Tomara, 120/121 AD).
1142 Ricl, Legal and social status, 108.
1143 MAMA VII 170 (Hadrianopolis); MAMA VIII 357 (Killanion Plain).
1144 More see M. Ricl, Donations of Slaves and Freeborn Children to Deities in Roman Macedonia and Phrygia: A Reconsideration, Tyche 16 (2001), 127-160.
In our inscriptions the boundaries between the ‘nuclear’ and extended family members are evident but flexible. The relationship within immediate family was both ideologically and emotionally important, but not necessarily dominant in the society’s structure. Nevertheless, it seems that family is the one social structure that is best documented in the inscriptions. Are some of these inscriptions perhaps evidence that all these people, family members, mentioned in one epitaph are from the same household? It is much more likely that they were only jointly erecting an inscription and contributed to the cost of setting up a tomb, not necessarily living together. As Flood argued: “what joined the group in an inscription was common interest rather than common residence; nevertheless, the relationship was recognized.”

Analyzing this material and comparing other information, for example testimonies of family feuds, we can deduce that familial social interaction has not changed much from the studied period.

Some of the questions still cannot be answered; indications of age at death, necessary for the analysis of age expectancy, are sporadic. In Phrygia the age at death is precisely attested on less than 30 inscriptions, definitely not enough for demographic statistics. One interesting peculiarity of this region would be that almost 50% of these epitaphs with indications of age at death are erected for children or youths, those under 20 years of age. Another is that the number of years in inscriptions in Phrygia is often written out, as opposed to Lydia where the years are mostly represented with numerals. In Lydia there are many more inscriptions, a little less than 200, with explicitly indicated age at death. Most of these inscriptions are from the northeastern region of Lydia. The average life expectancy of this demographic sample was 48.58 years, considerably higher than what is generally accepted as the average in the Roman Empire. Around 25% of these epitaphs were commemorating children and youth, those under twenty years of age. Many epitaphs show a widespread tendency to round off ages. It has been suggested that age-rounding is frequent and popular among the

1146 Most information on family feuds come from the confession inscriptions, for example SEG LVII 1158 (Hamidiye, 102/103 AD); sister-in-law has taken the money from her husband’s brother; further commentary in ed. pr. Hermann - Malay, New Documents from Lydia, no. 51; TAM V1 318 (area of Kula, 156/157 AD); mother-in-law (falsely?) accused of poisoning her son-in-law; SEG LVII 1186 (Kollyda, 205/206 AD); two brothers maltreated their father cf. lemma and commentary on other instances of disrespectful acts toward family elders in ed. pr. Hermann-Malay, New Documents from Lydia, no. 85.
illiterate and lower-class people.1147 There are also two extreme cases in this region, a
woman called Theodora lived 98 years and was buried by her husband1148 and a man
Aurelius Alexandros who lived 90 years.1149 Another feature are the epitaphs not
showing age at death, but years of marriage.1150

We also need to balance our understanding of the real and significant family
relations and the epigraphic habit of the area and local burial customs. One has to agree
with Thonemann who said that “the reconstruction of Phrygian families and households
is an art, not a science.”1151 For now, we have to collect all the information possible
even without counting the differences. Most of the epigraphically documented familial
ties still await detailed examination and comparative analysis and will certainly
contribute to a better understanding of regional history and culture.

6.7 Education

What proportion of the inhabitants of the Roman Lydia and Phrygia had the
ability to read and write? As these areas were more rural than urban, and most of the
population lived outside the cities, the opportunities of attending some kind of school
were slight. The other, highly likely possibility is that reading and writing were
commonly taught by parents. We should make an attempt to determine what levels of
literacy and literary education these inscriptions reflect. The surviving inscriptions give
the impression that more attention was given to the higher levels of education in the
cities than to elementary instructions. For municipal elites παιδεία was a social
requirement, a pathway to certain kind of career, including political ones. In that way
gymnasiion was not only one of the city’s symbols, but also helped to maintain the
distinction between upper and lower parts of society.1152

1147 R. Duncan-Jones, Age-rounding, Illiteracy and Social Differentiation in the Roman Empire, Chiron 7,
(1977), 333-353.
1148 SEG LVII 1246 (northeast Lydia, 186/187 or 240/241 AD); ‘Ἐτοὺς σοι’, μη(νός) Λῶνον ζ’, ἕρο
μοικράτας Θεοδώραν τὴν / ἣκατον γυναίκαν ἐτείμησαν ζῆσασαν / ἐτή η’, σεμίνος ἀνα/στραφέαν περὶ
tῶν / βίον.
1149 SEG XLIX 1741 (area of Kula?, 309/310 AD); ‘Ἐπ(οικι) τῷ δ’, μη(νός) Παῦ/νημοι ὄν δ’ Ἀρ. / Ὁουλιαινός / Ἀλεξάνδρου 
Λουκία/νός ἐτείμησαν τῶν / πατέρα Λυκ. Ἀλεξαν/δρον Γαῖον / ζῆς(αντα) ἐτή(α) η’.
1150 I.e. TAM V1 631 (Daldas, 231/232 or 285/286 AD); MAMA V Lists I 182, 86 (Dorylaion, end of 2nd or
beginning of 3rd century AD); MAMA V Lists I 182, 94 (Dorylaion).
1151 Thonemann, Households, 141.
1152 For more see W. V. Harris, Literacy and Epigraphy, ZPE 52 (1983), 87-111.
Greek language of inscriptions in Lydia and Phrygia, as the rest of Asia Minor, show that municipal epigraphy uses the language of high culture perhaps demonstrating cultural sophistication of the city elites. On the other hand, in rural areas Greek language was pronounced differently, with certain assimilation of cases and tenses. It is highly likely also an indication that Greek was not the native language of the majority of inhabitants of rural Anatolia.

As Maria Paz de Hoz pointed out, the abundant evidence of cultural interest in Anatolia could lead to the conclusion that many of the people erecting confession inscriptions wrote the texts themselves. That does not necessarily mean they have received formal school education. Mitchell suggested that the “barbaric” Greek of rural Anatolia was not perceived as such because of the contamination of Greek by native languages but rather because it was not learned and assimilated through schools.

Many inhabitants of the cities and villages in Lydia and Phrygia erected verse epitaphs in memory of their loved ones. Phrygia seems to offer the most informative examples from the rural areas. As shown by Thonemann in his recent article, the farmers used the vocabulary and diction of the Homeric epics in their commemoration. It seems that this rich and expressive language of Homer allowed them to select the virtues and qualities they valued. Such is for example a sentiment of one cobbler from Thyateira who is designated as Σκυτοτόμων ὁξ’ ἄρι[σ]τος Ἀπολλωνίδης. The reminiscence of the Iliad and heroic epithets are shown in the funerary epigram from Laodikeia on the Lykos:


1155 Cf. P. Thonemann, Poets of the Axylon, Chiron 44 (2014), 191-232; see also lengthy epitaphs MAMA X 77 and 89 from Altıtaş plain and many more in Phrygia.
1157 SEG 41 1033 (2nd or 3rd century AD).
1158 IK Laodikeia am Lykos 81.
Another feature showing the practice of perhaps anachronistic language is using the familial expressions such as δαήρ, designating brother-in-law and ἐνάτηρ for either brother’s wife or a wife of husband’s brother or ἀλόχος for a spouse.\textsuperscript{1159} There are also some examples of other literary influences,\textsuperscript{1160} like the epitaph from the area of Dokimeion: ὁ [φ][δ][ν][ς] / ἔστι κάκιστος, / ἔχε δ’ ἄγαθόν / τι μέγιστον· τῆκι / τοὺς φθονερούς / ἐλέγχων τῆν / κακίνην.\textsuperscript{1161}

All these elaborate verse epitaphs, confession inscriptions and oracles implied that there were people who were able to read them. There are examples where the expectation of literacy are documented as ἔζης δῆμον λειμα/θα, ἔρη δέ ηθεί καὶ ξαδίελ.\textsuperscript{1162}

One reason why some degree and aspects literacy were important in the funerary epigraphy was the idea of immortality and everlasting memory. The letters were sometimes perceived as eternal: γάρμα/σιν ἀνέναι/β/λένον φύλε σήμα/τι τώδε.\textsuperscript{1163} and sometimes epitaphs were actually represented as last words of the deceased: στήλη ταῦτα λαλεῖ καὶ λίθος, οὗ γάρ ἐγώ.\textsuperscript{1164} In the same manner, a thirteen year old Gaianos from Dorylaion is shown to have written his own epitaph:\textsuperscript{1165}


\textsuperscript{1159} See previous chapter 6.5.
\textsuperscript{1160} M. P. de Hoz, Escritura y lectura en la Anatolia interior. Una forma de expresar ethnicidad helénica, in Est hic varia lectio. La lectura en el mundo antiguo (Classica Salamanticensia IV), Salamanca 2008, 92-93.
\textsuperscript{1161} Ramsey, Cities and bishoprics, 745, 689 ll. 1-7; cf. AP XI 193: ὁ φθόνος ὡς κακὸν ἐστίν: ἔχει δὲ τι καλὸν ἐν αὐτῷ: τῆκι γὰρ φθονερον δήματα καὶ κραδίην.
\textsuperscript{1162} MAMA X 152 (2nd or 3rd century AD).
\textsuperscript{1163} SERP 124, 6.
\textsuperscript{1164} MAMA VII 553 (Gdanmaua).
\textsuperscript{1165} Ramsay, Cities and Bishoprics, 386,232(1) (Eumeneia).
\textsuperscript{1166} MAMA V Lists I(i) 182,85.
Another epitaph from the Phrygian plateau show poetic aspirations:


In Kotiaion we have a very interesting funerary inscription showing an attitude towards life:

πόλεων μὲν εἰ/μι δύο πολεῖτις, / ἐπιφανῶν / Πρυ/μνησσέων τε καὶ / σοφῶν Κοτια/έων, / θρεπτός / γενόμενος Ζοκτ/κοῦ Λεονίδης, / Ψύ/φαζ ο κληθείς / ταῦτα τοῖς φίλοις / λέγω / παίσων, τρύφη/σον, ζήσον· ἀπο/θανεῖν σε δεῖ. / θεόν <σ>οι, ὀρχησαί / [τε καὶ ——].

In the 3rd century Apameia one Menogenes also called Eustathes shared his views on virtuous life and everlasting memory:

tὸ ζήν ὃ ζήσας καὶ θανῶν ζῆ τοῖς φιλοῖς, / ὃ κτώμενος δὲ πολλὰ μὴ τρυφῶν σῶν τοῖς φιλοῖς / οὕτος τέθηκε περιπατῶν καὶ ζῆ νεκρῶν [τρό]π[ον]. / ἐγὼ δὲ ξτρύφησα Μηνογένης ὃ κ Ἐσθαθῆς, / μετέδωκα ἐμαυτὸν πάντα τῇ ψυχῇ καλὰ· / ἀμάχως ἐβίωσα μετὰ φίλων κὲ συνγενῶν, / μηδέποθ’ ὑποῦλους ἢ δολίως λαλῶν τινι. / οὕτως ὃ βιός μου γέγονεν, ὅταν ἐξον ἐγὼ· / ἐς πάντα δ’ ηὗτοχῆς, ἐμαυτὸν πιστεῦσας θεῶ, / τὸ δ’ ὃ/φιελόμενον ἀπέδοκα τῇ φύσι τέλος. / / Ροῦφος ἐπύήσα Μηνογένει μου γλυκυτάτῳ πατρί / κὲ Παῦλει Μ[η]νογένου φιλάνδρῳ μέχρι τεύχου.

1167 Haspels, Highlands of Phrygia, 314, 14.
1168 CIG 3827s (1st or 2nd century AD).
1169 MAMA VI List 147, 122.
There are a few attested teachers from Roman Lydia and Phrygia: a διδάσκαλος Aurelius Trophimus, a καθηγητής, and a few παιδευταί. A monument from Iulia Gordos is showing paideutai together with demos, neoi, epheboi, children and horsemen.

In Hierapolis we have a paidagogos Heiliodoros, whose epitaph was set up by his colleagues, οἱ παιδευταί.

In Thyateira there is a bilingual inscription documenting a teacher of Latin:

The social position of teachers was not a favorable one, as having a schoolmaster or a tutor for a father was compared to having a mother who was a hired servant or a grape-picker or a wet-nurse.

---

1170 SEG VI 137 (Phrygia).
1171 MAMA VII 358 (Vetissos?).
1173 TAM V2 1119; cf. L. Robert, Hellenica VI, 89-91 no. 33.
1174 SEG LIV 1338.
1175 Dio Chr. 7, 114: μὴ δὲν φροντιζόμενος τῶν ἄλλων τὰ τοιοῦτα προφερόντων, οὖν εἰδόθη καὶ διδάσκαλος πολλάκις ὁ μόνον τὰς αὐτῶν ἐργασίας, αἰς ὁδηγήσατο πρόσεστιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν γονέων, ἂν τινος ἔρημος ἢ μήτηρ ἢ τρυγήτου ἡ ἄνωθεν ἐξελθόντα ἢ ποτε ἢ μισθοῦ τιθέναι σειτά τῶν ὀφειλόν θ' ἐποίησεν ἢ πλουσίων ἢ ὅ ποτε διδάσκαλος ὑποδέχατο ἢ παιδαγωγήσε.
Another indication of literacy are sculptural representations on the inscriptions. Although, as already mentioned, doorstones and relief stelai almost invariably depict the tools and values of agricultural and pastoral labor (farm tools, beasts of burden, sheep, vines, and ploughs) there are some cultural elements (writing paraphernalia, toga and pallia). For example, east of Aizanoi agricultural tools occur: the plough\textsuperscript{1177} and pruning hook.\textsuperscript{1178} But they could appear together with tablets, scrolls and other writing objects.\textsuperscript{1179} On doorstones in Aizanoi there are representations of stylus and/or diptych.\textsuperscript{1180} Representations of stylus and wax tablets are frequently found on the monuments in other parts of Phrygia as well.\textsuperscript{1181} It seems that in Phrygia literacy was a way to show principal values of the society.

The rural people who produced some of these epitaphs could have been literate people with a remarkable interest in and pride on paideia and intellectual qualities. In her article de Hoz suggests that many inhabitants of rural Anatolia were literate and had some kind of education, so they could at least compose basic texts and funeral epigrams and in that way they demonstrated their identity and Greek education, necessary for social mobility.\textsuperscript{1182} That was the purpose of philosophical and poetic allusions, mentioning of the Muses and iconography of monuments. Nevertheless, they speak of wisdom and intelligence but have poor writing and orthography. We should perhaps consider the possibility that the Hellenization of rural areas in Lydia and especially Phrygia was superficial and slight.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1177} \textit{MAMA} IX 430.
\item \textsuperscript{1178} \textit{MAMA} IX 363; 391; 437.
\item \textsuperscript{1179} \textit{MAMA} X 5 (Appia, early 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD); 34 (Appia, early 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD); 155 (Appia, second half of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD).
\item \textsuperscript{1180} E. g. \textit{MAMA} IX 477.
\item \textsuperscript{1181} E.g. \textit{SEG} XXVIII 1082 (Akmoneia, 296/297 AD); \textit{SEG} XXVIII 1089 (Altae plain, 232/233 AD); \textit{SEG} XXVIII 1089 (Altae plain, 239/240 AD); \textit{SEG} XXVIII 1106 and 1107 (Appia, 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD); \textit{SEG} XL 1245 (Upper Tembris valley, ca. 220-230 AD); \textit{SEG} XXXVIII 1096 (Altae plain, 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD); \textit{SEG} XXVIII 1092 (Altae plain, 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD); \textit{SEG} XXXVIII 1099 (Altae plain, 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD); \textit{MAMA} VI 288, 289, 300, 309 (Akmoneia); \textit{MAMA} V 40 and 41 (Dorylaion).
\item \textsuperscript{1182} M. P. de Hoz, Escritura y lectura en la Anatolia interior, 103-104.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
6.8 Conclusion

As we descend down the social ladder, the cultural uniformity seen among the member of the elite almost evaporates. The demand to be Roman, to conform to the standards and expectations of the imperial elite that is so noticeable when examining the senatorial and equestrian families and even the local grandees, is much harder to trace among the middle ranks of society. For the most of the middle class people the scope was much narrower, local or regional at best (and, for the members of village communities, downright parochial). The fact that their means where much more modest when compared to municipal aristocracy accounts for them being much less represented in the epigraphic record. Apart from the numerous epitaphs, the epigraphical trail of the most individual members of the middle class is meagre at best. In the increasingly hierarchical and oligarchical society an individual without wealth and connections did not count for much. But, if the efforts of a single man where insufficient to make any public impression there was another path: the cooperation. And this, the linking of the various individuals in the groups organized according to professional or other criteria, is perhaps the most conspicuous aspect of the activities of the middle class in the Roman Anatolia.

Best documented non-elite organizations are the professional associations. Members of these groups show great social diversity. While many of them belong to what could be described with confidence as the “middle class”, members of the humbler occupations were closer to the modern notion of “lower class”. Difference was probably derived from the social standing and the profitability or their respective occupations. It is hard to doubt that the professional associations where factors of some weight in the economic and political life of the city. This is clearly shown by the connections some of them had with the distinguished members of the local elite. This is particularly true of Lydia where professional associations left a deep mark. From what evidence we have, it is evident that these groups had a very developed internal organization and where capable of protecting their interests and the interests of their members. Perhaps Roman mistrust towards these and other forms of citizen associations can be partly explained by their potential to disturb the established social order. Other types of associations seem to be close to guilds in their internal organization.
A special set of questions are raised by the rural inhabitants of the city territory. Especially in Phrygia, the territory of individual cities could be vast, encompassing many rural settlements. The current tendency in historiography is to emphasize the difference and separation between the classical city and the Anatolian rural communities. While certainly based on solid evidence, it is nevertheless reasonable to ask whether this tendency went too far, imposing imaginary boundaries where none existed. The rural communities in Roman Lydia and Phrygia display striking diversity in terms of size, level of organization, economic strength, material culture and the standard of living (and, probably, of ethnicity and language) that any simple generalization seems out of place. However, there is a clear proclivity for rural communities to redefine themselves according to standards of the developed cities. The Graeco-Roman urban culture was the dominant model of life in the Roman Empire and most village communities seem eager enough to follow it. Some of these villages advanced enough in the period under consideration to actually obtain the civic status. It is to be noted, however, that unspecified (but probably significant) part of population lived outside of any nucleated settlements in many scattered rural estates and farmsteads.

The conclusions drawn from the research of the families and the private life are both very rewarding and unfortunately disappointing. The most usable and, for the most part, the only available sources for studying the Anatolian families are epitaphs. Apart from some Neo-Phrygian finds, almost all of them are in Greek. Again, modern terminology is not always readily applicable on the ancient conditions. Average family doesn’t seem to particularly large and it is best described using the modern notion of the “nuclear family” i.e. the family that consist only of the parents and their children. It is tempting to collect the numerical evidence available, such as the age of death on the numerous epitaphs, to apply the methods of statistical analysis and to make some definitive conclusions on this basis. A historian of any more recent period would do so without hesitation. However, once again it must be stressed that any such conclusion is flimsy at best, being based on an accidental and, in some aspects, highly unreliable samples. For example, the average life expectancy gained from such analysis seems too high when compared with what we know from other sources and the other regions of
the Empire. Evidently, a person could live close to a hundred years in Roman Phrygia but whether this was typical or, more likely, astonishingly unusual, we cannot say.

There are few common aspect that can be satisfactorily applied to the entire free population of Anatolian communities in the Roman Empire. For the most part, they shared the common legal status and little else beside. The members of the most respected trades and crafts, organized into influential professional associations, had little in common with the shepherds in the far-off rural settlements. There are considerable fluctuations in regard of the actual mode of living, wealth and, probably, life expectancy. We should also assume that there were significant regional various and the factors such as the geographical position and the general agricultural abundance of the immediate surroundings (or lack thereof) had much more direct impact on the well-being of the middle and lower classes. Once we leave the higher stratum of the society, the diversity in every respect is the only norm.
7. **SLAVES AND FREEDMEN**

Slaves were at the bottom of the social hierarchy in the ancient world and its least visible element. In a society where inequalities were widely spread and commonly accepted they were the *stratum* with the least amount of freedom (in fact none at all, at least in theory) and with the heaviest burden of physical work and social humiliation. This is probably the reason why the ancient sources were not interested in recording their numbers or offering information on their roles in everyday life and production. Most of the ancient writers, theoreticians and philosophers were at best mildly interested in the question of slavery. Even the ideological defense of slavery is rarely encountered; it is also a conspicuously undeveloped section of ancient philosophy and apparently one of little importance. Inhabitants of Greco-Roman world felt little need either to explain or to defend this institution. For them slavery was not good or bad, natural or artificial, it merely was there.

Apart from the bare fact that slaves existed in Lydia and Phrygia between 1st and 3rd century AD, everything else is pretty uncertain. How many slaves were there? What were the sources used to maintain and to replenish the slave population? What was their role in the agriculture, industry or domestic life? Was there a slave education? What were the specifics or their everyday relations with their masters? For the most part, a modern historian must be content with only partial or approximate answers.

Phrygians and Lydians are commonly encountered in the works of Greek and Roman writers. References to persons of Anatolian descend as slaves or proper “slave material” are comparatively frequent but they rarely represented the contemporary

---

1183 G. E. M. de Ste Croix, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient World*, Ithaca-New York 1998, 416-425. In fact, Aristotle’s theory of “natural slavery” is the only clear candidate for a philosophical explanation and justification of slavery. This is probably the most unsophisticated and logically most problematic part of the entire Aristotle’s system.
reality. These references can convey the impression that Asia Minor was one of the main sources of slaves in the Roman Empire but this might actually just be a common *topos* of the Classical literature. Since the 5th century BC (and probably even earlier), Lydians and Phrygians made their way into the Greek literature as archetypical slaves and servants (together with Thracians, Scythians and the like). Cicero observed that every Greek comedy had a part for a Lydian slave.\footnote{Cicero, *Pro Flacco* 65: *Nam quid ego dicam de Lydia? Quis unquam Graecus comoediam scripsit in qua servus primarum partium non Lydus esset?*} In ancient novels Phrygians were portrayed as pirates who abduct people and sell them into slavery.\footnote{Chariton, *Callirhoe* 8.8.} In one of his discourses, Dio Chrysostom is reproaching free Rhodians and their servility towards powerful Romans by comparing them unfavorably with the slaves of inner Phrygia, Egypt and Libya.\footnote{Dio Chr, 31. 113-114: *καὶ ἐγὼς φαίνει δὲν, εἰ καὶ ἐχομεῖς ἄκουσθε, κρεῖττον ὡς ἀπαλλάττειν τοὺς ἐν Φρυγίᾳ μόση δουλεύοντας ἢ τοὺς ἐν Αἰγυπτίῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ.*} For this reason we cannot take just any literary reference to Phrygian or Lydian slaves as being strictly true and useful.

Much of the recent interest for the history of the world slavery and ancient slavery as well, was driven by the North American and British scholars who are apparently influenced by the early modern institution of slavery, especially that of colonial America and the antebellum American South. In many recently published papers this influence is acknowledged openly and many scholars do not shrink from drawing direct parallels between ancient Roman slavery and its 19th century counterpart, indeed sometimes this is treated as the most commendable approach. The actual influence of this mode of analysis can be traced in works of many other scholars, even those who are ostensibly opposed to direct historical analogies.\footnote{Works of M. I. Finley, which are certainly among the most influential on the subject of the ancient slavery in 20th century, are saturated with numerous examples and comparisons from colonial era. In the absence of the direct personal testimonies on life in slavery in ancient Rome K. Bredley, *Slavery and Society at Rome*, Cambridge 1994, 92-94 uses those of Afro-American slaves on the plantations of the Old South. Even, a Marxist such as G. E. M. de Ste Croix, op. cit. does not hesitate to cite examples from 19th century American history whenever they seem to offer an analogy to the ancient Greek system of slavery (for an especially striking instance, see p. 142). Similar examples could be multiplied without end.} In this section I intend to ignore this and other historical analogies altogether. From the standpoint of the proper historical methodology it is entirely unacceptable to equate two institutions (ancient and modern slavery) that are so different and so remote in space and time.

However, a theoretical view point seems necessary if we are to make any sense of dispersed and not so informative sources on ancient slavery and, more particularly,
the slavery in Roman Anatolia. The opinion of F. Papazoglou on the debate on the subject of slavery in the Hellenistic Egypt, can well be applied to Roman Anatolia or any other part of the ancient world. Papazoglu made an observation that the results of a research depend not only on the sources that are being examined but also on the method applied and general assumptions, theoretical standpoints with which a scholar approaches his research. A scholar needs to be able to ask the proper question and separate the important facts from the rest. According to her opinion, the choice of a theoretical approach to any scholarly problem is of the highest importance, and that approach itself is often the result of some very complicated circumstances, not only the objective ones but subjective as well.\textsuperscript{1188} The initial assumptions on the importance of slavery and the role of slaves in society and production will, inevitably, influence any interpretation and conclusion. This is apparent in works of almost all the scholars involved in the question of ancient slavery.

Generally speaking, slaves are mostly mentioned on epitaphs and usually they are home, domestic slaves, servants facilitating the lives of the elite. There were also slaves who served as personal secretaries, physicians, assistants or agents. It is generally agreed that slaves in the \textit{familia urbana}, and especially those whose occupation brought them close to their owners, stood a better chance of being manumitted or, if they died as slaves, being commemorated; those working in crafts or business had the opportunity to build up their \textit{peculum} in order to purchase their freedom or a tombstone. One specific way in which a slave-owner could have promoted a sense of community among his or her slave household was to allow certain slaves to start some kind of marital unions.

As previously said, most of the slaves were domestic slaves, owned by the richest citizens, although even people of lower financial status could have kept a slave. It seems that owning a slave was more the feature of social status and respect, than economic necessity. The everyday life of the slaves is hard to reconstruct from the epigraphic sources. The slave who worked as an agent for a member of the elite, or the slave who worked as a confidential secretary, a doctor or a tutor, was both an insider and an outsider in the Roman society; a trusted member of the \textit{familia}, with privileged access to its wealth and connections, but regarded in law and ideology as completely

\textsuperscript{1188} Ф. Папазоглу, \textit{Историја хеленизма}, Београд 2010, 294-295.
dependent, inferior and powerless. Slaves also played a significant role in establishing the social identity of their *familia* within the community and in structuring kin relations within the family. In this way they could have also been seen as representatives of the family in the public sphere.

Anthropologists distinguish between the open and the closed models of slavery. Open slavery is a system in which slaves can be freed and accepted fully into general society; closed slavery is a system in which slaves are a separate group so that they are not accepted into general society even if occasionally freed. Roman society was an example of the open model, Classical Greek and Hellenistic societies were not. In case of Anatolia from 1st to 3rd century AD we have an intersection of both Greek and Roman system of slavery. While manumissions are attested often enough in the Greek world, the rights given by a manumission were seriously circumscribed. A liberated slave in the Classical Greek society was not a citizen with equal privileges, nor were his posterity, even after several generations. The social and legal difference between freedmen and citizens was carefully observed and, while it was possible for a freedman to eventually became a citizen, his position in this regard was similar to that of resident aliens. Most of the Greek freedmen could never hope to obtain full citizenship and they carried the everlasting stigma of their slave origin. In this respect, the Roman society was much less rigid. Manumission in Rome was considered as sociably acceptable, even desirable, a positive moral act, although such a decision rested solely with the slave owner. Once freed, slaves were accepted into society far more completely than the freedmen in a Greek *polis*. The promise of manumission was probably most probable for urban, skilled, literate slaves, but it was apparent throughout the Roman society. The motivation effect of possible manumission could be seen as a way to make slaves into members of a unified labor force in the early Roman Empire.

Except perhaps in some aspect of the institution of sacred slavery, there is no trace of any specifically indigenous type of slavery in Lydia and Phrygia. Our knowledge of the specifics of slavery in the pre-Hellenistic (and even more so in the pre-Persian) Lydia and Phrygia is very slim, but whatever the particularities of the Anatolian slavery originally were, they must have been assimilated to the Greek model of slavery long before the rise of the Roman Empire.

---

7.1 Terminology and onomastics

The most reliable way to recognize a slave in an inscription is through the specific terminology. Interestingly enough, ancient Greeks had only one term (ἐλεύθερος) to identify free people but a whole array of different expressions to designate slaves. This says something about the social perception of slaves and slavery as marginal and ambivalent and thus hard to define precisely.\textsuperscript{1190} By far the most common and the most frequent term for a slave in Greek is δοῦλος. In fact, it is the only word in ancient Greek used exclusively for slaves or bondmen.\textsuperscript{1191} It is an expression with a long history in both Greek literature and documentary sources that has been used throughout Antiquity, a variant of it being attested in the Mycenaean tablets.\textsuperscript{1192} As expected, it is one of the most frequent designations for slaves on inscriptions from Roman Anatolia and it is especially regular in Phrygia.

Another frequent expression for a slave is σώμα, a “body”.\textsuperscript{1193} It is a very characteristic way to describe slaves; similar terms are encountered in other slave-owning cultures and in different times. At times, the multiple meanings of this word can be a source of confusion, because σώμα is also used in its literal sense and even to designate apparently free people and persons or human beings in general. Compared to δοῦλος, it is not very frequently used in Phrygian and Lydian inscriptions to describe slaves but there are a number of instances.\textsuperscript{1194}

Using abusive and belittling expressions such as “boy” or “child” to refer to adult slave persons is common throughout the history of world slavery. Slaves had no legal power of their own and, not unlike children, they were wards of persons who did. Such usage is thus particularly demonstrative for the perception of the slave as endlessly immature. However, some such expressions did preserve a trace of meaning that points to a young age, even when dealing with slaves. The term παῖς and its derivatives have a flexible meaning and may indicate descent, age and condition. It could be used for a boy or a girl, but it could also be used for a slave of any age. In Greek inscriptions from

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item LSJ sv. δοῦλος.
\item M. Ventris, J. Chadwick, Documents in Mycenaean Greek, Cambridge 1973 ², 123-124.
\item LSJ sv. σώμα.
\item TAM V1 360 (Kollyda, 33/34 AD); ASAtene 1963/64, 380 (Hierapolis).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Lydia and Phrygia these words are παῖς (a “boy”, “child”, but “in relation to legal condition, slave, servant, man or maid (of all ages)”), παιδίον (a “little or young child”, or “young slave, male or female”), παιδόριον (“little boy”, or “young slave”), παιδίσκος (“young boy or son”), παιδίσκη (“young girl, maiden”, but also “young female maid, bondmaid... generally, maidservant”), κοράσιον (“little girl, maiden”). The term κοράσιον is attested in Lydia, in an inscription from Hierokaisarea of the slaves donated to a temple.

Alternative expression to designate a slave is τὸ ἀνδρόποδον, “one taken in war and sold as a slave, whether originally slave or free, captive” and also (quite typically) “low fellow, base creature”. The word is in some way analogous with such expressions as τετράπονς or τετραπόνδης, four–legged livestock. It is usually used in both literature and in inscriptions; there are numerous examples in Attica and Ionia, but it Lydian and Phrygian inscriptions it is rarely attested.

Another term occasionally observed in the inscriptions from Phrygia is οὐέρνας, from the Latin verna meaning “a slave born in his master’s house, a homeborn slave”. It is perhaps an example of appropriation of a technical Latin term used to describe the position for which the precise enough Greek word was lacking.

Another expression frequently associated with slaves is θρηπτῶς (fem. θρηπτή, pl. θρηπτοί). This term and its meanings are discussed separately in this thesis but it must be said that it can also be used for a freeborn person, nurtured by someone other than his/her biological parents. Nevertheless, it was often used for slaves, usually for slaves born outside the master’s home. One should not automatically assume that they were treated better or differently than the other slaves in the household.

Sometimes, some technical terms designated for household positions were used for slaves. The expression, οἰκονόμος meaning household manager or house steward, was used. The same can be said for πραγματευτής as an estate manager.

---

1195 E. g. SEG XXXVIII 1237; CMRDM I no. 90 (= Riel, Svest o grehu no. 25).
1196 LSJ sv. παῖς, παιδίον, παιδόριον, παιδίσκος, παιδίσκη, κοράσιον.
1197 TAM V2 1252.
1198 LSJ sv. ἀνδρόποδον.
1199 MAMA IV Lists I (i), 182, 123 (Dorylaion); MAMA VII 135 (Hadrianapolis).
1201 Riel, Legal and social status, 99.
1202 TAM V3 1845 (243/244 AD); Waelkens, Türsteine 462 (Blaundos, 3rd century AD).
1203 IK Tralleis 194 (2nd century AD); TAM V2 1213 (Apollonis).
A distinct category are public slaves, designated as δημόσιοι, or public slaves, owned by the community (a polis, in all recorded instances).\textsuperscript{1204} There are, however, four inscriptions from Thyateira recording δημόσιοι with patronymic and indicating perhaps freeborn people.\textsuperscript{1205} One example from Hierapolis documents one Θεοφίλος who is δημόσιος, but also agonistic epimeletes.\textsuperscript{1206} As Pleket suggested occasionally free men were prepared to fulfill functions which normally were occupied by slaves.\textsuperscript{1207}

Slave status of a person sometimes can be uncovered only indirectly. Individuals mentioned without a patronymic, in the context where we would not expect this, or together with others who have their fathers regularly recorded, are most probably unfree. Allusions to masters and owners are another indication as well as the evidence of slave-specific occupations and duties. Sometimes the recognition is aided by specific attributes such as “public” (δημόσιος, in sense of “in public possession”) or “private” (τοις).

Slave names are a separate issue. There are number of names which appear to have been associated specifically, though perhaps not exclusively, with slaves. In his study on slave names in Rome, Solin deduced that in the inscriptions most Greek slave names had a mythological background.\textsuperscript{1208} Nevertheless, these names were also used for freeborn persons. In his study from 1907, Lambertz listed all then attested Greek slave names and explained that they usually bear local geographical names, as well as heroic and theophoric names.\textsuperscript{1209} Another large group would be names constructed from abstract concepts and wishes (Wunschnamen).\textsuperscript{1210} This type of names was probably drawing upon personal characteristic and reflects the perception of slave owners. In his recent article Marek showed that among the names derived from precious and semi-

\textsuperscript{1204} E. g. SEG LI 1783 (Hierapolis, reign of Hadrian);
\textsuperscript{1205} TAM V2 1075 (heavily restored); 1084 (also restored); 1142; 1152 (heavily restored); cf. SEG LIV 1907.
\textsuperscript{1206} SEG XXIX 1404 (reign of Augustus): Σεβαστοὶ Καίζαξοι καὶ τῶι / Δήμωι Θεόφιλοις Φιλαδέλφου δημόσιοι ὁ καθεσταμένος ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπιμελήσας τῶν τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ ἁγώνων τὸ / ἀνάθεμα καὶ τὸν βομβὸν παρ᾽ ἑαυτὸι.
\textsuperscript{1209} M. Lambertz, Die griechischen Sklavennamen, Wien, 1907, 10-30.
\textsuperscript{1210} Ibid, 40.
precious stones and aromatics there were no predominately slave or freedmen names.1211

The most common “Sklavennamen” in Rome according to Solin’s list are: Felix (attested 461 times), Eros (346), and Hermes (328), followed by Hilarus, Prima, Antiochus, Alexander, Onesimos, Faustus, and Primus.1212 The Greek equivalent to Felix, Eutyches,1213 is also one of the most frequent names for slaves in Lydia and Phrygia, together with Onesimos (“Useful”, the well-known runaway slave in Colossians 4.9 bears the same name).1214 Apart from one slave in Silandos in 92/93 AD named Agrippa,1215 one Loukios in Dorylaion1216 and one Commodus in eastern Phrygia1217 there are no Roman names used for slaves. One of the most common female names for a slave was Trophime, probably associated also with rearing and θερπτόη, as well as the male equivalent Trophimos. Another regularly attested group was so called Lallnamen, many of them also indigenous, such as Ammia, Apphia, Papias or Tatias. The wife of aforementioned slave Commodus, attested in eastern Phrygia, was called Mikka.1218 Although it was presumed that this name had Lycaonian or Phrygian origin, Robert showed that it was a Greek name, frequent in Asia Minor as in the rest of the Greek world.1219

Male names Agathon1220 and Agathopous1221 are also attested as slave names several times, but both are quite common for free individuals.

---

1211 C. Marek, Imperial Asia Minor: Economic Prosperity and Names, in: R. Parker (ed.), Personal Names in Ancient Anatolia, Oxford 2013, 190 and esp. n. 74; L. Robert (in L. Robert and N. Firetti, Les Steles funéraires de Byzance, Paris 1964, 179): “Une fois de plus, on constate que la notion de “nom d’esclave” presque autant que celle de “nom de courtisane” ne correspond pas à une réalité stable; c’est plus ou moins tôt, suivant les regions, que noms d’esclaves et noms de citoyens puisent dans une meme fonds.”

1212 H. Solin, Die stadtromischen Sklavennamen, 680.


1214 In Solin’s Namenbuch Eutyches and Onesimos are frequently used as names for slaves in Rome, H. Solin, Die Griechischen Personnamen in Rom, Berlin 1982, 796-801 (Eutyches) and 913-919 (Onesimos).

1215 TAM V1 57.

1216 MAMA V Lists I(i) 182, 123.

1217 MAMA I 41.

1218 MAMA I 41 (Laodikeia Katakekaumene).

1219 L. Robert, Noms indigènes dans l’Asie Mineure Gréco-Romaine, Paris 1963, 56-57 and 256; it is attested once in LGPN I, once in LGPN IIIa and LGPN IV, five times in LGPN IIIb (four times in Beoetia and once in Thessaly and twice in LGPN Vb.

1220 TAM V1 257 (Kula); Haspels, Highlands of Phrygia 360, 135.

1221 I Sultan Dağı 608; MAMA V Lists I(i) 182, 122.
In Magnesia ad Sipylum two interesting names are attested, the freedman Korymbos and his former master Mithres. According to Robert, the name Κόρυμβος was a Greek name associated with hair. It is mostly attested in Attica, but it is also documented seven times in Asia Minor, namely in Ionia, Caria, Lycia and Phrygia. The name of the master, Mithres is Persian and as stated by Robert reflects the persistent influence of Persian diaspora, which went on to exist and thrive in Asia Minor until well into the Christian era. Name Mithres is frequently attested in all parts of the Greek world, especially in the island of Thera and coastal Asia Minor.

There are also several rare slaves names attested in Lydia and Phrygia. It seems they are used as a kind of pseudo-utilitarian names (similar to Onesimos), describing slaves as good workers or defining their type of work. One such case is, previously unattested, the name ‘Αξιομένη (“deemed worthy”). On Pisido-Phrygian border, there is a slave named Auxilia. Another distinctive name is Sakkos, perhaps a kind of “sack carrier.” One slave in Philadelphia is named Skeptikos.

7.2 Sources of Slaves. Slave Demography in Lydia and Phrygia

Two obvious questions must be answered before any attempt to ascertain the social and economic importance of slavery can be attempted: how many slaves where there in Roman Lydia and Phrygia (ideally, but improbably, in absolute figures or, at least, in proportion to the whole population) and what the origin of these slaves was? A partial or complete failure to provide meaningful answers would necessarily have serious bearing on the overall conclusions of this chapter. Of course, these two issues

---

1224 Attested once in LGPN I, twelve times in LGPN IIa, four times in LGPN IIIa and three times in LGPN Va and Vb respectively; in Phrygia in a fragmentary inscription from Aizanoi MAMA IX P220.
1226 Attested ten times in LGPN I, three times in LGPN IIa, once in LGPN IIIa and thirty three times in LGPN Va and five times in LGPN Vb; in Lydia it is also attested in TAM V2 1250 and I Sardis 6; 132 and 224; SEG XXXII 1236; in Phrygia it is attested in IK Laodikeia am Lykos 6; MAMA IX 112; MAMA IX P266.
1227 E. Akinci Öztürk, C. Tanriver, New Inscriptions From The Sanctuary Of Apollon Lairbenos, EA 43 (2010), 47-48 no. 7
1228 MAMA VIII 379 = I Sultan Dağı 608.
1229 IK Laodikeia am Lykos 48; cf. editor’s commentary; also LSJ: ό σάκχαρος, coarse cloth of hair, esp. of goats’ hair and anything made of this cloth.
1230 TAM V3 1911; cf. attested once in LGPN IV and once in LGPN Va.
cannot be really separated: size and composition of the slave population will have been influenced by whatever means of slave supply are available. The availability of new slaves will have serious impact on the way the owners treat their existing slaves. First, I will make an attempt to address the second question.

There were five primary sources of slaves in the Roman Empire: 1) persons forcefully enslaved in wars or by pirates or brigands; 2) persons imported from beyond the frontiers of the Empire; 3) “self-enslaved” persons; 4) infants abandoned by their parents, and 5) children born to slave-mothers within the Empire. A commonplace of ancient history is that the war and piracy are the primary sources of the new slaves. For various reasons, however, this will not have been the case with the Roman Empire from the 1st to 3rd century AD. True, the wars were frequent enough during the Early and the High Empire, but most of the conflicts after Augustus were border wars (often with Romans on the defense) with limited gains in slaves or other loot. Trajan’s conquest of Dacia flooded the market with perhaps as much as tens of thousands new slaves but this was the single outstanding conquest of the 2nd century AD. It cannot be said that piracy or brigandage were eliminated in the Roman Empire because they remain to be recorded and thus a potential source of new slaves. However, they decreased drastically in intensity and could have been of only minimal importance in this regard. In fact, there is solid evidence that the number of slaves provided by wars and piracy in the Eastern Mediterranean already receded greatly during the 1st century BC. This is probably true for the Roman world at large. Even if we assume very low percentage of slaves in the population of the Empire, extensive foreign conquest would have to occur each year to provide sufficient supply.


The claim of Byzantine antiquarian John Lydus, De Magist. 2.28 that Trajan returned from the last Dacian war with over half a million slaves is quoted again and again, in spite of it being quite impossible: even with an excessive estimate, this figure approaches the entire population of early 2nd century Dacia. This “fact” is often adduced as the proof of the continual importance of war as the source of slaves during the Early Empire, e.g. C. R. Whittaker, op. cit., 122-123.


According to W. Scheidel, Quantifying the Sources of Slaves in the Early Roman Empire, JRS 87 (1997), 164-165, if we assume moderate levels of fertility of slave population and moderate supply of abandoned infants, it would still take ca. 25000 imported slave yearly to maintain the slave population of 10 million (Scheidel is purposely using the higher estimate then he believes is warranted); if low estimates are taken then the minimal necessary foreign import of slaves would have to be around 40000.
The magnitude and importance of foreign commerce in slaves is hard to establish. Varro, quite succinctly, claims that slave-owners in Rome obtained their slaves from one place - Ephesos. This probably means that Ephesos (and other large ports of Asia Minor and Eastern Mediterranean) held intermediate position in slave trade with inland Asia and perhaps the region around the Black Sea as well. However, this reflects the situation in the 1st century BC that might not remain the same after Augustus.

Considering the prevalence of manumissions in the Roman Empire, even much more extensive conquest and warfare would not suffice to maintain the size of the slave population. Likewise the assumed scale of the foreign slave import would have to be huge to make any difference. In a paper dedicated to this question, Walter Scheidel concludes that it is impossible to assess the size of trade in foreign slaves in the Roman Empire but that it probably was not very significant for the maintaining of the Empire’s slave population. Therefore, we are left with the sources of slaves available within the Empire. The “self-enslavement” is the most elusive and probably the least significant of sources. By the process of elimination, the most important source of new slaves in Roman Phrygia and Lydia would have been the offspring of slave mothers and the abandoned infants of any origin. For the existing population of slaves to be maintained, we would either have to assume its high reproduction rate or many thousands of infants abandoned by parents each year. Although there is no certain way of proving it, the first assumption is more likely and more in accordance with the epigraphic record. In fact, there are indications that some slave owners purposely encouraged reproduction among slaves to obtain young slaves for training and selling.

---

1236 Varro, De ling. lat. 8.21.
1237 W. Scheidel, Quantifying the Sources of Slaves in the Early Roman Empire, JRS 87 (1997), 159: “As to the third variable, estimates of the size of the pool of ‘enslavables’ both within and outside the Empire inevitably rest on guesswork. The number of potential suppliers of slaves, mainly via child exposure and sale, within the Empire might be put at forty million or about three-quarters of the non-slave population which should seem a generous estimate. Populations beyond but within reach of the borders were limited in size: one would think in the first instance of the peoples of Ireland, Scotland, Germania, South Russia, the Caucasus, the Arabian Peninsula, and the Sudan (broadly defined). While Mesopotamia and Iran could have been another source, demand for slaves within the Parthian Empire has to be taken into account as well. Needless to say, the inhabitants of most or all the other areas listed above would also make use of slaves themselves which must have limited the scope of export.” Cf. W. V. Harris Demography, Geography and the Sources of Roman Slaves, JRS 89 (1999), 72-73 who agrees with overall conclusion.
Judging from the Roman literature, trading in slaves was widespread activity and was considered important yet, at the same time, somehow less then dignifying and, on the whole, not an acceptable occupation for men of high social status. This might partly be assigned to the general resentment toward mercantile pursuits, characteristic of the Roman landholding elite, but it does not explain the attitude entirely. Available evidence suggests that the members of the elite (even the highest, senatorial elite) were more frequently involved in direct slave trade then they cared to admit, sometimes driven by the sheer necessity. It is also implied that it was highly profitable but in a way degrading activity. That the slave trade is considered very important but that the direct participation in it is shameful (at least to some degree) for slave owners is a curious paradox but one that is encountered in other times and in other slave-holding societies.

Local elite in Roman Anatolia seems to be less concerned about the low social status of the slave trade. There is a honorary inscriptions for a slave trader Alexandros in Thyateira who was also an agoranomos - a fairly high civic office. There is a specialized slave owner in Hierapolis (παιδαξηνηξφθνο), apparently engaged in rearing of the young boys. Existence of a regular slave market is attested in Akmoneia, Thyateira and Sardeis, and can be inferred in Apameia.

As we have seen, most of the new slaves would have been the children of existing slaves or the exposed children. The ongoing importance of the slave trade in inner Anatolia is proven by the previously mentioned inscription of the 1st century AD from Thyateira where shop-keepers in the slave market and the slave-brokers honored and dedicated a statue of Alexandros, son of Alexandros, a slave-dealer (σωματέμπορος), because he acted with integrity during his four-month tenure as

---

1238 Even T. Flavius Vespasianus, the future emperor himself, seem to be engaged in the slave-trade ca. 62 AD when his fortune was almost exhausted: Suet. Vesp. 4.3; cf. A. B. Bosworth, Vespasian and the Slave Trade, CQ 52-1 (2002), 350-357.
1240 TAM V2 932.
1241 Alt. v. Hierapolis 270.
1243 TAM V2 932.
1244 SEG XLVI 1524.
1245 Dio Chr. Or. 35.14.
agoranomos and donated money to celebrate lavishly the festival days of the Emperors: 1246

oi toû stатарίου ἐργασταί / καὶ προξενηταὶ σωμάτων / ἐτείμησαν καὶ ἀνέθηκαν / Ἀλξεανδρὸν Ἀλξεάνδρου / σωματείμπορον ἄγοραν/μήσαντα τετράμηνην ἀγών / καὶ ἐπιδόντα ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων τῇ πόλει / πολυτελώς ἐν ταῖς ἐορτασί/μοις τῶν Σεβαστῶν ἣμεραῖς.

The above mentioned inscriptions from Hierapolis mentions a παιδαξηνηξφθνο, a master who kept young slaves. 1247


If the restorations in this inscription are correct this would be an interesting example of a paid obligation taken by the specific type of a slave-owner. But even more interesting is the actual occupation of this slave owner. What is the meaning of the term παιδαξηνηξφθνο in this context? He was perhaps a local slave nurturer who bought slave infants or collected abandoned ones, raised them and sold them at what was still a very young age. This conclusion is in accordance with the above mentioned assumption of prevalence of slave rearing as the source of new slaves. However, as the text is heavily restored other possibilities also exist. Perhaps the term can designate a kind of

1246 TAM V2 932.
1247 Alt. v. Hierapolis 270.
orphanage. Perhaps the owner himself was a slave *pragmáteutes* and as he had no family, boys from that orphanage came every year to put a wreath on his tomb.

Since the slave was considered a piece of property which could be bought, sold, and transferred, slave-holding and slave sales were taxed like any other kind of merchandise or property. Epigraphic evidence on taxes on slave trade from Asia Minor goes back to the late Archaic age and it is plausible to assume that it is as old as the monetary economy itself. For the Roman province of Asia there is the so-called Ephesian Customs Law (or The Customs Law of Asia). It is actually a series of legal acts and provisions compiled over almost two centuries. It contains various regulations on trade and taxing in the province, including provisions on the import, export, and sale of slaves, for which actions a tax (*telos*) was to be collected. The stone on which this *Lex portorii* is inscribed was discovered only in 1976 and was neglected for a long time. The monument (dimensions: height 2.82 m, width 1.44 m, thickness 0.3 m, original monument would have been over 3 m high) is a stone slab, made of white crystalline marble with blue-gray shading and some traces of quartz. It suffered extensive damage as it was used as secondary building material for the construction of the Church of St. John in the 6th century AD. Around 155 lines of the text are visible, which is probably not more then three quarters of the original document. Today it is conserved in the Ephesus Archaeological Museum and rightfully regarded as one of the most important epigraphic monuments preserved anywhere in Asia Minor.

For the discussion of the slave trade, more important parts of the Customs Law are ll. 12, 74-76, 98, 117-122.

In the first provision on slave trade (early 1st century BC) we read: "[ύπορ σωμάτων ἄνδρεών ἢ θηλείων ἐκτὸς σωμάτων] παιδαρίων κορασίων μὴ τι πλείον τέλους ἐκάστης κεφαλῆς δηναρίων πέντε διδόναι ὀρφειλέτω(ι). vac. [seruorum seruarum, nisi] puerrorum puellarum, plus quam denarios quinque pro capite portorii causa dare ne debeto." If the tax on child slaves was not more than five *denarii*, this

---

1249 Syll. 3.4 (Kyzikos, ca. 520 BC).
1251 *Customs Law*, ll. 12.
implies a maximum market value of 200 denarii. This taxation reveals the ambiguous conception of slavery.¹²⁵²

Privileges of publicani extend to the realm of the slave trade. A publicanus is, among other things, excused from paying telos (that is, portorium) on any slave he imports or exports (ordinance from 75 BC).¹²⁵³ Since publicani or their agents in the province held much of the actual slave trade, one cannot but wonder at the possible implications of such a privilege. As their role in economic life of the province was gradually diminished from Augustus onward, trade in slaves was taken over by local dealers to whom, to the best of our knowledge, similar privilege was not extended. Is it possible that this led to an increase of average prices of imported slaves and consequently, to the reduction in sales and overall importance of this source of new slaves?

The next provision (from the year 17 BC) treats the question of tax on import and export of slaves when rented to a publicanus: οἱ αὐτοὶ προσέθηκαν· ὑπὲρ σωμάτων ἑκάστης κεφαλῆς πλείον τὸν ἐν τῷ τειμεντικῷ νόμῳ μενοῦ ἁγιασμένου εἴσαγωγῆς μὲν δὴν ἡμῖν ἐξαγωγῆς δὲ δηνάριον ἐν ὁ δημοσιώνης λαμβανέτο.¹²⁵⁴ This limits the extra profit publicani could take on every individual slave to two and a half denarii for import and one denarius for export. Clearly, the leasing of the taxes on slaves was a lucrative pursuit if such a legislative limitation was necessary. Disparity in maximum taxes implies greater commercial value of imported slaves.

The ordinance from the year 5 AD imposes obligatory registration of all imported slaves. Whoever imports slaves of both sexes from outside the province need to apply for registration in the customs office (to publicanus or to a procurator). If there are no custom offices or suitable officials (presumably at the point of entrance in the province), then the person who imports slaves will register them with the highest local official in the nearest city.¹²⁵⁵ The same ordinance affirms that the taxation on import of

¹²⁵² Mitchell, Anatolia I, 257.
¹²⁵³ Customs Law, II, 74-76: οὐς / [...c.9... δημοσιώνης εἰς Ἀσίας εἰς Ἀσίαν εἰσαγάγῃ ἢ ἐξαγάγῃ, οὔ τέλος Λούκιος Ὀκτάωνος, Γάδος Ἀδριάνος ἔμετοι εἰσαγομένους, ὑπὲρ τούτοις τέλος μὴ / [...c.9... ὑπὲρ πλείου καὶ τῶν τοῦ πλοίου σκευῶν καὶ ὑπὲρ δουλῶν καὶ ἐν άπαντον, οὐς ἢ ἢς ἢν οἰκοθὲν ἄγασιν ἢ παραπάτησιν, ὑπὲρ βοβλίων.
¹²⁵⁴ Customs Law, II, 98.
¹²⁵⁵ Customs Law, II, 117: οἱ αὐτοὶ προσέθηκαν· ὡς ἢν νοοῦσιν δοῦλον ἢ δοῦλήν εἰς ἐπισχεῖαν Ἀσίαν εἰσάγῃ ἢ ἐξάγῃ, πρ[ός / [...c.17... ὥσπερ αὐτοῦ ἀπογραφῆσθω παρά τούτου, ὡς ἢν φανερῶς ἐν τῶι
slaves is identical regardless of whether the slaves are brought overland or by sea and that duties are payed only once, at the point where slaves entered the province: [μήτε δημοσίωνς μήτε ἐπί]τροπος ὑπάρχῃ τότε ἐν τῇ ἐγγίστα πόλει, ὡς ἄν τὴν μεγίστην ἀρχήν ἔχῃ, παρὰ τούτων ὑπογραφέσθω. While there is a dominant picture of province of Asia as the area of large maritime cities, inland trade across Anatolia was certainly of great importance. This piece of legislation would be especially significant for inhabitants of Phrygia with its long borders adjoining regions outside of the province. The slaves were certainly imported from other provinces in Asia Minor and client kingdoms but perhaps from further away as well. The fact of obligatory registrations of all imported slaves clearly shows the level of organization and the state supervision regarding the slave trade. It also gives some credence to the assumption that each community had a precise index of its slave population; perhaps there was even a province-wide register. If even a fraction of such documents were preserved, which is not the case, we would have a clearer picture of the size of the slave trade and perhaps of the total size of the slave population in Asia.

The question about the number of slaves in any province of the Roman Empire is not easily answered. No ancient author makes any explicit statement in this regard. Perhaps parity with the total number of slaves in the province of Asia, the whole of Asia Minor or even the whole of the Empire could be made? But these numbers, as well as the population totals are equally absent and any demographic figure found in the modern literature is an educated guess at best and a pure fiction at worst. In spite of our inability to provide exact figures the question remains important. The impression we
get from the ancient authors is that slaves were indispensable and slavery omnipresent. If this impression actually reflects the reality of the Greco-Roman world, then there must be a comparatively high percent of slave participation in total population.

Egypt is the one province of the Roman Empire where we occasionally have more precise population data, although geographically and chronologically fragmented. But even there the total population is subject of debate with both ancient authors and modern scholars in disagreement. The Egyptian figures, such as they are, indicate that slaves were approximately one tenth of the whole population with some regional and social variations (the percentage is higher in urban areas, lower in villages), and that about one fifth to one sixth of the recorded households own slaves (again, slightly more in cities and towns, slightly less in villages). Is this percentage valid for the whole of the Empire (and by implication, Roman Anatolia), at least as the order of magnitude? Many scholars agree that it is but there are others who object sharply. These ratios would imply that basically rich families owned slaves while a minority of middle class households could own a slave or two. They also imply that almost all slaves are households slaves and personal servants, leaving very little slave workforce for manufacture or agriculture.

Scheidel relies on “simple demographic models” and methodology of statistical approximation to establish the general order of magnitude for the slave population of the Roman Empire. He begins with the widespread assumption that the Roman Empire had roughly 60 million inhabitants in the 2nd century AD and accepts the percentage (ca. 10%) obtained from Egyptian census returns. Thus, he supposes that slaves were

---

1259 Ibid., 70-71: “Slaves constitute about 11 percent of census population (118 of 1084). In census returns with complete or nearly complete principal families, slightly under sixth of household register slaves (26 of 167, or 16 percent). However, once again villages differ from metropoleis. For complete or nearly complete households, the overall incidence of slaveholding is a good deal higher in metropoleis (15 of 72 households, or 21 percent) than in villages (11 of 95, or 12 percent); there are about four chances in five that this difference is significant. But in villages, 15 percent of complex households register slaves (6 of 41), as against 11 percent of simple households (6 of 54); since complex village households were probably wealthier than simple ones, the difference may be important, although the numbers are far too small for confidence.” Cf. R. S. Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity*, Princeton 1993, 208-209.
1260 For the entire population of the Empire see: B. W. Frier, *Demography*, in: *CAH X*, 2, 811-816. According to this careful but still somewhat hypothetical estimate, the Empire had approximately 45 million inhabitants in 14 AD and around 60 million in AD 164 (on the eve of the plague) - population apex not reached again until 16th century. The outstanding 19th century work on ancient population, C. J. Beloch, *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt*, Leipzig 1886, 507 estimates the population of the Empire at the time of Augustus at 54 million (28 of which in the East) and this figure has a large following even today, unlike Beloch’s later attempts to revise it upwards.
“six million in a population of sixty million”, on the eve of the Antonine plague. Harris rejected Scheidels conclusions as being “without much in the way of justification. We are offered a second-hand guess about Italy - two to three million slaves - and for the rest of the provinces an extrapolation from Egypt, where, it has been agreed for some time, the likely proportion of slaves in the chora was about 10 per cent (at Alexandria things may have been different). On the other hand, for provinces like Asia, Harris proposes that the actual percentage of slaves in the entire population fell within the range 16.6 to 20%.

But how big was the entire population of the province of Asia? Most of the historians engaged in demographic studies of antiquity are reluctant even to hazard a guess. Beloch in his venerable work on ancient demography made a serious attempt: 19 million for Anatolia and Syria combined in AD 14, probably around 11 million for the whole of Anatolia and between 5 and 6 million for province of Asia. Broughton’s estimate was only slightly lower, between 4 to 5 million for the province, roughly 600,000 for Lydia and about twice as much for Phrygia. These figures are now recognized as being too high, especially for the early 1st century AD. Frierr’s estimate (based largely on the methodology advocated by McEvedy and Jones) is 8.2 million for entire Anatolia and around 3.5 million for province of Asia in 14 AD (including client kingdoms annexed after this date). Frierr’s figures for 164 AD are 9.2 and 4 million respectively. The population of Lydia is under half a million and that of Phrygia around 800,000. If correct, these population heights were not attained again before the late 19th century. If we choose to follow Scheidel, there would be 40000 slaves in 2nd century Lydia and 80000 in contemporary Phrygia. If, on the other hand, Harris’ assumption is accepted as valid, respective numbers would be 66-80000 and 132-160000 slaves, which seems a bit too elevated. But, whether one sees these figures as surprisingly high or disappointingly low is a matter of perspective.

1261 W. Scheidel, Quantifying the Sources of Slaves in the Early Roman Empire, JRS 87 (1997), 158; see also I. Biezunsk-Malowist, L’Esclavage dans l’Egypte greco-romaine II (1977), 156-158.
1262 W. V. Harris, Demography, Geography and the Sources of Roman Slaves, JRS 89 (1999), 64.
1263 Ibid., 65.
1264 Beloch, op. cit., 514.
1267 B. W. Frierr, op. cit., 812.
1268 Ibid., 814.
The only seemingly precise figure on slave population for any of the cities in Asia is provided by Galenus. He claims that there were 40000 slaves in Pergamon (together with 120000 citizens of both sex and any age and an unspecified number or non-citizen free inhabitants).\footnote{Gal. De prop. 5.49.} If we estimate the total of the city’s population at around 180000, 40000 slaves would be 22\% of the population, or just above one fifth, which is considerably higher then the comparative Egyptian example adopted by Scheidel but, incidentally, very close to Harris’ estimates. There is no easy solution to this riddle. Perhaps Galenus was simply wrong or exaggerating or was merely guessing. If his figure is at least roughly correct how does it help the discussion on the slave population in neighbouring Lydia, for example? Should we assume that at least the larger cities of the region had the same percentage of slave population? A standard estimation of the population of the Sardeis in 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD fluctuates between 60 and 80000. Thus, if take the highest estimation, we are dealing with either 17600 (if we take Galenus figure as basis) or 10000 slaves (if the Egyptian parallel is accepted as valid) in the city.

Also, we could only make an educated guess, for statistical reasons, that the average “social life expectancy” of slaves (the amount of time spent in slavery, allowing for periods of freedom before and/or after enslavement) must have been relatively close to twenty years regardless of the sources of slavery. If slaves were to be released and if the promise of release was commonly used as incitement to work better, it is reasonable to assume that owners used them at the period of life when they were the most productive.

At first sight, judging from the inscriptions, it seems that there are more male slaves than female. It is traditionally assumed that any reference to slave in ancient sources means male slave unless explicitly stated otherwise. In recent decades historians came to believe that the truth is very different, even directly opposite to this assumption and females were probably predominant in numbers within slave population.\footnote{This demographical observation is also based on data obtained from census records of Roman Egypt; cf. R. S. Bagnall, Missing Females in Roman Egypt, \textit{SCI} 16 (1997), 127-133.} The main reason for this was that infant exposure and sale into slavery often discriminated against daughters and in favor of sons.\footnote{On this see A. Cameron, The exposure of children and Greek ethics, \textit{Classical Review} 46 (1932), 105-114; I. Biezunfska-Malowist, Die Expositio von Kindern als Quelle der Sklavenbeschaffung im} Exposure of children was common in many
parts of the Roman Empire and it had considerable demographic, economic and psychological effects. The position of girls in this situation seems obvious at least from the preserved (and much discussed) fragment of Posiddipus’ *Hermaphroditos* as we read: \(^{1272}\)

\[\text{ὑίόν τρέφει πᾶς κάν πένης τις ὄν τύχη θυγατέρα δ’ ἐκτίθησι κάν ἣ πλούσιος.}\]

This fragment has reached us without any discernible context, but perhaps comic overstatement rests on a degree of perceived reality. Among other ancient authors, Polybius also remarks that contemporary Greeks (mid-2\textsuperscript{nd} century BC) refused to bring up more than a few of their children. \(^{1273}\) Presumably, most foundlings, if not all, became slaves.

We should also note that slave women were relatively rarely manumitted during the period of prime fertility. \(^{1274}\) Even though, studying Egyptian census returns, Bagnall and Frier have found that the average fertility of slave women was similar to that of all women \(^{1275}\) female slaves were presumably used as a reproductive tool for obtaining new slaves.

The example of precisely documented gender and age of slaves is attested in an inscription from Hierokaisareia of donation of slaves to the temple: \(^{1276}\)

\[\text{[ἐπὶ Α]οὐκράτορος Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου / [Καίσαρος Γερμανικοῦ ἀνθυπάτου δὲ] / [Ποπίλιον Κορηλίου Σκεπίωνος, / [ἱερογλυφοῦντον Κρητίνου τοῦ}}\]

\(^{1272}\) Posidippus, *Hermaphroditos* fr. 11.

\(^{1273}\) Polyb. 36.17: ἐπέζρελ ἐλ ηνῖο θαζ᾽ ἟κᾶο θαηξνῖο ηὴλ ἗ιιάδα πᾶζαλ ἀπαηδία θαὶ ζπιιήβδελ ὀιηγαλζξσπία, δη᾽ ἡλ α ἐμεξεκψζεζαλ θαὶ ἀθνξίαλ εἶλαη ζπλέβαηλε, θαίπεξ νὔηε πνιέκσλ ζπλερῶλ ἐζρεθφησλ ἥκᾶο νὔηε ινηκηθῶλ πεξηζηάζεσλ. εἴ ηηο νὖλ πεξὶ ηνχηνπ ζπλεβνχιεπζελ εἰο ζενὺο πέκπεηλ ἐξεζνκέλνπο ηί πνη᾽ ἂλ ἠ ιέγνληεο ἠ πξάηηνληεο πιείνλεο γηλνίκεζα θαὶ θάιιηνλ νἰθνί ικελ ηὰο πφιεηο, ἆξ᾽ νὐ κάηαηνο ἂλ ἐθαίλεην, η῅ο αἰηίαο πξνθαλνῦο ὑπαξρνχζεο θαὶ η῅ο δηνξζψζεσο ἐλ ἟κῖλ θεηκέλεο; ηῶλ γὰξ ἀλζξψπσλ εἰο ἀιαδνλείαλ θαὶ θηινρξεκνζχλελ, ἔηη δὲ ῥᾳζπκίαλ ἐθηεηξακκέλσλ θαὶ κὴ βνπινκέλσλ κήηε γακεῖλ κή᾽, ἐὰλ γήκσζη, ηὰ γηλφκελα ηέθλα ηξέθεηλ, ἀιιὰ κφιηο ἓλ ηῶλ πιείζησλ ἠ δχν ράξηλ ηνῦ πινπζίνπο ηνχηνπο θαηαιηπεῖλ θαὶ ζπαηαιῶληαο ζξέςαη, ηαρέσο ἔιαζε ηὸ θαθὸλ αὐμεζέλ.\]

\(^{1274}\) W. Scheidel, *Quantifying the Sources of Slaves in the Early Roman Empire*, *JRS* 87 (1997), 167.


\(^{1276}\) *TAM* V2 1252 (41/41 or 43/44 – 51/52 AD).
We can only speculate on how many slaves there were in an average household. If we accept the supposition of slave population as only about one tenth of total, then most of the slaves will have to belong to upper class families, while only better off middle class families will have a slave or two. Presumably, if the higher estimate is accepted, a wider slave ownership among the middle class becomes a real possibility. In such a scenario an average middle class family could have two or three slaves in the household, and even families of more humble means could afford some. Members of the elite certainly sustained whole households of slaves as seen in at Thermai Theseos, a village of Mokkadene in Lydia, part of an estate belonging to the wealthy C. Iulius Quadratus, where we find an association (κολληγία) formed by the (slave) household (φαμιλία). These slaves too were probably largely domestic and not a part of the rural workforce.

### 7.3 Family ties

According to the Roman law, there was no such thing as a slave family. Most of the Roman jurists are quite clear on this point. Greek attitude was similar, any union among slaves or between slaves and free was legally invalid. Children born from such union were slaves that belonged to owner of their parent(s) and could become free only through the act of manumission.

But, even though from a legal standpoint slaves were not supposed to have a family, the inscriptions show a different picture. Examples of union between citizens and slaves exist even in Rome. As a component of Anatolian society, the slave

---

families certainly existed in large numbers, even if they were unrecognized by the jurists. Thus, the documents recording existence of such families are very important for obtaining the complete image of the society. It seems slaves were actually encouraged to form some kind of marital relationship.\textsuperscript{1278} One of the reasons was probably economic, breeding slave children either for domestic work or sale. It was also in the master’s interest that the slaves have stable family life that made them content and the number of slaves was increased.\textsuperscript{1279}

An interesting example is a funerary monument for a slave Dadouchos and his family,\textit{doulos pragmateutes} of the senator C. Iulius Philippus (\textbf{LS 11}).\textsuperscript{1280}

\begin{verbatim}
\end{verbatim}

Another \textit{doulos pragmateutes}, Eutychianos, from the estate of Flavia Politta in Apollonis, also erected an inscription for his kind-hearted daughter in law Prepousa, himself, his wife, children and grandchildren.\textsuperscript{1281}

On Pisido-Phrygian border one Auxilia, a slave of Telemachos, made a funerary inscription for her sons, Agathopous and Germanos, out of her own funds.\textsuperscript{1282}

A homeborn slave (probably of the Imperial house) Loukios from Dorylaion made the inscription for himself and his wife (σύνθιος) Aurelia Themisto.\textsuperscript{1283} She was probably a freedwoman from the same household, but because the inscription cannot be precisely dated there is a slight possibility she was a freeborn who received her imperial

\textsuperscript{1278} Riel, Legal and social status, 99.
\textsuperscript{1279} K. Bradley, Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire: A Study in Social Control, Brussels 1984, 47-51.
\textsuperscript{1280} \textit{IK Trralleis} 194 (2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD).
\textsuperscript{1281} TAM V2 1213: Δὐηπρηαλὸο Φι(αβίαο) Πσιιίηηεο ὑπαηηθ῅ο δ(νῦινο) πξαγκαηεπηὴο / Πξεπνύζῃ πἱνῦ / γπλαηθὶ ςπρῆ ἀγαζῆ κλείαο ράξηλ θαὶ ἑαπ/ηῷ θαὶ γπλαηθὶ θαὶ ηέθλνηο θαὶ ἐγγόλνηο.
\textsuperscript{1283} MAMA 5 Lists I(i),182,123: Λνύθηνο δνῦινο / νὐέξλαο ηνῦ θπξίνπ / Αὐξ(ειίᾳ) Θεκηζηῷ γιπ/θπηάηῃ ζπλβίῳ / κλήκεο ράξηλ / θ(ὲ) ἑαπηῷ δῶλ.
gentilicium after 212 AD. In eastern Phrygia, Commodus, a slave of one L. Calpurnius (?) Proculus erected a funerary *bomos* for his son Zotikos, wife Mikka and himself.  

A possible family of slaves is also attested in a funerary inscription from Philadelphia. It was set up by the *oikonomos* Agathephoros and his wife Iuliane:  


In one inscription from Saïttai, a freedman of Lonkhas named Antheros was perhaps a biological son of the father of Ti. Claudius Lonkhas and a slave.

A rare example is found in the plains of Axylon where a free woman named Pardalas had a son with her slave Epaphroditos and they were all buried together in the same tomb. The possible shame on unions between slaves and freed was not nearly as strong for freedmen as it was for the freeborn. Slaves and freedmen associated freely, especially members of the same *familia*.

There are examples of slaves and freedmen who were an important part of master’s *familia* and sometimes buried in the shared tomb.

In the area close to Thyateira a master named Antoninos erected a funerary inscription for his slave Dionysios, together with the slave’s parents and brothers and his own *syntrophos* Eutychion.

\[\text{ἐτους σέζ', μη(νὸς) Πα/νήμου ν' ἀ(πιόντος). / Διονύσιον ἐτε/μήσαν Ἀντωνεί/νος ὁ κύριος κ(αί) οἱ / γονεῖς κ(αί) οἱ ἀδελ/φοι κ(αί) Ἐυτυχίων / τὸν σύντροφον. / χαῖρε παροδείτα.}\]

---


1285 TAM V3 1845 (243/244 AD); cf. the editor’s commentary.

1286 SEG XXXI 1018: [ - - - - - - - - - - ] / Τι Κλαυδίος [- - ca.8- -] / Λογνᾶς ἔτειμησαν Ἀνθή/ρον Λονγά / τὸν πατρικὸν αὐ/τοῦ ἀπελεύθησαν ὁ θάνατος και ὤν / θέραντα Τι Κλαυδίος Ἀνθή/ρος ὁ ὀυ/δὲς αὐτοῦ καὶ Κλαυ/δία Χαρίτιον ἢ σύνης αὐ/τοῦ ἔτειμησαν Ἀμμα καὶ Μόσχιον καὶ Λαφίαν τὸν ἐα[υ]/τὸν πατέρα ἐτειμήσαν / Ἀνθήρε ἦρε χαῖρε.


1288 I. e. TAM V2 1050 (Thyateira); TAM V3 1911 (Philadelphia); TAM V3 1829 (Philadelphia); Hermann, Malay, New documents no. 4 (near Thyateira, imperial period); MAMA V 89 (Dorylaion); IK Laodikeia am Lykos 85; IGR IV 720 (Blaundos).
In Thyateira, one Stratonikos, son of Eunomos, also allowed members of his immediate family, wife, children, grandchildren as well as foster-children and freedmen to be interred in his tomb: \(^{1290}\)

ζων / Στρατόνεικος Eινό/μου κατεσκεύασεν τὸ / μνημεῖον αὐτῶ καὶ / γυναικὶ καὶ τέκνοις
καὶ ἐκγόνοις αὐτῶν καὶ / θρέμμασι καὶ ἀπελευ/θέροις. ἐὰν δὲ τις ἀπαλ/λοτριώσει τὸ
μνημεῖον / ἢ τὸν κειμένον τινὰ ἐξω / βάλῃ ἢ ἐκκόψῃ τὴν ἐπι/γραφήν, ὑποκείσεται τῇ /
Θυατερηνὸν πόλει (δὴν.) ὑπ’. / τῆςδὲ ἐπιγραφῆς ἀπε[τι(?)]/θέμην τάντιγραφον / εἰς τὸ
άρχειον.

In another similar example, a Roman official whose name cannot be restored and who spent some time with the legions V Macedonica, VII Claudia pia fidelis, IV Scythica and I Itallica, also allowed his family and freedmen to be buried in the same tomb: \(^{1291}\)

ζων / [. . . ]ος Γ. νιός Σε<ρ>γ(ίᾳ) Σεκου[νδ — — / πρ]αγματευόμενος ἐν ἑπαρ[χειά
Γαλα/τί(?)]α παραχειμαστικοῖς λεγ[ώνων ἐ. Μα/κε]δονικῆς καὶ ζ. Κλ[αυδίας] Πιστῆς
Εὔσεβοῦς / κ]αι δ’ Σκυθικῆς καὶ α’ Ίταλικῆς [τὸ μνημεῖον ἑαυτῶ καὶ τέκνοις καὶ
ἐγγό[νους καὶ] / γυναιξίν αὐτῶν καὶ ἀπελευθ[ροί καὶ] / Δαίμοσιν Ἕληνας Ποπλίου
θξ[ατρός] / Φλαουίας τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ Λ. Φω[. c. 6 . . ] / Ποπληνοῦ τοῦ τέκνου
κατεσκ[εύασεν].

In Akmoneia a wealthy Roman citizen Titus Flavius Praxias, built a tomb for himself and his family and posterity. His freedmen are also allowed to be buried in the same tomb. \(^{1292}\) The inscription includes the usual clauses prohibiting anyone else from being buried there. Praxias’ freedmen were apparently considered as members of the (extended) family:

\(^{1290}\) TAM V2 1129 ll. 1-12.
\(^{1291}\) TAM V2 1143 (Thyateira).
\(^{1292}\) MAMA VI 272.
Likewise, in Eumeneia, an Aurelius and his wife allowed many members of his household to be buried in his heroon, including his household intendant Charis, freedwoman Eutychia, his foster-child Hippodamia, his nurse (?) Symphoris, Symphoros, Symphoris and Zotikos:

The expression in l. 6 πρόοικος was probably a household manager or “intendante”.

The relationship between masters and their slaves and freedmen was at times quite close and words of affection could occasionally been seen on the epitaphs. One such example from Philomelion in Phrygia is an epitaph made by Aurelius Leukis for his slave Basilike. She is praised for her σπουδή and εὐνοια. A freedman, named Chares used kind words for his relations with his former master. In a verse funerary inscription from Philadelphia, a freedman named Skeptikos praised his benevolent master for allowing him to be buried in front of his tomb:

Σκέπτικος Ἀρχελάου ἀπε/λεύθερος ἐνθάδε κείμαι /
δεσπότεω χρηστοὺ / λαϊνέων πρὸ τάφων.

---

1293 SEG XXVIII 1154.
1294 J. and L. Robert, BE 1979, no. 520.
1295 MAMA VII 200a = I Sultan Dağı 11.
1296 TAM V1 18 (Lyendos).
1297 TAM V3 1919.
In the case of some ὑπάμονοι in Lydia and Phrygia, more epithets are attested, such as χρηστός (worthy, good), ἀρεσφίλης (beloved), ὀθεινότατος (strongly missed), or πιστός (trustworthy).1301

This is a proper place to consider one widespread assumption on the treatment of slaves in the Roman Empire. Namely, that the quality of their life improved significantly during the Early Empire. It is also stated that slave were respected far more then before and that more progressive owners finally began to treat them as human beings.1302 The support for these claims is usually found in a number of Greek and Latin authors of the 1st and 2nd century AD. In his speech on slavery Dio Chrysostom said: οἱ ἀνθρώποι ἐπιθυμοῦσι μὲν ἑλεύθεροι εἶναι μάλιστα πάντων, καὶ φασί τὴν ἑλεύθεριαν μέγιστον τῶν ἀγαθῶν, τὴν δὲ δουλείαν αἰσχρότατον καὶ δυστυχέστατον ὑπάρχειν, αὐτὸ δὲ τούτο ὃ τι ἐστὶ τὸ ἑλεύθερον εἶναι ἢ ὃ τι τὸ δουλεῖειν, οὐκ ἴσασιν.1303 In various other discourses, Dio affirms that slaves are human beings and that they ought to be treated as such. He treats the misuse of slaves as shameful and possible source of moral corruption for the slave owners. Cassius Dio treats killing of slaves as a crime.1304 Similar ideas can be found among the Roman writers. Seneca the Younger clearly states that slaves are human too and he disapproves of brutal physical punishment of slaves.1305 To abandon old or sick slave is a crime for Suetonius.1306 Younger Pliny even shows understanding for some slaves that went so far as to kill their brutal and abusive master.1307

Does all this, together with the epigraphic evidence discussed, prove that living conditions of slaves improved in the 1st century AD? Most probably not. As some of the supporters of this idea are well aware, most of the “signs” of this improvement are

1298 TAM V1 188 (Saittai, 169/170 AD).
1299 MAMA X 194 (Appia, late 2nd or early 3rd century AD).
1300 Waelkens, Türsteine 615 (Vetissos).
1301 MAMA IX P191 (Aizanoi).
1303 Dio Chr, 14.1, 4: “Men desire, more than anything else, to be free, and they say that freedom is the greatest of blessings, while the slavery is the most shameful and wretched of states; and yet they have no knowledge of the essential nature of this freedom and this slavery of which they speak”; English translation by J. W. Cohoon.
1306 Suet. Cl. 25.
present already in the Hellenistic age, if not earlier. The alleged improvement of lives of slaves is usually explained as the sign of decrease in their numbers: they were harder to come by then previously, more expensive and valuable and thus better taken care of. But we have already seen that this supposed decline in number of slaves during the Early Empire is probably a modern fiction. Closer personal connections between slaves and free are also attested in epigraphic monuments in the Hellenistic world. Strong statements about slaves as living tools, objects or property are particular of the legal perspective on the question of slavery. The above mentioned statements by various writers and philosophers are actually in harmony with the age-old views. Even the philosophy of Epictetus approaches the questions of slavery and freedom from a conservative stoic point of view. The quoted sentence of Dio belongs to the same realm of philosophy. Stoics differentiated between real and superficial freedom and slavery. “Really” free is the philosopher, a person confident in his knowledge and in control of his wishes and passions. Whether or not this person wears shackles or a crow is irrelevant. The person is free if he or she is free on internal plane, everything outside is of less importance. Such a position achieved little in the way of analysis of the real slavery and certainly offered no solace to those actually in shackles.

7.4 Occupations

Inscriptions commemorating slaves and freedmen are known from every province of the empire; they are almost all found in urban contexts, which of course reflects the general pattern of epigraphic habit. Where the occupation is indicated, it is almost always urban; the majority of slaves whose role is recorded were employed as personal servants, to officials, soldiers or local notables, with a few involved in the imperial administration and a few employed in crafts and trade. There were obviously many slaves in Lydia and Phrygia. Slaves originating from Anatolia are frequently mentioned in the literary tradition: Phrygian slaves in particular had long become a standard motif, while Lydia, Caria and Cappadocia also gathered attention.

Slaves’ main occupation continued to be domestic and personal service, in the broadest sense, from doctors, secretaries and tutors to cooks, dressers and masseurs. Generally speaking, females mostly worked around the house, while male slaves were also secretaries, *paedagogi*, or business agents. On Pisido-Phrygian border one female estate manager is attested.\(^{1310}\)

Εἰρήνη Λονγύλλιανοῦ καὶ / Σεωύήρου οἰκονόμισσα Στά/χωι τῷ ἱδίῳ ἀνδρὶ σεμνοτάτῳ / μνείας χάριν.

Although there was an opinion that Eirene was the wife of an *oikonomos* named Stachys, Robert later argued that she was in the service of Longillianus and Severus as a slave and that Stachys was only named as her husband.\(^{1311}\) Nothing in the inscription points to her servile status, but we are probably entitled to assume it.

In Hierapolis an epitaph of the *paidagogos* Heliodoros is preserved:\(^{1312}\)

ἡ σορός καὶ ὁ τόπος Ἡλιοδώρου παιδαγωγοῦ, / ἐν Ἕ κηδευθῆται αὐτόςέτερος δέ οὐδείς / μετὰ τὴν τελευτήν αὐτοῦ· ἐὰν δὲ τὶς τολμήσῃ ὑ/πεναντίον, δῶσαι προστίμου τῷ φίσκῳ (δήναρα) φ᾽· / ἃν προνοήσονταί οἱ παιδευταί καὶ οἱ κηδό/μενοι τοῦ Ἡλιοδώρου· ταύτης τῆς ἑπιγραφῆς / ἀντίγραφον ἀπετέθη εἰς τὰ ἄρχεια:

Judging by the fact that the tomb was going to be looked after by *παιδευταί*, Heliodoros’ professional colleagues, we could perhaps deduce that he was a slave without relatives.

Many slaves participated in nurturing and rearing their masters’ children as well as other children in and outside the household. In a recently published inscription from Hypaipa previously unattested expression ἄνθρωποι θερητικοί is documented and the editors believe it could be an equivalent to ἄνθρωποι τροφεῖς and *nutritores*.\(^{1313}\)

---

\(^{1310}\) MAMA VIII 399 = I Sultan Daği 567.

\(^{1311}\) L. Robert, *Hellenica* XIII, 106-107 esp. n. 4: “elle aussi était intendante et elle était esclave.”

\(^{1312}\) SEG LIV 1338 A II. 1-7.

\(^{1313}\) M. Ricl, H. Malay, ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΙ ΘΡΕΠΤΙΚΟΙ in a new inscription from Hypaipa, *EA* 38 (2005), 50 = SEG LV 1288 (2nd century AD).
Two women, Elpis and her friend or relative purchased the funerary complex intended for their large families. Unlike them, their husbands have neither patronymic nor ethnicity and this could be seen as a sign of their low status. They seem to be in a subordinate position as it was the wives who bought the funerary complex themselves. The future freedmen of the house who were at the time in charge of nurturing their masters’ children will have the right to be interred in the heroon. It seems that thanks to the slaves’ close relations to Elpis and the rest of the family, the ones who nurtured their masters’ children could expect an early manumission and the privilege of being buried in the family tomb.

In northeast Lydia, there are several inscriptions mentioning seven, or in one case even 34 people reared by the same couple or individual. A couple in Tomara who nurtured eight slaves of one Antistius Priscus:  

---

1314 M. Ricl, H. Malay, ANΩΡΩΠΟΙ ΘΡΕΠΤΙΚΟΙ, 47.  
1315 M. Ricl, H. Malay, ANΩΡΩΠΟΙ ΘΡΕΠΤΙΚΟΙ, 48.  
1316 M. Ricl, H. Malay, ANΩΡΩΠΟΙ ΘΡΕΠΤΙΚΟΙ, 50.  
1317 SEG XLIX 1620 (Maionia, imperial period).  
1318 TAM V1 764 (Iulia Gordos), 782 (Tomara, 120/121 AD); SEG XL 1093 (Lydia, 175/176 AD); Hermann, Malay, New documents no. 37 (west of Daldis, Roman Imperial period).  
1320 Ricl, Legal and social status, 108.
As Ricl suggested, there is a possibility that there were couples and individuals specialized in bringing up and training other people’s slaves or exposed and rescued children. This possibility is sustained by the attestation of two Phrygian male educators designated as ἀππαξ. There are just a few epigraphic attestations of slaves active in agriculture and Broughton argued that agricultural slavery was of little importance. This assumption has a large following. In the Phrygian inscription slaves are used as cattle shepherds, in the area of Kula, there was a five year old boy, probably a slave who was also a shepherd. In Thermai Theseos there is a whole family of slaves on the estate of a possible descendant of illustrious Pergamene family, one C. Iulius Quadratus:

Slavery in industry was equally conspicuous by its absence. As we have seen there are several indications that there were slaves working in the textile or wood industries in Saittai. There are two possible attestations of slaves in Saittai, belonging to the same family and few other examples, also in Saittai, as three persons

---

1321 TAM V1 782 (Tomara, 120/121 AD).
1322 Ricl, Legal and social status, 108.
1323 MAMA VII 170 (Hadrianopolis); MAMA VIII 357 (Killanion Plain).
1324 TAM V1 71 (Thermai Theseos, 140/141 AD); TAM V1 317 (are of Kula, early 2nd century AD); MAMA IV 297 (Dionysopolis, 3rd century AD).
1325 Broughton, Asia Minor under the Empire 27BC – 337 AD, 690-692; see also W. Westermann, The Slave Systems, 120.
1326 TAM V1 85; SEG XXIX 1186; cf. also Zimermann, Handwerksvereine, 93-95.
Ammianus,\textsuperscript{1327} Attalianos\textsuperscript{1328} and Iulianus\textsuperscript{1329} do not have their patronymic indicated in the inscriptions, a possible indicator of their servile status. As we have seen in Saittai a certain Octavius Polykleites is one of the local lanarioi.\textsuperscript{1330} The Octavii Polliones are known as one of the most prominent families in the city. Perhaps the person mentioned in the inscription is either their freedman or his son. Incidentally, the same family had a slave Philetairos as a member of the association of tektones.\textsuperscript{1331} In an epitaph from Philadelphia, a female linen worker named Trophime is attested.\textsuperscript{1332} As she has no patronymic we could perhaps suppose her servile status.

A special category of slaves were gladiators. One is attested in Saittai as a member of the first team of gladiators and probably had won some victories in the arena:\textsuperscript{1333}

\[\text{Μάτερνος δού[λας / πά]λ(ος α' [νι(κόν)...].}\]

Another possible, although not explicit example is a new funerary inscription for a gladiator from Tralleis: Σπικλος Στράτων μνείας χάριν.\textsuperscript{1334} Apart from inscription, this monument contains a relief depicting gladiator within a rectangular recess. We see a typical representation of a gladiator resting on his right foot. In his hands he carries a small square shield and a short curved sword. The gladiator’s face is completely covered by the helmet and the shield. His name Σπικλος probably derived from Latin spīculus, “sharp, pointed”. It is another kind of utilitarian slave-name, appropriate for a highly distinct profession.

\section*{7.5 Hierodouloi}

The sacred manumission is a curious social and religious institution that existed in many parts of the Greek speaking world. It is encountered in Delphi and elsewhere in

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item TAM V1 84: epitaph made by συνεργασία τῶν λινουργῶν.
\item SEG XXIX 1195: epitaph made by συνεργασία τῶν πιλοποιοί.
\item TAM V1 83: epitaph made by συνεργασία τῶν λινουργῶν.
\item TAM V1 85 (145/146 AD).
\item SEG XXIX 1186 (165/166 AD).
\item TAM V3 1790.
\item TAM V1 140; cf. L. Robert, Les gladiateurs, 161 no. 136 and p. 286.
\item A. Saraçoğlu, M. Çekilmez, A Gladiator Stele From Tralleis, \textit{EA} 43 (2010), 57–58.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Central Greece, in Macedonia, Asia Minor and Syria. The very geographical and chronological disparity gave rise to doubts if we are actually dealing with a single phenomenon. The nature of this institution too caused a fair amount of puzzlement for scholars, as well as the issue of the actual status of these sacred slaves (\textit{hierodouloi}). Their position regarding the sanctuary, the deity and their former masters needs some clarification as well as the issue of their actual freedom or bondage. Are these “sacred slaves” slaves at all?

Westermann made an attempt to solve these questions by claiming that the “sacred manumission” was, actually, a full and complete manumission. In his opinion, once the transaction (either dedication or sale) was done, the person in question was really free by the very nature of the act itself. He could, of course, remain in the sanctuary as \textit{hierodoulos} but this had little in common with the “secular” slavery. Westermann believed that slavery was a secular institution foreign to the Greek religion and that Greek gods, at least formally, could never own slaves.\footnote{\textit{W. L. Westermann}, Slavery and the Elements of Freedom in Ancient Greece, \textit{Quarterly Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences} 2 (1943), 1-14.} Sokolowski praised the overall value of Westermann’s attempt and some of his insights but rejected the general conclusion. He pointed out to a well documented fact (one that Westermann was well aware of, but tried to downplay its significance) that Greek sanctuaries could purchase and sell slaves like any other public institutions or private persons. Sokolowski criticized several distinguished scholars for their half-hearted attempts to solve a complex and important question. “I think therefore that the real meaning of the sacral manumission is not clear, the terms ‘trust sale,’ ‘fiduciary sale,’ and ‘apparent sale’ are too nebulous.”\footnote{\textit{F. Sokolowski}, The Real Meaning of Sacral Manumission, \textit{Harvard Theological Review} 47-3 (1954), 174.}

Most of the difficulties in understanding the sacred manumission lay in explaining the precise meaning of \textit{paramone} (i.e. “waiting period”, “obligation to continue in service, of a slave whose manumission is deferred”)\footnote{\textit{LSJ sv. παραμονή}.} clause in this type of inscriptions. Why obligation and delay, if a slave is freed by being dedicated to a deity? It seems that by this transaction a slave acquired a special status that insured the protection against any future attempts at seizure but also included certain obligations, at least during a trial period. This important assumption needs to be examined in the light

\footnotesize{\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{1335} W. L. Westermann, Slavery and the Elements of Freedom in Ancient Greece, \textit{Quarterly Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences} 2 (1943), 1-14. \\
1337 \textit{LSJ sv. παραμονή}. \\
\end{tabular}}
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of an important inscription from Phrygia were the sacred manumission seems to be thwarted. There are also profound differences between the obligations of a *hierodoulos* and those of an ordinary slave. “The transfer of the slave to the god could be carried out in two ways: by the master or by the slave himself. The dedication by the master with or without the condition of liberty is attested by numerous documents from all periods of Greek history. Other scholars were closer to the opinion that *hierodouloi* initially were real slaves but their status evolved over time and the ownership of the “sacred slave” became a special position based on a trust and acceptance rather than the actual physical possession. This is in agreement with Ricl who suggested that “people of the sanctuary were perhaps originally completely slave and parts of the patrimony (*hieroi douloi*); then they slowly developed into various statuses (*hieroi, hierodouloi* and sim.), remaining tied to the sanctuary in a kind of symbiosis.”

As we have seen earlier, in Roman Imperial period private persons had the customs of donating their slaves to local sanctuaries. There are several explicit attestations of *hierodouloi* in Lydia. One is attributed to the area of Hierokaisareia from the mid-2nd century BC. There are also three from the Roman period, two undated from Iaza and one more from the 3rd century AD Maionia.

Of the three *hierodouloi* mentioned in these inscriptions, two have patronymics and one of them is mentioned as a *synierodoulos* of a priest. More commonly used is the expression *hieroi*, attested several times in Lydia and frequently used in

---

1339 *TAM* V2 1252.
1341 *TAM* V1 459: ἱερόδουλον Τρόφομον Ἡ<Πη>α καὶ Διὸς Σαβδίου / ποιήσας συρήνα ὑπὸ ἐξου[σίας κοιλαθῆς ἵππος] ἑκκάτης τῆς στήλης, *TAM* V1 483a ll. 15-17: καὶ Γλύκων [ὁ ἱεροόρσι] τοῦ συνεργόδουλου ἐπέστησεν ἱεροοίρσι στεφάνος; cf. also SEG LVII 1185 (Kollyda, 197/198 AD).
1342 *TAM* V1 593 (250/251 AD).
1343 Ricl, Society and Economy of Rural Sanctuaries, p. 88.
1344 *TAM* V1 182 (area of Saittai); 423 (Kollyda); 681 (Characipolis); *TAM* V2 1348 (Magnesia ad Sipylum); SEG XXXIV 1219 (Saittai); Petzl, *Beichtinschriften* no. 5; 1 Manisa Museum 234.
Katagraphe inscriptions from the sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos near Hierapolis. In Lydian inscriptions hieroi appear to be a group active in a sanctuary, not as individuals. Ricl appropriately pointed out that “it is difficult to say whether the terms δούλος τῶν θεῶν, ἱερόδουλος and ἱερός found in the Lydian inscriptions define a status or an office (or both).”

In Phrygian katagraphe inscriptions consecrated slaves became ἱεροὶ κοι ἐλεύθεροι, while consecrated freeborn children were ἱεροὶ. There are no precise information on the duties of hierodouloi and hieroi in and around sanctuary. They could have participated in cult ceremonies, but also had some work on temple estates or workshops. In Aizanoi one hieros by the name of Hermas is attested; he took care of δημόσια γράμματα. The legal and social status of slaves of gods varied according with local traditions and periods. So far, no freedmen of gods are attested either in Lydia or in Phrygia.

An unusually intriguing and difficult confession inscription from the same sanctuary is also documenting what seems to be a failed sacred manumission. A former slave whose name is only partly preserved (Neik...) confesses his many sins to Helios Apollo. Among them is a sacred manumission of one of the family slaves. This was done without the consent of the master who demanded the manumission be cancelled; this, however, was a breach of promise given to sanctuary: καὶ παραγγείλας μοι τοῦ θεοῦ μὴ δίδων / [τὴν] ἐλευθερίαν τῷ κυρίῳ μου / [περὶ]ρίδικοκόμην ἐδώκα. The confessor even mentions a dream in which the deity came to claim the promised slave: ἐκολ/άσθην ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πολλὰ / [καὶ] ὑπερασπάθη καὶ / ἐπενποδῶν ἐκαθόκως ἐμόν / δοῦλον καὶ ἄν πόλας ἵζομεν[ν] / καὶ κεῖθεν ἄνάξιον.

This document provides an interesting example of unrealized sacred manumission. At first glance, the problem is the one of manumission initiated by a

---

1345 Ricl, Society and Economy of Rural Sanctuaries, p. 89.
1346 MAMA IX P28.
1347 More on this see Ricl, Society and Economy of Rural Sanctuaries, 90.
1348 MAMA IV 279 (2nd or 3rd century AD); cf. Ricl, Svest o grehu, 239-240 no. 124.
1349 MAMA IV 279 ll. 7-10.
1350 MAMA IV 279 ll. 10-15.
person lacking the legal power. It seems that the official position of the sanctuary was that the manumission was valid and that it should be carried through.

7.6 Imperial slaves and freedmen

Imperial slaves and freedmen are not so frequently attested in Lydia and Phrygia compared to some other parts of the Roman Empire. They belonged to a distinct category which was not affected by the usual problems of slave labor. Their social position and financial status was noticeably different than the average slave population.

One very interesting inscription from Hadrianopolis in Phrygia is documenting one imperial homeborn slave as eirenarch:  

Κοσμίων κυρίου Καίσα/ρος οὐ/έρνας ε/ίρη/νάρχης Δ/ί Μεγίστω ε/ύ/χήν.

It is unusual to find an imperial verna holding the eirenarchia. He was perhaps a kind of police officer but connected with an Imperial estate and not a municipal magistrate. One imperial freedman, known from the dedications to Zeus Bennios from the Upper Tembris Valley, was, after manumission, an ε/ιρηνοφύλαξ τής ἐ/παρχείας, a kind of police officer of the eparcheia, equivalent of the municipal eirenarchai.

ἐπὶ ύπάτων Ο/ύσεπασιανοῦ Καίσα/ρος τὸ 0’ καὶ Τίτον Καίσαρος τὸ ζ’, Τ/ίτος Φλάβιος Ἡλ/λος Ο/ύσεπασια/νοῦ Καίσαρος ἀ/πελεύθερος ε/ίρη/νο/φύλαξ τής ἐ/παρχείας, ύδος δὲ Γλύκωνος Τειμαίου Ἀγροστεα/νοῦ, ὑπὲρ τῶν Σεβαστῶν καὶ ὑπὲρ / ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ὑπὲρ Σε/ξτιλίας Πο/πλίου / θυγατρός Ἡδονῆς τής ἑαυτοῦ γυναικὸς / καὶ ὑπὲρ Τίτου Φλαβίου Σε/ξτιλιανοῦ Ἡλίου υἱοῦ ἰδίου Δ/ί Βέννιῳ τής ἑαυτοῦ πατρ/ί/δος Ἀγροστεων καὶ Ζβουρῆς καὶ τ/οῖς πατρίοις θεοῖς εὐξάμενος ἀνέθηκεν.

1351 MAMA VII 135 = I Sultan Dağı 396.
1352 See also ed. pr. J. G. C. Anderson, A summer in Phrygia II, JHS 18 (1898), 123.
1353 On this particular inscription see also Schultess in RE Suppl. III s. v. ε/ιρηνάρχα, p. 420: “nicht städtischer E. gewesen sein, sondern bloß über die kaiserliche Domäne”; Magie, Roman Rule, 1514 n. 46: “his duties may have been limited to an imperial domain”.
1354 SEG XL 1232 (79 AD); also SEG XL 1233.
It seems that Helios, Glykon and Teimaios worked as slaves on the imperial estate on which also the marble quarries near Soa were situated. After manumission and enfranchisement, apart from the new office and new name, T. Flavius Helios married the free-born woman Sextilia Hedone. From this one, as well the other dedication to the same deity, we can see they had a son, T. Flavius Sextilianus Helios. Another possibility could be that he was freeborn, but sold himself into slavery, perhaps for easier advancement in the administration.

One imperial freedman was honored as *euergetes* in the inscription from Stektorion:1355

ή βουλή καὶ ὁ δήμος / ἐτείμισεν Μ. Αὐρ. / Σεβαστῶν ἀπελευθέρων Κρήσκεντα, ἐπὶ τροπον Δυνδοῦ/νοι Γαλλίας καὶ ἐπὶ τον Φρυγίας καὶ ἐπὶ τον καστρήσιν, ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ εὐεργετήσαντα / τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν· τοῦ ἄνδριάντος τὴν ἀνάστασιν / ποιησάμενον Αὐρ. Σε/βαστῶν ἀπελευθέρου / Ζωσίμου.

Another example, found in Tyriaion, is an honorary inscription by the *boule* and *demos* honoring a freedman Publius.1356 An imperial freedman Maximus was honored in Attaleia as a benefactor of the *koinei*on neoteron.1357

One epitaph to a child of five suggests that the father was residing at Nakoleia at the time. As he was a slave of an emperor, he was probably attached to the nearby imperial estates:1358


Another funerary inscription, from Laodikeia on the Lykos, documents an imperial freedman with his family, slaves and freedmen:1359

---

1355 Ramsey, *Cities and Bishoprics*, 704, 641.
1356 I Sult n Dğı 365: 'Αδριανοπολειτῶν ἡ ἴμβολη καὶ ὁ δήμος ἐτείμισαν Πούσπλιον ὑπελευθέρησαν Αὐρ. / Σεβαστῶν ἀπελευθέρων τοῦ ἄνδριάντος τὴν ἀνάστασιν / ποιησάμενον Αὐρ. Σεβαστῶν ἀπελευθέρου / Ζωσίμου.
1357 TAM V2 845: [Μαμίῳ Σεβαζή/νυ] / ἀπειεπζέξῳ θν[ηλεῖ(?)]/νλ ηὸ λεώηεξνλ η / ἰδίῳ εὐεξγέηῃ.
1358 MAMA V 201 (18/19 AD).
1359 IK Laodikeia am Lykos 85.
The position and possible wealth of some imperial slaves and freedmen is documented by one inscription from Dionysopolis, where a slave of Domitia Augusta, wife of the emperor Domitian, donated some roof tiles and money for the sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos:  


Another example would be Eutyches, an imperial slave in north Phrygia who erected statue of Apollo in the sanctuary of Apollo, celebrating his master’s victory:  


In Tralleis, Chresimos, freedman of emperor Nerva, helped the building of thermae in the gymnasion:  

In Tyriaion there is also a dedication by an imperial freedman, (M. Aurelius) Eukleides, to an emperor. The emperor, probably Commodus, was hailed as νέος Ἡλιος.\footnote{MAMA VII 107 = I Sult n D ğı 343: [ὑπὲρ νείκης . . . . . Λύτο/κράτωρς νέον Ἡλίου/ou [Κομμ/δοῦ Μάρκο/ς / Α]υ/γ:ός Ε]ικλειδί[ς/ ἀπείκ/εθος Καίσαρας Αὐτο/κράτωρ Δι/γήτῳ / [σ]ύ/χήν].}

A prayer for Trajan’s well-being and victory erected by an imperial slave in 104 AD, one year before the final conflict with Decebalus in Dacia, is probably found in Sebaste:\footnote{SEG XXXI 1124}

υπὲρ τῆς Αὐτοκράτορος / Νέρουα Τραίανοῦ Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικο<ν> / Δαμιανοί αἰωνίου δια/μονῆς τε καὶ νείκης / Εὐφραστος Καίσαρος / δούλου ἑτοὺς / ῥη’, μη(νὸς) θ’.\footnote{MAMA V Lists I(i) 182,122: Καρπάκος Ἀγαθάπο/δι δούλῳ τοῦ κυρίου Λύτοκράτορος, / ἀπεί τῶν ἐν Συννάδοις, σὸν τῇ γυναικὶ Δύ/μην καὶ τέκνως αὐ/τοῦ μνίας χάριν ἀνε/θηκαν τὸν βομάν.}

In Dorylaion one Karikos, together with his wife and children, erected a bomos to Agathopous, an imperial slave, a horseman in Synnada.\footnote{R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, Not Wholly Free, 5.}

7.7 Manumissions

The institutionalized release from slavery was very common in Greco-Roman world. The frequency and general simplicity of manumission set ancient slavery apart from its medieval and modern counterparts. The manumission is probably the most neglected aspect of slavery in the modern historiography. The reason is probably that most of the students of ancient slavery consider manumission as the virtual end of slavery which is not true, strictly speaking.\footnote{R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, Not Wholly Free, 5.} At least in some variants of Greek manumissions, freed slaves retained a number of obligations toward their former masters. Although in strictly legal terms the rights attained by a freedman where equall to that of a resident foreigner, their social position was not the same. Once again, this is the area where Roman practice was more flexible and open.

Fortunately enough, in Greek and Roman society slaves could anticipate freedom if they worked hard and demonstrated skill. Legal manumission was the key.
Nevertheless, close bonds between former slaves and masters remain and are sometimes commemorative in the inscriptions.

Following Rachel Zelnick-Abramovitz’s study, taxonomy for Greek types of manumission may be schematized as follows, based primarily on the parties or entities involved: the public or private identity of the manumittor (the polis or a private citizen); the presence of a deity (sacral manumission); the involvement of political institutions; and the degree to which the action is publicized. All of these types involved witnesses such as family or friends – similar to Roman manumissio inter amicos – but whose presence served only for purpose of evidence in court, should it be needed. Because of the informal nature of these manumissions, little evidence survives. Two non-Roman manumission processes most common in the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire are well-attested: sacral and secular.1367

Slaves were manumitted with great frequency, and freedmen were accepted into Roman society. For centuries Romans had a tax of five percent on manumissions (vicesima manumissionum/libertatis).1368 In Lydia, Thyateira, we have a reference to an embassy trying to negotiate relief from the burden of 5% tax on manumission on behalf of the whole province of Asia.1369 We can deduce that the tax was a burden, probably due to the frequency of manumissions. We should also bear in mind, as Scheidel observed, that high rates of manumission can make a biologically reproducing slave population socially non-reproductive.1370

The most prominent ex-slave that ever came from Phrygia was the stoic philosopher Epictetus. He was born in the mid-1st century Phrygia, probably in Hierapolis as a child of slave parents.1371 The name he was given at birth is unknown as well as the names of his parents. In his young age he became a slave of Nero’s freedman

1368 The tax was introduced in 357 BC by the consul Manlius; the tax was filed under the agricultural category, and the duty and sum of the tax collection could be auctioned off to publicani who would go out and collect it, for more see K. Bradley, The vicesima libertatis: Its History and Significance, Klio 66 (1984), 175–182.
1369 TAM V2 973.
1370 W. Scheidel, Quantifying the Sources of Slaves in the Early Roman Empire, JRS 87 (1997), 157.
1371 In Asia some importance seems to be invested in the fact that he was of the local origin. There is a stoic diatribe preserved in an inscription from Pisidia (dated 150–200 AD), mentioning Epictetus as a slave, SEG XLVII 1757 II, 15-19: ὑ μέλε, ἔπιθηα ἀπὸ καηξὸο ἐηέρζε, / αἰὲ[ν ἀλζξώπσλ ζνθίᾳ θύδαλ’ <ἐ>κὰ θξήλ, / ὅλ ρξή κε ιέγεηλ· ζ<ε>ίνο γέλεη’· αἴζε δὲ θαὶ λῦλ / ηνηνῦηόο ηηο ἀλὴξ ὄθεινο κέγα θαὶ κέγα ράξκα / πάλησλ εὐμακέλσλ δνύιαο ἀπὸ καηξ.
and secretary (*a libelis*) Epaphroditus in Rome.\(^{1372}\) That gave him an opportunity to circulate among the Roman elite and study with the eminent Musonius Rufus. When Domitian in the early nineties expelled philosophers from the city, Epictetus went to Nicopolis in Epirus and attracted a large audience, including the historian Arrian and perhaps even, Hadrian. It should also be noted that there is no evidence as to whether Epictetus had previously been manumitted by Epaphroditus, or as to what his status was later on.\(^{1373}\) The long journey from Hierapolis to Rome was typical of the compulsory mobility to which Roman slaves from the Eastern provinces were normally subjected. One could say that it was because of slavery that Epictetus became a philosopher, as slavery seems to have brought him certain opportunities.\(^{1374}\) A striking feature of Epictetus’ teaching is a preoccupation with freedom; this preoccupation could be explained by the notion that a philosopher who had once been slave might well have had a far keener appreciation of liberty than one who had not.

Explicit mentions of manumissions in Lydia and Phrygia are comparatively rare. Two characteristic examples, one from each province, will be discussed. In Lyendos, one freedman, Chares, son of Chares erected a grave monument for his former mistress.\(^{1375}\) Their relation is described in a very positive manner.

Another category would be sacred manumissions. In this type of manumission a slave owner dedicated or sold a slave to a deity. A common feature of the sacral manumission was a *paramone* clause (from παραμένειν, “to remain, stay, or continue”), which stipulated that despite paying for the manumission (presumably the slave’s self-purchase) newly freed person had to continue serving the master for a certain period. The slave’s ostensible purchase of freedom presupposed a social and economic dislocation from the slave owner. Thus, the purpose of the *paramone* was to insure continued service after the slave was manumitted. A classic example of this type of manumission is attested in Pisidia:\(^{1376}\)

---

\(^{1372}\) *PIR²* E 74.

\(^{1373}\) For more see F. G. B. Millar, Epictetus and the Imperial Court, *JRS* 55 (1965), 141-148.


\(^{1375}\) *TAM* VI 18 II. 4-10: Χάρις Χάριτος ζητούσην(?) / τὰς ταφής τῆς κυρίας μου [—— ——— / ——— ——— ——— ———] ας, ἐς / μνήμας ἐς πόλις δικραία [χύσω / καλὰς ἄντοιχας υπέρ / ἐμοὶ καταληκτοῦσθε ἵππε[θερία]ν, ὦς ὦ / ΚΑΣ-ἀντροφός μου ττήρηκα / και ὄ βρέγοις.

Olympias was manumitted on the condition that she would stay, presumably with Aur. Marcia for the duration of the latter’s lifetime, but as a free woman in respect to everyone else. The inscription was engraved when Marcia was still alive, and μείνη was erased after her death, probably on Olympias’ initiative, since the latter’s paramone-obligation ended at that moment.1377

The same sanctuary also yielded an example of conditional manumission. The θρεπτή Ammia was manumitted by her owner Aurelia Ammia under the condition that she remains in the service of her former mistress.1378 This particular example is paralleled by many similar sacred manumissions from the sanctuary at Delphi.1379

It seems that slave-owners wished to re-capitalise the value of old or dispensable slaves, yet retain their services. The polis was probably interested in keeping the social distinctions by sanctioning the former masters’ rights to their freed slaves’ services; and since manumitted slaves were treated as other non-citizens and engaged in those kinds of work that were considered fit for slaves, manumission was to the advantage of the economic life in the polis.1380

Another category of inscriptions concerning manumissions are so called katagraphe inscriptions, especially from the same sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos. They are so called because of the repeated verb καταγράφω meaning to convey, transfer by deed, register under one’s name. As Ricl pointed out only the complete phrase ἔξειχόρησε καὶ παρεχώρησεν [καὶ κατέγραψεν]1381 is showing the whole procedure: “the master had first relinquished all his rights over the slave, than handed him over to the God and finally had him registered under the God’s name.”1382

1377 Ricl, A New Paramone-inscription, 33.
1378 MAMA IV 278 (239/240 AD).
1379 Cf. commentary of MAMA IV 278.
1381 SEG L. 1269 ll. 3-4 (237 AD).
1382 M. Ricl, Donations Of Slaves And Freeborn Children to Deities in Roman Macedonia and Phrygia: A Reconsideration, Tyche 16 (2001), 156.
In the last decade many new inscriptions of this type were published. In most of them the persons consecrated to Apollo are θερπτοί, but as Ricl proposed we should perhaps consider all θερπτοί from this sanctuary as slaves. There are two interesting examples documenting not only consecration of slaves but the conveyance of workshops, houses and tools, as well as incomes and expenditures to the donated slaves:

'Ετους σας', μη(νός) α', ζι' Ηλίῳ Ἀπόλλωνι Λαρίμηνῳ Ἀπολλώνιος Μηνο[κ]ρίτου καταγράφεται ζήνονα τὸν ἐμαυτὸν τεθραμμένον· εἰ δὲ τις ἐπενκαλέσας, θήσει εἰς τὸν θεὸν προσκύνησε τὸν θεον· ἐν τῇ ἱεραρχίᾳ καταγράφεται δὲ τὸ θύμιον τῆς ἕργαστήριαν κη τὸ δίστεκον κη ἄρμεν[α - - - ]α σὺν εἰσόδοις κη ἐξόδοις.

and


Both of these slaves were probably experts in their trade, had adjoining living quarters and were probably obliged to render services to the temple, but also provided for livelihood for a successful life of a free person.

Another katagraphe inscription provides more information on the age and origin of the slave:

---


1384 M. Ricl, Donations Of Slaves, 158.

1385 SEG LVIII 1522 (212/213 AD).

1386 SEG LVIII 1524 (218/219 AD).

1387 SEG LVIII 1529 (imperial period); cf. Τίτος Φλάβις 'Ἀρχιλλέως in SEG LVIII 1527.
The slave Neikon was around thirty years old and even the name of his previous owner is documented. It is also important to notice that this *katagraphe* was effective immediately: he becomes *hieros*, not answering to anyone but the God.\(^{1388}\)

The procedure of official manumissation through public archive and subsequent consecration of the slave to Apollo is attested in another document from the same sanctuary.\(^{1389}\) Achilleus freed the slave officially, submitting the papers of manumission to the city archives, and then assigned him to the god. Achilleus still refers to Epiktetos as ‘my slave’ in line 3, so editors believe that Epiktetos was perhaps still bound to him by *paramone*.

One other clause is attested several times in this type of documents; that consecrated and manumitted slave cannot be enslaved again.\(^{1390}\) The conveyed slave was almost an equal member of the community.\(^{1391}\)

Manumitted slaves were legally free and, according to the Roman perception of this group, they instantly received most of the privileges of the free population, while in time they could expect full integration into society. There are instances of Roman freedmen achieving high social status, beside imperial freedmen who were often part of the wealthy elite at the very moment of their manumission. Traditional Greek understanding of manumission was at odds with this. In Greek social terms manumitted

\(^{1388}\) See the commentary on *SEG* LVIII 1529.


\(^{1390}\) E.g. *SEG* XLV 1729 (Ricl, Les *KATAGRAΦΑΙ*, 181 no. 32) ll. 6-11: μηνδόνς ἔχοντος ἔξουσιάν ἀντεί πέιν τῇ γραφῇ ταυτή ἤ / ἔφαγασθεί ὡς δοῦλης; *SEG* LVIII 58 1520 (ÖZTÜRK, Tanriver, New *Katagraphai* 2008, 102 no. 14) ll. 7-9: εἰ / τις δὲ ἐπεκαλέσει τοῦ Ζωσίμου ὡς εἰς δοῦλαν ἀνθρώπου.

\(^{1391}\) M. Riel, *Donation of Slaves*, 156.
slaves’ actual position was semi-slavery, or midway between slavery and freedom, at least during the first generation. The possible confusion in this regard was overcome during time, the Greek concept of manumission gradually retreated. After AD 212 and the Edict of Caracalla, any manumitted slave automatically became Roman citizen. The conflict was resolved by triumph of the Roman concept of freedman.

7.8 Conclusion

Slavery was a common feature of life in Roman Anatolia. So far as we can see, it was equally well established in both Lydia and Phrygia. There is also good evidence for slavery in urban and rural context. Urban slaves are encountered more often in the epigraphic documents but this is to be expected and it need not be in relation to the actual spread of the institution, although the Egyptian parallel would suggest that slaves were somewhat less common in villages then in towns and cities.

In Asia Minor, the trade in slaves was a natural part of the commercial relations in the eastern Mediterranean; Ephesos, in particular, together with Sardeis, became an important slave market. Large inland commercial centers most certainly had one as well. It seems that the scale of foreign trade in slaves declined from the time of Augustus. Wars of conquest and piracy were certainly much less important in the 1st and the 2nd centuries AD than before. But this does not automatically mean that the total number of slaves declined as well, although this was often assumed by scholars. There are certainly no clear indications in our source material that numbers of slaves diminished: slaves seem to be present as ever before. The answer lies probably in the growth of the relative importance of the local sources of slavery: offspring of slaves and the abandoned infants. The former source was probably the more important one. Natural reproduction of the existing slave population was undoubtedly encouraged by the slave owners and some of them seem to have purposely raised slave to offer them on the market. Almost all of the slaves we have direct evidence about seem to have been born as slaves. This is perhaps facilitated by the rise in prices of average slaves, but we lack direct confirmation.

Slave names are an interesting topic although its relevance for understanding the nature of slavery is rather limited. Thousands of slaves attested in Rome originated from Asia Minor. Nevertheless, the possession of a Greek name by a slave is not in itself proof of Greek or eastern origin. A majority of the slaves attested in Lydian or Phrygian inscription bear Greek names. The choice of names mostly reflects culture and preferences of the slave owners. There is a number of peculiar names as well as some typical “slave-names”. Many slaves also had typical names, prominent among free population, such as Chares and Agathon.

It is sometimes assumed that the Roman presence in Asia Minor brought about an increase in the number of slaves both as managers and as workers, but this claim is hard to substantiate. Slaves were involved in all kinds of activities from personal service to crafts and business, to education, and in all regions and all levels of society from the depths of the countryside to the houses of the urban elite. Their role was vital for sustaining the lifestyles and ambitions of many elite members, including personal services and dominant position in the process of education. However, the inscriptions from Lydia and Phrygia do not provide as much information on slaves as we would like.

Perhaps the most intensively debated question concerning ancient slavery is the role of slaves in the production. The 19th century scholars took it for granted that the Greco-Roman society was slave-holding in a very literal sense: slaves were thought to be the ancient working class that did all or most of the physically demanding and humiliating tasks. Nowadays this is the view of only a small minority of historians (mostly those that follow the concepts of M. I. Finley on ancient economy). It is clear that any kind of physical or administrative task in antiquity could be entrusted to slaves. But the question is were the slaves of Lydia and Phrygia dominant or at least a major part of working population?

The simple fact is that epigraphic sources provide no basis for any similar conclusions. There are only a small number of references to slaves as craftsmen and slightly more of those that mention slaves as agricultural workers. Not even all of these examples are beyond doubt. Numerous queries and mines could well have been worked by slaves but evidence on this is absent. Most of the slaves mentioned in inscriptions are household slaves, doing domestic and menial work. Of course, it was expected of the members of the higher classes to be attended by host of personal slaves, but even
humbler individuals and families could probably afford a slave or two. Does this mean that the importance of slavery in Roman Lydia and Phrygia was not very high? Far from it, the importance of this institution goes well beyond direct economic participation, although one could argue that providing workforce for numerous households constitutes a serious economic role as well.

The above mentioned problem would be easier to solve if only we had solid evidence regarding the number of slaves or their participation in the total population. This is, regrettably, not the case and percentages and population estimates used in this chapter are only reasonable but unproven (and, perhaps, unprovable) assumptions, even if they are taken from some of the best contemporary experts on ancient demography. Of the estimates considered, existing evidence seems to be more in the line with the lower one. It might well be true that slaves were around 10% of population (according to accepted estimate this would be 120000 slaves for the two Anatolian regions) but this is impossible to prove.

Sometimes close bonds and affections between masters and slaves can be observed, displaying perhaps a brighter image in those difficult circumstances. The evidence for closer attachments is surprisingly frequent, given the general scarcity of documents that mention slaves at all. But, once again, this is actually surprising only to those who take the large scale slavery of early modern societies as the norm. In a society where slaves were, for the most part, members of a household and where few, apart from the small number of the wealthiest families, were in possession of more than three slaves, it is only natural that master-slave relations were less formal and rigid, sometimes approaching regular family relations. And sometimes these relations were taken even further. There is also an example of free woman living openly in a marriage-like community with her slave. Certain social distinctions and boundaries that are taken for granted to be absolute among the members of the higher classes seem to lose strength in the lower strata of society.

As a social group and a legal category, the slaves were present everywhere but we could only guess their proportion in the general population and their full significance in the production. Their importance in real life of Lydian and Phrygian communities was certainly not negligible, at least that is the impression we get from the epigraphic sources. A number of hugely important questions, as well as most of the smaller ones
simply cannot be solved with the existing evidence. But such issues are typical of the ancient history as a whole, and not specific for the western Anatolia.
8. CONCLUSION

Roman rule in Asia Minor is the single longest period of continuous and complete rule over this region in Antiquity. Most of Asia Minor was incorporated in the Roman Empire already at the time of the Actium and the rest was there by the first half of the 1st century AD. It remained firmly in Roman and Byzantine possession until the Persian and Arab advance in the 7th century AD. No other ancient power, foreign or domestic, held sway over it for any comparable length of time, and few actually ruled the entirety of the peninsula. This alone justifies the opinion that effects of the Roman rule on the Anatolian society were profound and long-lasting. However, a careful examination of all of the available sources concerning various social groups leads to a somewhat different conclusion. While Roman presence undoubtedly left the mark that was neither insignificant nor transient, the social and cultural legacy of the previous, pre-Roman phases of historical development is actually more visible, at least as far as the period under consideration (1st to 3rd centuries AD) is concerned. The changes brought on by the Late Antiquity (4th to 7th centuries) probably amount to one of the biggest transformations in history of Anatolia, but they are the result of a complex interaction of factors, which cannot be simply labeled as the “Roman” influence and they exceed the scope of the present thesis.

The differences between Lydia and Phrygia, singled out in the introduction, remain visible and important throughout this research. Apart from the common social traits shared by the ruling elites of the two Anatolian regions, which were part of the Empire-wide phenomenon, there is hardly any feature that could be described as identical for both of them. Lydia remained a more densely populated and more urbanized area, closely connected to the western seaboard and the administrative center of the province.
Phrygia, covering a much larger area than its western neighbor, even under Roman rule remained less populated, with much more scattered network of cities and probably significantly larger proportion of the rural population (although any kind of precise statistic to support the claim is, of course, lacking). Differences in their cultural traditions are also still visible during the first centuries of the Roman dominion. The separate historical experience influenced the ways the societies of these regions coped with realities of the Roman Empire.

One of the major catalysts of social and economic changes in the Roman Empire is conspicuously absent from either Lydia or Phrygia: the significant role of the Roman army. The military factor that, to a large degree, quickened the pace of the Romanization and molded the shape of the local societies in provinces along the Rhine and Danube is barely noticeable in the Anatolian interior. The reason is easy to establish: Asia was a senatorial province far removed from the borders of the Empire and thus without a significant military presence. Although inland regions, Lydia and Phrygia were on the course of important military roads that offered direct land routes to the eastern theatre of war. But even as there are clear records (mostly by ancient authors) of major military movements across the interior of Asia Minor to (or from) Euphrates limes, these seem to have little more than momentary effect on the lives of the local population. From the end of the 2nd century AD the presence of larger military formations is recorded more often, sometimes in connection with the mistreatment of the local population by the soldiers.

Epigraphic record of the military presence in Lydia and Phrygia is slight and does not even begin to compare to the abundance of documents left behind the Roman army along the borders of the Empire. Rare as they are, the attestations of soldiers are much more frequent in Phrygia (over thirty compared to mere five in Lydia). Elsewhere in the Empire more recruits came from rural areas than from civic centers. Although specific numbers are absent, it is probably safe to assume that Asia Minor contributed a large number of recruits to the imperial army (most soldiers mentioned in Phrygian inscriptions are veterans) but this had only limited effect on their home region, because most of them did not return. This is hardly surprising, considering that these men spent up to twenty five years in the military service far away from their place of origin, gradually severing any connection they had with it. Those that did return fit broadly in
the social category of the middle class, although occasionally some of them seem to have had wealth of some size and higher social aspirations. In the case of some active soldiers that are attested in epigraphic record, it is not always certain whether they are actually locals or recorded in Anatolia by accident while on duty.

The protection offered by Roman military power and the comparative stability of the Empire in the first two centuries AD had an important and lasting effect on the populace of the two Anatolian regions. The noticeable prosperity is inconceivable without a necessary level of safety. Situated in the western part of Anatolian interior, Lydia and Phrygia were far removed from any kind of outside threat. Until the very end of the 2nd century AD none of the internal uprisings or civil wars was fought on their soil. Brigandage as a social phenomenon was never quite absent in the ancient world but, since the complaints about it rise only after the Severan period, it seems that prior to it, cases of brigandage were rather rare and the local authorities were able to cope with them efficiently. Conditions were less safe and stable in the 3rd century but even then these regions were rarely directly threatened.

If the epigraphic practice is taken as a measure, we can conclude that the fortunes of urban communities in Lydia and Phrygia where on the steady rise from the Augustan times onward, reaching their peak around the middle of the 2nd century AD. The epigraphic harvest is more plentiful in the 1st century AD than in the 1st century BC and experiences a sudden rise in the 2nd century. There is only a gradual decline during the early 3rd century, but the number of epigraphic finds drops sharply after the middle of the century, which is to be expected, considering the general degradation of safety, frequent civil wars and the debasement of coinage that went on at this time.

There are other indications that social development during the Early and the High Empire should be envisioned against the background of general growth and prosperity. It should be stated, however, that most evidence for this comes from the urban context, although there is no reason to doubt that rural Anatolia experienced the growth of population, if nothing else. Archaeological excavations were conducted more thoroughly on the sites in Lydia than those in Phrygia, but the overall impression is the same: the general size of the cities and the number of large scale building projects reaches an apex around the 150 AD. Sardeis, undisputedly the largest urban center of Lydia (and, probably, larger than any city in Phrygia, with the possible exception of
Apameia) reaches its maximum surface area at this time and the same is true of the smaller centers such as Philadelphia, Tralleis, Magnesia ad Sipylum and the others. This was so in spite of the frequent earthquakes. Even the famine and the plague of the mid-2nd century AD do not seem to have put any permanent obstacle to the development of these cities. There is also direct literary evidence for the size and wealth of Apameia in the early 2nd century AD. Coinage of the individual cities, more widespread and diverse at this time than ever before or later, also bears witness to this. It became unfashionable in the recent historiography to speak of any positive effects of the Roman rule, but the material conditions of the Lydian and Phrygian cities certainly did improve during the period under consideration, and this was in great part due to the stable environment provided by the Roman state.

There is a high degree of continuity between the Hellenistic and Imperial periods in the Roman Asia Minor. The two most obvious aspects displaying that continuity are the public language in use and the shape of civic institutions. While there is some evidence for Greek language even in late Archaic Lydia (but hardly any in Phrygia), the widespread usage and serious epigraphic habit in Greek began only after Alexander’s conquest. The Greek becomes the standard language of writing and public discourse in the Hellenistic Lydia and Phrygia (although, once again, the development in Phrygia was much slower and more gradual). This remains so during the Early and High Empire and, in fact, in contrast to the provinces such as Egypt or Syria, it will remain to be the case throughout the Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Of course, the predominance of Greek in the public usage does not imply the actual disappearance of the native spoken languages. While the last preserved records of Lydian language are hardly later than the early 3rd century BC, it is safe to assume that it was spoken for a considerable longer length of time. Phrygian, however, is recorded as a written (and, presumably, spoken) language even in the 3rd centuries AD (the so-called Neo-Phrygian inscriptions).

As was the case during the Hellenistic age, the great majority of all inscriptions are recorded in standard koine Greek. The intrusion of Latin is very limited. We have no basis to estimate the size of the population that used Latin as the language of the everyday communication; it was probably not very large and confined to the families of western immigrants. It is unlikely that even the senators and equestrians of local origin
used Latin as their first language. While a number of Roman military colonies was established in these parts of Anatolia, they do not seem to have kept their Latin character for more than a generation or two, with a possible exception of Antiochia in or near Pisidia (actually in the borderland between Phrygia and Pisidia). On the other hand, Latin is at times encountered in the official Roman inscriptions (these are sometimes bilingual). Thus, even if not spread widely, it could easily display its importance as the language of the ruling power.

The local civic institutions underwent only minor changes when compared to the last three centuries BC. The basic model of the urban life in Roman Anatolia was still very similar to the typical Hellenistic *polis*, with its local citizenship and laws, and recognizable civic institutions (the civic council, the popular assembly, elected magistrates, courts and public services etc.). Even the new cities were organized along these lines. These cities had to suffer a degree of adjustment to reconcile their institutions with the realities of life under the Empire. Interference of various representatives of the Roman state and the special and distinct status of the Roman citizens where just the two most obvious aspects.

Societies of Roman Lydia and Phrygia are in many respects similar to their Hellenistic predecessors. However, there are a number of important differences that must be acknowledged and commented upon. Some of these are the result of direct Roman intervention or influence; others are outcomes or the local development. The general hierarchization of society is the most visible characteristic of all. It too has some precursors in the social development of the Hellenistic *polis*, but on the whole it is a typical phenomenon of the Imperial era.

The social mobility was hindered by various factors. The main feature of higher social advancement was material wealth, but even that was only a necessary starting condition, and not even the highest fortune was a guarantee in itself. Senators were a closed order, equestrians only slightly less so and even the local municipal elites evolved over time into closed circles that preferred to keep the outsiders out. Hierarchy was the order of the day and this development was certainly favored by the Romans and perhaps in fact actively supported by them. The urban societies where this development took place still had the outward appearance of constitutional democracy and still officially clung to the Classical Greek ideals of freedom, autonomy and equality. Local
citizenship still retained some degree of importance and popular assemblies were still held (at least until the 3rd century AD) and voted on issues of local importance. But behind this pseudo-democratic facade, the new social hierarchy of wealth, political power and social influence was the actual reality. Those on the top made all the important decisions: we can hardly point out to any example of a higher civic official in Imperial Lydia or Phrygia who was not the member of the elite and this fact speaks volumes in itself. For the most part, the rest of the society seemed content to let the elites govern their cities and their lives. But this might be just another illusion created by the nature of the preserved evidence.

The greatest social changes brought on by the Roman rule were those on the very top of the social hierarchy: actually, the two highest orders were the creation of the Imperial rule and have no parallel in the pre-Roman development or indeed in the provincial society of the 1st century BC. Prior to the rise of Augustan empire, there were no local senators or equestrians.

Senators of local origin were never numerous: about thirty cases (12 from Lydia, 18 from Phrygia) are so far attested during the first three centuries of the Empire. Difficulties in the way of a provincial intending to enter the Senate were substantial. It took extraordinary wealth, far greater than the usual possessions and income of the local rich families, Roman citizenship (held for several generations), an accomplished Roman public career (with the complete *cursus honorum*), good Roman connections (preferably with the Emperor himself) and sheer luck. This was simply too demanding for all but a few most fortunate and ambitious. We have no means to explain the total number of attested senators from the two Anatolian regions or its proportion to other parts of the province or to the other Eastern provinces. Why are there significantly more senators from Phrygia (larger, but further removed from the centers of the province, more sparsely populated and less urbanized) than in Lydia? Perhaps this can be explained as being the result of the policy of a single emperor - Commodus, who introduced several new Phrygian families into the Senate. But important questions do not stop there. Why do only a quarter of the senators in the province of Asia come from these two regions? Is this in direct proportion to their relative population (the size of which we can only guess) or are there other factors in play? Similar questions can be raised when we compare these figures to those from the other Eastern provinces.
A significant point can be made about the relationship of these senators with their hometowns. Once a person entered the Senate he became a member of the highest Imperial elite and it was expected of him to transfer his place of residence to Italy and to excel in the service of the Roman state. From a strictly Roman point of view, there was no inclination to maintain any connection with his place of origin. A career in the imperial service could (and usually did) take an individual to most diverse parts of the Empire. And yet, there is a strong and deliberate tendency on the part of the senators to maintain close connections and a significant presence in their homeland. They, or their family members, continue to be prominent in local social and political life. The significance they attached to their places of origin is explainable from several different angles, some of which could be less than rational. There was, of course, importance of local influence they held and were intent on keeping, the income they drew from local sources, but probably also some more personal and sentimental reasons. That said, we shouldn’t lose sight of the fact just how untypical and scarce these senatorial families were. Most of the average sized and smaller cities in Lydia and Phrygia (as well as some of the largest centers) had no senators in all three centuries under discussion. The senators were the very summit of the social hierarchy, elite of the elites.

The introduction of a new member into the Senate also meant the creation of a new senatorial family. There are several examples of families from Lydia and Phrygia sending members to the Senate over several generations. It was expected of a son of a senator to follow the career path of his father. In this light, it is interesting to note that we have no attested case of a senatorial family in these regions lasting more than three generations. The most likely explanation lies in practical difficulties of maintaining this exceedingly desirable but also exceptionally demanding status.

The imperial elite was made up of senators and equestrians. Although not praised as highly as senatorial rank, it was a major social and political success to achieve the equestrian status. Compared to senators, the equestrian ordo was much more heterogeneous with much greater internal diversity of wealth, origin, career and actual political power and influence. It was also easier (but by no means easy or straightforward) to obtain this status. Thus, there are comparably more equestrians than senators in Lydia and Phrygia, and they are encountered much earlier (the first one attested is L. Antonius Zeno, a contemporary of Augustus). Their number is even greater
if we accept the assumption that every single attested asiarch is a member of this *ordo*. Only few of them were proper military equestrians; they are encountered serving in various posts throughout the Empire, sometimes seemingly completely detached from their homelands. The majority of equestrians owe their status to honorary promotion and they served the Empire in numerous administrative roles.

Compared to the members of local elites, equestrian families had more wealth and connections, both provincial and imperial. In some cases, their wealth was very close to that required for a senator, as is proven by examples where in one and the same family the gap between orders is surmounted in a single generation: the father is an equestrian and the son is already a senator. As is to be expected, equestrians originating from Lydia or Phrygia are encountered all over the province of Asia. Engaged in local politics and social life, as well as the provincial administration and various official duties all over the Empire, most of these men are best described as the real provincial elite.

If the members of the senatorial order remained in close contact with their hometowns and regions, the equestrians cherished these connections even more. They are encountered as large-scale benefactors throughout the province of Asia, as patrons, donors and protectors of their cities of origin. In this respect, their behavior is not very different to that of the municipal aristocracy from the ranks of which they came, except maybe in scale. They show various connections with local social life and cult and sometimes they sustain closer ties with local associations for reasons that could be political, honorific but also economic.

The full integration of these two regions into the Empire is proven by the existence and the obvious importance of the two highest orders of the Roman society. But they remained, by their own choice, the integral part of the local societies, albeit the most romanized segment of it. They accepted many recognizably Roman social and cultural traits as means of fusion with the larger imperial elite. By the nature of their duties, they had to have the active knowledge of Latin language (which is not always the case even with local Roman citizens). In fact, senators and equestrians could be the only part of the population in Lydia and Phrygia - immigrants from Italy aside - that might have actually used Latin as their language of everyday communication. But even this is open to debate and it will be of some interest to contrast their degree of Romanization with the overall Roman influence on the society in the final section of this conclusion.
Compared to the relatively abundant evidence left by the local elites, even the number of equestrian inscriptions seems small. Clearly, for the most local municipal aristocrats even the equestrian rank was unattainable. They had to satisfy themselves with all the manner of local honors and duties, with significant but geographically limited political and social influence and with the publicly expressed gratitude and respect of their fellow-citizens. Honorary inscriptions and epitaphs mentioned various distinguished individuals, offices they held and public services they performed. The border between the normal performance of one’s official duty and the exercise of the public benefactions is often vague. In Roman times, at least as far Lydia and Phrygia are concerned, these benefactions reached unprecedented proportions.

Euergetism is the single best attested phenomenon of the public life in Roman Anatolia. No other public practice is mentioned as often nor is it described in equally laudatory terms. This is yet another aspect of Hellenization that not only survived the Roman conquest, but actually thrived under Roman rule. The analysis of this phenomenon, however, shows that there is little to it specific for either Lydia or Phrygia. Public benefactions reach the zenith of their frequency and size in the period between Trajan and Septimius Severus. New buildings, public, utilitarian or sacred, were constructed and older ones repaired at the private (but tirelessly publicized) expense, public spaces were rearranged and maintained in the same way. Wealthy individuals are frequently recorded as organizers or financiers of public events, sometimes directly distributing money or food to the citizenry. There is no way to tell how much of the build-up of the cities and their general well-being were due to this kind of public activity, but it is reasonable to assume that it constituted a significant portion. In fact, it is possible that much of the general prosperity that we can observe in the 1st and 2nd centuries AD is actually the prosperity of the wealthiest class of the population. Preserved honorary inscriptions convey a superficial impression that the municipal elites invested much resources and energy in the public spending and all this because of their personal virtue and patriotism. This is a widespread ideological construct but that does not make it more credible. In fact, there are good reasons to attribute this socially desirable practice entirely to selfish motives. These are, of course, nowhere stated openly. By investing in causes that were viewed favorable by the public, or even by giving money directly to the citizens, a member of the local elite would purchase
popular approval and social standing (a sort of symbolic capital) that could translate in the actual political power and influence - at least at the local level. This was never a solitary effort because by improving personal reputation, one would always improve the reputations of his families. The importance of families is amply attested in various inscriptions. If a honorand had illustrious relatives or ancestors they are likely to be mentioned in the same inscription. A more successful member of the family could use his or hers reputation or position to favor one of his relatives and especially children. Persons attested as benefactors or public officers at a very young age (sometimes in the early infancy) are clear examples of this tendency. Women of higher social status seem to be much more prominent than in the preceding times and that is probably another attestation of the same phenomenon. I believe that the municipal elite was the initiator of social mobility in Lydia and Phrygia. As we have seen, in many cases descendants of municipal magistrates entered the equestrian ordo and started their more ambitious careers in the province and in the Empire. On the other end, that same municipal elite mainly financed the industries and crafts in the cities, employing members of the so-called “middle class”, thus improving overall economic conditions.

Nevertheless, epigraphic material is often flawed and problematic due to epigraphic habits and chance findings. For example, in Saittai there are many attestations of professional associations and craftsmen, but very little inscriptions concerning municipal elite. Similar example is Phrygian Dorylaion, where one senator, three equestrians and asiarchs, respectively, are attested, but only a handful of municipal officials.

Finally, another explanation for the excessive amplitude of euergetism could be the safeguarding of the existing social order. In a society that was still very much influenced by the age old ideals of equality, but was in reality increasingly hierarchical and elite-centered, there was a real necessity to keep this imbalance less apparent and therefore less threatening. This could be achieved by allowing the members of middle and lower classes to have some degree of participation in the general wealth through public festivals, distributions and expenses on the public space.

Most of the epigraphic evidence from Roman Lydia and Phrygia is made by or made for the highest echelons of society. The source material available for study of the middle classes is much more modest, while the lowest class of free population and
slaves are recorded only irregularly. Behind the highly problematic but unavoidable term “middle-class” there is a combination of various social and professional groups. The majority of the population of any Lydian or Phrygian city probably belongs to this extensive category. It seems that general tendency towards hierarchization is apparent even within the middle class, where some groups and professions take much more prominent place than the others.

Much of the preserved evidence on the middle classes actually testifies about only one aspect of their lives: professional and other associations. This fact resulted in great emphasis on professional associations in modern scholarship, especially when the cities of Lydia are concerned. Perhaps this has led scholars to exaggerate the actual importance of these associations: citizens or non-citizens of humble means are more likely to express themselves in an expensive medium such as an inscription when they act as an organized group. But associations are much more visible than in the Hellenistic age and their relative importance seems to have grown. They are very diverse in scope and activity, but it appears that they had a highly sophisticated internal organization and some connections with the prominent members of the local aristocracy. Their role in the economic life of the cities can only be guessed, but it would be wrong to assume that it wasn’t significant. In this respect it seems that there are considerable differences between these two regions: the professional associations are more diverse and more frequently attested in Lydia than in Phrygia.

Details of the everyday life of the common people are even less available if we move from urban centers and into the rural hinterland. Pre-Roman and even pre-Hellenistic Anatolian rural society seems to be much better preserved in the Phrygian inland than in Lydia. There is little that can be said with certainty about the organization, social structure or even the physical appearance of the most of these villages. When a village community begins to express itself more often through inscriptions it is usually the sign of some degree of urbanization and the imitation of the urban features. If we take the degree of urbanization and influence of the Greco-Roman civilization as the criteria, Phrygia certainly appears as a more conservative and less developed of the two regions; its rural population seems to be more resilient to outside influences. Differences in historical experience between Lydia and Phrygia, but also the sheer size of Phrygia, its climate and the remoteness from the centers of the province are
the most likely explanations for this disparity. Both Lydian and Phrygian societies were dominated by small villages where people probably lived in close contact with one another. Therefore, a position in society would to a large extent depend on other people’s evaluation of one’s conduct, as in most rural and traditional societies, past and present.

It is difficult to say whether cities and their rural surroundings were indeed “two different worlds”. Even cultural differences can be exaggerated and we do not know enough about economic relations between the cities and the villages to readily accept the notion of the “parasitic cities” that is borrowed from the medieval and modern European history. Many inhabitants of the villages were citizens and in many smaller cities a large part of the urban population could have in fact be engaged in agriculture. In the case of many smaller settlements the line between village and town is not always clear.

As in any other part of the ancient world, the slaves are the least apparent part of the society. They are rarely mentioned in inscriptions, while even less often comments in ancient literature tend to revolve around the few classical tropes about Lydians and Phrygians as typical slaves. As a social group and a legal category the slaves were present everywhere, but we cannot even guess neither their proportion in the general population nor their significance in the production process. Most of the slaves mentioned in inscriptions are household slaves. Of course, it was expected of the members of the higher classes to be attended by a host of personal slaves, but even more humble individuals and families could afford a slave or two. Again, it seems that this picture does not differ drastically from pre-Roman times.

At the beginning of this research, one of my main interests was in demography. In Lydian funerary inscriptions month of someone’s death is frequently documented and I hoped to collect and analyze as much information as possible. However, the demographic sample proved too small at this point. Thus, I was not able to fulfill the initial intention.

The established social hierarchy was the reality of these parts of Asia Minor under Roman rule. In observance of this important fact, this thesis (and this conclusion) was arranged according to the social ladder: from the top to the very bottom. Such a rigid division of this society was the Roman contribution to the history of Lydia and Phrygia.
Another was the introduction of the imperial ruling class. Both of these changes were not simple events but results of a prolonged development. It cannot be truly said that the latter was accomplished before the 2nd century AD, the former took even longer to fully succeed. Neither of these developments constitutes a social revolution: the society was only gradually altered but not drastically changed by the establishment of the Empire. In fact, the very social hierarchy established during the Roman rule can be taken as an instrument to measure the degree of Roman influence. The top of the social ladder (senators and equestrians) is the most romanized of all; as we descend downwards toward local elites and, beyond, into the middle class, the degree of Romanization becomes first smaller, than almost negligible. As if in a kind of a time machine, pre-Roman i.e. Hellenistic elements begin to predominate. This parallel can be taken even further, because at the lowest point, and especially in rural Phrygia, even the Hellenistic elements begin to fade and the old Anatolian rural society predominates in the picture. If we consider ethnicity, experienced in terms of kinship, language, dress, behavior, and symbolic expressions including common ritual activities and what may be summarized as ‘shared experiences’ then inhabitants of Roman Lydia and Phrygia would undoubtedly be surprised by modern doubts about their identity. Lydians / Phrygians or Greeks? They were probably a bit of both.

Compared to major social changes that Roman conquest and rule brought to some of the European provinces, their achievements in inland parts of the province of Asia seem slight. But the Romans were seldom inclined to force the unnecessary alterations if the existing foundations could support the imperial structure. This was the case in the most of the Greek-speaking provinces and it was certainly the case in Lydia and Phrygia where modest modifications were mixed with the fair degree of continuity. Major developments after the 300 AD will eventually shatter this image, but they lie beyond the scope and the goals of this thesis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Offices</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Reign of</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ti. Claudius Iulianus</td>
<td>Sardeis</td>
<td>• Trib. mil. leg. IV Scythicae&lt;br&gt;• Quaestor prov. Achaiae&lt;br&gt;• Trib. Plebis&lt;br&gt;• Leg. pr. pr. prov. Achaiae&lt;br&gt;• praetor</td>
<td>Grandson of no. 9, nephew of no. 8, mother Iulia Quintilia Isaurica</td>
<td>Hadrian</td>
<td>IEph 5106, cf. PIR² C 902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Ti. Claudius Iulianus</td>
<td>Sardeis</td>
<td>• Leg. Aug. leg. XI Claudiae&lt;br&gt;• Cos. suff. in September between 154 and 156&lt;br&gt;• Leg. Aug. pr. pr. prov. Germaniae inferioris</td>
<td>Son of no. 1</td>
<td>Antoninus Pius</td>
<td>CIL III 7474 = ILS 2475, CIL XIII 8036 = ILS 2907, CIL XVI 110; cf. PIR² C 902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Cn. Licinius Rufinus</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>Consul suffectus</td>
<td>Son of no. 4</td>
<td>Elagabalus</td>
<td>TAM V2 987-988a; TAM V2 987; cf. PIR² L 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>• Praetor&lt;br&gt;• Leg. Aug. pr. pr. prov. Norici&lt;br&gt;• Cos. suff.</td>
<td>Father of no. 3</td>
<td>Severi</td>
<td>TAM V2 984-987; SEG XLVII 1656; IG X 2(1), 142; AE 1949,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>T. Flavius Clitosthenes</td>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>Cos. suff. ca. 220-230</td>
<td>Wife Ti. Claudia Frontoniana</td>
<td>Elagabalus or Severus Alexander</td>
<td>IEph 635; IK Tralles 72; cf. PIR² F 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>T. Flavius Stasicles Metrophanes</td>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>Cos. suff.</td>
<td>Son of no. 6, wife Claudia Capitolina</td>
<td></td>
<td>IK Tralles 72, 82, 83; IEph 635b; cf. PIR² F 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ti. Iulius Aquila Polemaeanus</td>
<td>Sardeis</td>
<td>Cos. suff. 01. 04. – 30.06. 110</td>
<td>Son of no. 9</td>
<td>Trajan</td>
<td>IEph 5101, 5102, 5113; cf. PIR² I 168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9. | Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus | Sardeis | • Trib. mil. leg. III Cyrenaicae  
• Adlectus inter aedilios  
• Praetor  
• leg. Aug. leg. IV Scythicae  
• proconsul prov. Ponti | Wife Quintilia, son no. 8, daughter Iulia Quintilia Isaurica, grandson no. 1 and great-grandson no. 2 | Vespasian | IEph 5101, 5102, 5104, 5105, 5106, 5112, 5113; I. Sardes 45, IEph 5106, IGR I 338; cf. PIR² I 1260 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Curtius Iulius?) Crispus</td>
<td>Philadelphia?</td>
<td>Cos. suff.</td>
<td>Wife Haruspicia Demo</td>
<td>*TAM V1 273b, TAM V3 1465, 1466; cf. <em>PIR² C 1596</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>C. Iulius Philippus</td>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>Cos. suff.</td>
<td>wife Flavia Phaedrina or Flavia Lepida</td>
<td>*IK Tralles 51, 54, 143; cf. <em>PIR² 1458</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>Hierocaesarea/Thyateira</td>
<td>vir viarum curandarum, questor urbanus, provincial questor, a plebeian tribune, strategos, curator rei publicae in Alexandria Troas, legatus iuridicus Apuliae, Calabriae, Lucaniae,</td>
<td></td>
<td>*TAM V2 923; <em>SEG 41 1032</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legatus iuridicus Hispaniae dioeceseos Tarraconensis, legatus provinciae Asiae consul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2

### Senators in Phrygia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Offices</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Reign of</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Aelius Antipater</strong></td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>• Ab epistulis Graecis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>IEph</em> 2026; <em>Philostr. VS</em>; cf. <em>PIR</em>² A 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Legatus Aug. pr. pr. prov. Bithyniae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. M. Antonius Antius Lupus</strong></td>
<td>Laodikeia on the Lykos</td>
<td>• Praefectus feriarum Latinarum</td>
<td>Son of no. 3 or (more probably) no. 4; wife Claudia Regilla</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Vita Comm.</em> 7,5; <em>CIL VI</em> 1343; cf. <em>PIR</em>² A 812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Xvir stlitibus iudicandis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Trib. mil. leg. II adiutrcis Piae fidelis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Quaestor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Praetor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• augur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cos. suff. 1. 10.- 31. 12. 148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. M. Antonius Zeno</strong></td>
<td>Laodikeia on the Lykos</td>
<td>• Cos. suff. 168/170</td>
<td>Son of no. 3; wife Antia Marcellina</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>IL Tun</em> 1408, <em>CIL VI</em> 36848; cf. <em>PIR</em>² A 883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Proconsul prov. Africae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. C. Asinius Nicomachus Julianus</strong></td>
<td>Blaundos?</td>
<td>Cos. suff. Procos. Asiae</td>
<td>Son of no. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>IGR I</em> 502; <em>IGR IV</em> 717; cf. <em>PIR</em>² A 1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. C. Asinius Protimus Quadratus</strong></td>
<td>Blaundos?</td>
<td>Cos. suff.</td>
<td>Father of no. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>IEph</em> 3040, <em>IGR IV</em> 1013; cf. <em>PIR</em>² A 1244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Father of no.</th>
<th>Wife</th>
<th>Wife in Life</th>
<th>Caracalla</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Aurelius Sanctus</td>
<td>Prymnos</td>
<td>both he and his wife (?) styled as sunklhtko…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plotia Agripina (?)</td>
<td>Caracalla</td>
<td>MAMA IV 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Claudius Stratonicus</td>
<td>Aizanoi</td>
<td>• Leg. Aug. leg. I Minerviae 184-186 • Cos. suff.</td>
<td>Commodus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wife Flavia Tiberina</td>
<td></td>
<td>IGR IV 570, AE 1930, 30; cf. PIR² C 1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>T. [ ] Diogenianus</td>
<td>Akmoneia</td>
<td>consul</td>
<td>3rd century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMA VI 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>T. Flavius Claudianus Ponticus</td>
<td>Dorylaion</td>
<td>• tribunus laticlavius</td>
<td>Commodus – middle of the 3rd century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEG XXVI 1371; SEG XXXVI 1196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>T. Flavius Lartidius</td>
<td>Akmoneia</td>
<td>consul</td>
<td>3rd century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMA VI 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Position 1</td>
<td>Position 2</td>
<td>Position 3</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>T. Flavius Montanus Maximianus</td>
<td>Aknoneia</td>
<td>quae tor urbanus</td>
<td>quae tor provinciae Africae</td>
<td>aedilis cerialis</td>
<td>Middle of the 3rd century</td>
<td>MAMA XI 104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>praetor</td>
<td>praetor</td>
<td>praetor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>curat or</td>
<td>curat or</td>
<td>curat or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>legatus Augusti pro prae tore provinciae Thraciae</td>
<td>legatus Augusti pro prae tore provinciae Thraciae</td>
<td>legatus Augusti pro prae tore provinciae Thraciae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consul</td>
<td>consul</td>
<td>consul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probably descendant of T. Flavius Montanus, archiereus of Asia</td>
<td>Probably descendant of T. Flavius Montanus, archiereus of Asia</td>
<td>Probably descendant of T. Flavius Montanus, archiereus of Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hermolaus</td>
<td>Tripolis</td>
<td>ΡΩμης ... βουλή</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle of the 3rd century</td>
<td>MAMA VI 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>L. Servenius Cornetus</td>
<td>Aknoneia</td>
<td>Xvir stitibus iudicandis</td>
<td>Quaestor prov. Cypri</td>
<td>Aedilis</td>
<td>Mother Iulia Severa, daughter Servenia Cornuta</td>
<td>Nero</td>
<td>MAMA VI 254, 262; MAMA XI 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>Aknoneia</td>
<td>Sevir (equitum Romanorum) turmae II, tribunus laticlavius…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

**Equestrians in Roman Lydia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aur. Aelius Phoibus</td>
<td>Iulia Gordos</td>
<td>ἰπικός</td>
<td>Valerian and Gallien</td>
<td>BMC Lydia, p. LV sq; Imhoof-Blumer, Lyd. Stadtm. 87; TAM V1 758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. T. Antonius Claudius</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>priest of Apollo Tyrimnos</td>
<td></td>
<td>TAM V2 913; 935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfenus Arignotus</td>
<td></td>
<td>praefectus cohortis II Flaviae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Numidarum, praepositus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cohortis II Flaviae Bessorum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in Dacia Inferior, tribunus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cohortis I Cilicum and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1394

Legend:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial offices (P)</th>
<th>Municipal offices (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Cn. Arrius Apuleius</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>praepositus cohortis I Gaetulorum, praefectus alae II Flaviae Agrippianae</td>
<td>200-250 AD</td>
<td>SEG XLVI 1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>C. Arruntius Antoninus</td>
<td>Thyateira/Sardeis</td>
<td>ippikos, archon M</td>
<td>Severus Alexander</td>
<td>I. Sardis 77; TAM V 2 915; SEG XXXVI 1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>M. Aurelius Artemon</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>ó kratiostos = vir egregius</td>
<td>Middle of 3rd century</td>
<td>TAM V 3 1498, 1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Genealogy</td>
<td>Ruler</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M. Aur. Diadochus Tryphosianus</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>ἵππικός ἀρχιερεύς Ἀσίας ναὸν τῶν ἐν Περγάμῳ Ρ ἀσιάρχης Ρ ἀρχιερεύς τῆς πατρίδος Μ διὰ βίου βουλάρχος Μ στρατηγός Μ</td>
<td>Severus Alexander</td>
<td>TAM V 2 950, 951, 952, 954 ; BMC p. CXXIV adn. 7 ; Imhoof-Blumer, NZ 48 (1915), 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M. Aur. Popilius Bakhius</td>
<td>Sardeis</td>
<td>ἵππικός ἀγονοθέτης Μ</td>
<td></td>
<td>I. Sardis 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M. Aur. Priscillianus</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>ἵππικός νεωκόρος τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Μ</td>
<td>Severus Alexander</td>
<td>TAM V 2 957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ser. Calpurnius Iulianus</td>
<td>Magnesia on the Sipylos (?)</td>
<td>δῖς χειλίαρχος Ρ στεφανηφόρος, στρατηγός, ἀγορανύμος Μ</td>
<td>2nd – 3rd century</td>
<td>TAM V2 1409; PME C 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tib. Cl. Zoilos</td>
<td>Sardeis</td>
<td>ὁ κράτιστος = vir egregius ἐπίτροπος τῶν Σεβαστῶν Ρ</td>
<td>around 200 AD</td>
<td>I. Sardis 60; PIR² C 1056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Domitius Rufus</td>
<td>Philadephia/Sardeis</td>
<td>ὁ κράτιστος = vir egregius ἀσιάρχης Ρ</td>
<td>253-254 AD</td>
<td>TAM V1 230 =TAM V 3 1422 ; SEG XXXII 1220 ; Münsterberg, Beamtennamen, 149 ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name and Title</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>T. Flavius Clitosthenes (Iulianus)</td>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>ὁ κράτιστος = vir egregius</td>
<td>Middle of 2nd century</td>
<td>IG XII 3, 525; IK Tralleis 141; PIR² F 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Herrenius Atticus</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>πράφεκτος P</td>
<td>Antoninus Pius</td>
<td>TAM V 3 1473; PME H 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Herrenius Niger</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>πράφεκτος P</td>
<td>Antoninus Pius</td>
<td>TAM V 3 1473; PME H 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>C. Iulius Philippus</td>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>ὁ κράτιστος = vir egregius</td>
<td>2nd century</td>
<td>IK Tralleis 50, 54; PIR² I 459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Iulius Poseidonius</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>χειλίαρχος Αὐγúστου P</td>
<td>1st century</td>
<td>TAM V 3 1443; PME I 479; PME I 98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 4

**Equestrians in Roman Phrygia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aelia Larcia</td>
<td>Laodikeia on the Lykos</td>
<td>÷ γυνή = fnema egregia = fémna egregia</td>
<td>Middle or second half of 2nd century</td>
<td>IK Laodikeia am Lykos 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ael. Dionysodorus</td>
<td>Synnada</td>
<td>ἵππικος πρῶτος ἄρχων Μ</td>
<td>MAMA VI 378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aelius Stratonikos</td>
<td>Dorylaion</td>
<td>ἀπὸ ἱππικῶν στρατειῶν ἄρχερευς Ἄσιας Ρ ἐπιστάτης στεφανηφόρος Μ</td>
<td>second half of the 2nd century</td>
<td>MAMA V Lists I, 181, no. 33 (=IGR IV 525)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. T. Ael. V[aleri]anus</td>
<td>Synnada</td>
<td>χειλιαρχος</td>
<td>Middle of 2nd century</td>
<td>MAMA IV 64; PME A 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. P. Aelius Zeuxidemus</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>Advocatus fisci =</td>
<td>Second half of 2nd century</td>
<td>IGR IV 819; PIR² A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Provincial offices (P)
- Municipal offices (M)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ariston Zeno</th>
<th>L. Antonius Zeno</th>
<th>century</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>L. Antonius Zeno</td>
<td>Laodikeia on the Lykos</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Cn. Arrius Apuleius</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>200-250 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Aurelius Clodius Eutychus</td>
<td>Temenothyris</td>
<td>First half of 3rd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Aur. Elpidephorus</td>
<td>Synnada</td>
<td>First half of 3rd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Aur. Faustinus</td>
<td>Synnada</td>
<td>First half of 3rd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Cl. Septimia Nikarete</td>
<td>Synnada</td>
<td>First half of 3rd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Title and Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Claudius M. f. [Pa]p(ricia) Asiaticus</td>
<td>Synnada</td>
<td>Trib( unus) mil(itum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Tib. Claudius Polemon</td>
<td>Themisonium, family ties in Cibyra (Caria)</td>
<td>ῥπιπικός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>L. Egnatius L. f. Teretina Quartus</td>
<td>Akmoneia</td>
<td>Praefectus cohortis II Claudiae Curator alae Augusta Geminae (Cappadocia) Tribunus militum legionis VIII Augustae (Germania Superior) Praefectus equitum alae Augustae (Brittania or Syria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>C. Iulius Cleon</td>
<td>Eumeneia</td>
<td>Tribunus militum legionis VI Ferratae ἄρχοι τῆς Ἀσίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Iulius Lycinius</td>
<td>Synnada</td>
<td>συνδίκος ταμείου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>M. Iulius Strenio Antistianus</td>
<td>Synnada</td>
<td>καθολικὸς = procurator a rationalibus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>L. Macedo</td>
<td>Kolossai</td>
<td>χειλίαρχος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Magnius Dionysius</td>
<td>Dorylaion</td>
<td>ἵππικος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>L. Mamius Fabius Largus</td>
<td>Buried in the area of Aizanoi</td>
<td>eques Romanus equo publico / ἵππικος ῥωμαίος ἵππος δημοσίος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Statilius Critonianus</td>
<td>Laodikeia on the Lykos</td>
<td>ὁ κράτιστος = vir egregius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>M. Ulpius Hermogenianus</td>
<td>Tiberiopolis</td>
<td>ἵππικος ῥωμαίος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ulpius Lycinius</td>
<td>Synnada</td>
<td>συνδίκος τὸῦ ἱεροτάτου τομείου Π</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>M. Ulpius Zenonis filius Quirina Trypho Megas Antonianus</td>
<td>Themisonium</td>
<td>Miles et praefectus cohortis I Ulpiae Galatarum ἀρχιερεύς Ἁσίας Π</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 25. | C. Voc(onus) Aelius Stratonikos | Dorylaion | άπο ἰππικῶν στρατευόν 
ἀρχιερεύς Ἀσίας ναῶν 
tῶν ἐν Περγάμῳ Ρ 
ἐπιστάτης τῆς πόλεως 
στεφανηφόρος Μ | Second half of 2<sup>nd</sup> century | *IGR IV 525 = MAMA V* 
List 181, 33; *PME A* 
64 = *PME V 122bis* |
Table 5
Archiereus Asias and Asiarchs in Lydia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. P. Aelius Paullus</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεύς τῆς Ἄσιας</td>
<td>Wife Ulpia Marcella (no. 55)</td>
<td>Hadrian or Severi?</td>
<td>TAM V2 931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Publius Aeilius Euandros</td>
<td>Palaiapolis</td>
<td>ἀσιάρχης</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd century</td>
<td>Hermann, Malay no. 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. L. (or Aurelius) Annianus</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>ἀσιάρχης&lt;ε&gt; δι&lt;ε&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Severi</td>
<td>TAM V2 933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. M. Antonius Alexandros Appianos</td>
<td>Iulia Gordos</td>
<td>ἀσιάρχης</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius, Commodus</td>
<td>TAM V1 693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Claudius Antonius Lepidus</td>
<td>Sardeis</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεύς Ἀσίας</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius, Lucius Verus</td>
<td>SEG XXXVI 1093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. M. Antonius Lepidus</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεύς καὶ ἀγανοθέτης διὰ βίου τῶν μεγάλων Σεβαστῶν Καισαρῆσιν θεᾶς Ἴδωρῆς καὶ</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>I. Sards 8, X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5: Archiereus Asias and Asiarchs in Lydia*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Title/Relation</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>C. Arruntius Maternus</td>
<td>Sardeis</td>
<td>ἀσιάρχης</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius, Lucius Verus, Commodus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I. Sardis 77 ; SNG 4004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>C. Assinia Iulina</td>
<td>Sardeis</td>
<td>ἀρχιέρεια τῆς Ἀσίας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Related to C. Assinius Nicomachus Frugianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>after 176 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEG XLIII 865; SEG XLVI 1526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>C. Assinia Frugilla</td>
<td>Sardeis</td>
<td>ἀρχιέρεια τῆς Ἀσίας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Related to C. Assinius Nicomachus Frugianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>after 176 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEG XLIII 865; SEG XLVI 1526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Assinius Frugi</td>
<td>Sardeis</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεύς τῆς Ἀσίας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Related to C. Assinius Nicomachus Frugianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>after 176 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEG XLIII 865; SEG XLVI 1526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Aurelia Hermonassa</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>δις ἀρχιέρεια τῆς Ἀσίας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wife of archereus Asias and asiarch M. Aurelius Diadochus (no. 18), daughter of asiarch and archereus Asias Aurelius Athenaeus and archiereia Asias Flavia Priscilla (nos. 15 and 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Severus Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TAM V2 951; 954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Aurelia Tatia</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>ἀρχιέρεια Ἀσίας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wife of archiereus Asias L. Aurelius Aristomenos (no. 17; possibly related to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Severi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TAM V2 944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Aurelius Aelius Attalianus</td>
<td>Asiarch C. Iulius Iulianus Tatianus</td>
<td>Husband of Flavia Priscilla (no. 35), father of Aurelia Hermonassa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(no. 12), father-in-law of M. Aurelius Diadochus (no. 18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End of 2nd, early 3rd century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Aurelius Athenaios</td>
<td>Asiarch C. Iulius Iulianus Tatianus</td>
<td>Husband of Flavia Priscilla (no. 35), father of Aurelia Hermonassa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(no. 12), father-in-law of M. Aurelius Diadochus (no. 18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End of 2nd, early 3rd century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>[Aurelius] Attalus</td>
<td>Asiarch C. Iulius Iulianus Tatianus</td>
<td>Husband of Aurelia Tatia (no. 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caracalla (after 212 AD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>L. Aurelius Aristomenes</td>
<td>Asiarch C. Iulius Iulianus Tatianus</td>
<td>Husband of Aurelia Tatia (no. 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Severi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M. Aurelius Diadochus Thyateira</td>
<td>Asiarch C. Iulius Iulianus Tatianus</td>
<td>Husband of Aurelia Tatia (no. 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Severus Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Aurelius Hermolaus</td>
<td>Asiarch C. Iulius Iulianus Tatianus</td>
<td>Husband of Flavia Priscilla (no. 35), father of Aurelia Hermonassa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(no. 12), father-in-law of asiarch Aurelius Athenaius and archiereia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asias Flavia Priscilla (nos. 15 and 35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>M. Aurelius Philadelphia</td>
<td>Asiarch C. Iulius Iulianus Tatianus</td>
<td>Husband of Flavia Priscilla (no. 35), father of Aurelia Hermonassa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(no. 12), father-in-law of asiarch Aurelius Athenaius and archiereia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asias Flavia Priscilla (nos. 15 and 35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name 1</td>
<td>Place 1</td>
<td>Rank 1</td>
<td>Father of No. 20</td>
<td>Father of No. 23</td>
<td>Son of No. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>M. Aurelius Manilius Hermippus</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>ἀσιάρχης</td>
<td>Father of no. 20</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>[M. Aurelius] Tychicus</td>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>ἀσιάρχης στεφανηφόρος</td>
<td>Father of no. 23</td>
<td>Severus Alexander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>M. Aurelius Zosimus</td>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>ἀσιάρχης</td>
<td>Son of no. 22</td>
<td>Severus Alexander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Claudia Ammion</td>
<td>Hierokaisareia</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεία τῆς Ἀσίας</td>
<td>Wife of Poplius Gavius Capito (no. 54)</td>
<td>Claudius/Nero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Tib. Claudius Meiletos</td>
<td>Sardeis</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς Ἀσίας νοοῦ τοῦ ἐν Σμύρνῃ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Between Claudius and Hadrian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>P. Claudius Menippus Centauriani f.</td>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>ἀσιάρχης</td>
<td></td>
<td>Valerianus and Gallienus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Tib. Claudius Menogenes Caecilianus</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς Ἀσίας</td>
<td>Grandson of archiereis Asias Antonia Caecilia (no. 4) and Tib. Claudius Quir. Socrates (no. 30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>M. Claudius Niceratus Cerealus</td>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>ἀσιάρχης</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Tib. Claudius</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς</td>
<td>Husband of Antonia</td>
<td>End of 1st,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Relation</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Socratis f. Quir.</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>Caecilia (no. 4) and grandfather of Tib. Claudius Menogenes Caecilianus (no. 28)</td>
<td>beginning of 2nd century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Cornelia Secunda</td>
<td>Severei</td>
<td>Wife of archiereus Asias C. Iulius Hippianus (no. 432), mother of asiarch C. Iulius Iulianus Tatianus (no. 44)</td>
<td></td>
<td>TAM V2 966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>[L.] Cornelius Vettenianus</td>
<td>Septimius Severus/Caracalla</td>
<td>Wife of archiereus Asias C. Iulius Hippianus (no. 432), mother of asiarch C. Iulius Iulianus Tatianus (no. 44)</td>
<td></td>
<td>BMC Lydia p. 261, no. 153; SNG 3158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Demetrios Heraclidae f.</td>
<td>Septimius Severus/Caracalla</td>
<td>Wife of archiereus Asias C. Iulius Hippianus (no. 432), mother of asiarch C. Iulius Iulianus Tatianus (no. 44)</td>
<td></td>
<td>I. Sardis 8, VIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Domitius Rufus</td>
<td>253-254 AD</td>
<td>Wife of archiereus Asias C. Iulius Hippianus (no. 432), mother of asiarch C. Iulius Iulianus Tatianus (no. 44)</td>
<td>End of 2nd, beginning of the 3rd century</td>
<td>TAM V3 1422; TAM V1 230; BMC Lydia p. 273f, no. 206f; SNG 3164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Flavia Priscilla</td>
<td>954, 957</td>
<td>Wife of archiereus Asias C. Iulius Hippianus (no. 432), mother of asiarch C. Iulius Iulianus Tatianus (no. 44)</td>
<td>Middle of 2nd century</td>
<td>IG XII 3 525; IK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Clitosthenes (Iulianus)</strong></td>
<td><strong>egregius ἀσιάρχης ναὸν τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἀσιάρχης δίς</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flavius Clitosthenes, grandfather of senator T. Flavius Stasicles Metrophanes</strong></td>
<td><strong>century</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tralles 141; PIR² F 245</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td><strong>T. Flavius Hierax</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hypaipa</strong></td>
<td><strong>ἀσιάρχης</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SEG XXXVI 1074; Campanile, Studi Ellenistici 19 (2006), 542</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>[Fro?]nto</td>
<td><strong>Sardeis</strong></td>
<td><strong>ἀσιάρχης</strong></td>
<td><strong>Antoninus Pius</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coll. Wadd. 5254</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td><strong>Glyco</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hypaipa</strong></td>
<td><strong>ἀσιάρχης</strong></td>
<td><strong>Septimius Severus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Revue Numismatique 1, 1883, p. 399</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td><strong>Hermolaus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hypaipa</strong></td>
<td><strong>ἀσιάρχης</strong></td>
<td><strong>3rd century</strong></td>
<td><strong>IEph 3802</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td><strong>Iulius Calpurnius</strong></td>
<td><strong>Philadelphia</strong></td>
<td><strong>ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας ναὸν τῶν ἐν Περγάμῳ</strong></td>
<td><strong>End of 2nd, beginning of the 3rd century</strong></td>
<td><strong>TAM V3 1483</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td><strong>M. Iulius Dionysios Aquilianus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thyateira</strong></td>
<td><strong>ἀσιάρχης Περγαμηνῶν</strong></td>
<td><strong>Caracalla</strong></td>
<td><strong>TAM V2 969</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td><strong>C. Iulius Hippianus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thyateira</strong></td>
<td><strong>ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς Ἀσίας</strong></td>
<td><strong>Husband of Cornelia Secunda (no. 31), father of asiarch C. Iulius Iulianus Tatianus (no. 44)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Severi</strong></td>
<td><strong>TAM V2 966</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td><strong>C. Iulius Iulianus Tatianus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thyateira</strong></td>
<td><strong>ἀσιάρχης</strong></td>
<td><strong>Son of C. Iulius Hippianus and Cornelia Secunda (nos. 43 and 31); related to Aurelia Tatia (no. 13) and Tib. Claudius</strong></td>
<td><strong>Severi</strong></td>
<td><strong>TAM V2 966, 967</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Donation Text</td>
<td>Era</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>C. Iulius Lepidus</td>
<td>Sardeis</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεύς τῆς Ἀσίας</td>
<td>Domitian?</td>
<td>I. Sardis 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>C. Iulius M. f. Lepidus</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεύς τῆς Ἀσίας</td>
<td>Cf. no. 45</td>
<td>TAM V2 968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>L. Iulius Libonianus</td>
<td>Sardeis</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεύς τῆς Ἀσίας ναὸν τῶν ἐν Λυδίᾳ Σαρδιανῶν</td>
<td>Albinus?</td>
<td>I. Sardeis 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>C. Iulius Pardalas</td>
<td>Sardeis</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεύς καὶ διὰ βίου ἁγιοθέτης θεᾶς Ῥώμης καὶ Αὐτοκράτορος θεοῦ νιὸν Σεβαστοῦ</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>I Eph 3825 (Hypaipa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>C. Iulius Philippus</td>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>ἀσιάρχης ἀρχιερεύς Ἀσίας ἁγιοθέτης διὰ βίου</td>
<td>Grandfather of senator C. Iulius Philippus</td>
<td>OGIS 498; IK Tralles 51; 54; 128-130; Martyrium S. Polycarpi 12, 21; PIR² 1460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>C. Iulius Python</td>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεύς Ἀσίας</td>
<td>Antoninus Pius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Kydoros</td>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>ἀσιάρχης</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td>SEG LVIII 1295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Menander</td>
<td>Hypaipa</td>
<td>β’ ἀσιάρχης</td>
<td>Septimius Severus/Caracalla</td>
<td>Revue Numismatique 1, 1883, p. 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name(s)</td>
<td>City/Area</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>L. Pescennius Gessius</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>ἀσιάρχης γ’ ἀσιάρχης curator rei publicae</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle of 3rd century</td>
<td>SEG II 652; TAM V3 1500; IK Smyrna 635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Poplius Gavius Capito</td>
<td>Hierokaisareia</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς Ἁσίας</td>
<td>wife Claudia Ammion (no. 24)</td>
<td>Claudius/Nero</td>
<td>I. Manisa Museum 532; IEph 681; BMC Lydia, p.58f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Ulpia Marcella</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεία τῆς Ἁσίας ἀρχιερεία τῆς Ἁσίας ναὸν τῶν ἐν Σμύρνη</td>
<td>Wife of archiereus Asias P. Aelius Paullus (no. 1); daughter of M. Ulpius Damas from Ephesos</td>
<td>Hadrian or Severi?</td>
<td>TAM V2 931, 996; TAM V2 997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Ulpia Stratonike</td>
<td>Nakrasa (or Akrasos), Lydia</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεία Ἁσιας γυμνασίαρχης</td>
<td>Wife of archiereus Phesinus from Theos</td>
<td>1st or 2nd century</td>
<td>IGR IV 1571; I. Manisa Museum 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Anonymi</td>
<td>Area of Tripolis</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεῖς Ἁσίας</td>
<td>ancestors of Fl.Aurelius Eilos</td>
<td>around second half of the 2nd century</td>
<td>SEG XLI 1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Anonymi</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεῖς Ἁσίας</td>
<td>Father and grandfather of T. Antonius Claudius Alfenus Arignotus Qurinia, equites</td>
<td></td>
<td>Septimius Severus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Archieerous Asias and Asiarchs in Phrygia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Aebutius Flaccus</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεύς Ἀσίας, ἀρχιερεύς τῆς Ἀσίας ναοῦ τοῦ ἐν Κυζίκῳ</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd century</td>
<td>SEG LII 1342; IGR IV 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelia Ammia</td>
<td>Amorion</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεία Ἀσίας</td>
<td>Son M. Iulius Aquila (no. 26)</td>
<td>2nd century</td>
<td>SEG XXXVII 1099bis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeliana Regina</td>
<td>Apameia</td>
<td>Ἀσίας ἀρχιερεία</td>
<td>Wife of archiereus Asias Proclianus Trypho (no. 29); possibly related to asiarch (P.) Aelius Trypho (no. 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>IGR IV 784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P.) Aelius Trypho</td>
<td>Apameia</td>
<td>ἀσιάρχης ἀσιάρχης τρίς</td>
<td>Possibly related to archereis Asias Proclianus Trypho and Aeliana Regina (nos. 29 and 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>BMC Phrygia p. 101, no. 179f; p. 89, no. 118; SNG 3506, 3507; MAMA VI 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Aelius Zeuxidemus Cassianus</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>• ἀρχιερεύς Ἀσίας • ἀσιάρχης • curator rei publicae</td>
<td>Grandfather of senator Aelius Antipater</td>
<td>2nd century?</td>
<td>IGR IV 819; IGR IV 828; MAMA IX 26; PIR² A 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonia</td>
<td>Laodikeia on</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεία τῆς</td>
<td>Daughter of no. 8</td>
<td>1st or 2nd</td>
<td>IK Laodikeia am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Century</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>L. Antonius Zeno</td>
<td>Laodikeia on</td>
<td>Άρχιερεύς Αυτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Σεβαστός ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ</td>
<td>Possibly the same as no. 8?</td>
<td>SEG XXXVII 855; MAMA VI 104; RPC I 2912-2916; RPC I 2928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Lykos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>L. Antonius Zenon</td>
<td>Laodikeia on</td>
<td>• Άρχιερεύς τῆς Ἀσίας&lt;br&gt;• Ιερεύς τῆς πόλεως&lt;br&gt;• Γυμνασίαρχος</td>
<td>1st or 2nd century</td>
<td>IK Laodikeia am Lykos 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Lykos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>M. Aurelius Severus</td>
<td>Aizanoi</td>
<td>Άρχιερεύς Ἀσίας ναὸν τὸν ἐν Περγάμῳ</td>
<td>Severus Alexander</td>
<td>IGR IV 577=MAMA IX P40; SNG Phrygia 105; Coll. Wadd. 5585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Claudia (or Claudiane)?</td>
<td>Dorylaion</td>
<td>Άρχιερεια τῆς Ἀσίας</td>
<td>Wife of archiereus Asias C. Iulius A… Saturninus (no. 27)</td>
<td>Echos d’Orient 10 (1907), p. 77, no. 2 = MAMA V Lists I 183, 154-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Claudia Lorentia</td>
<td>Synnada</td>
<td>Άρχιερεια τῆς Ἀσίας</td>
<td></td>
<td>IGR IV 706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>L. Claudius Lepidus</td>
<td>Aizanoi</td>
<td>Άρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας ναὸν τὸν ἐν Σμύρνῃ</td>
<td>Hadrian ?</td>
<td>MAMA IX 22; IGR IV 586=MAMA IX P55 ; MAMA IX P56=SEG XXVI 1352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Tib. Claudius Pardalas</td>
<td>Aizanoi</td>
<td>Άρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας ναὸν ἐν</td>
<td>First half of the 2nd century</td>
<td>MAMA IX 18-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name 1</td>
<td>Location 1</td>
<td>Location 2</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>[Tib. Claudius] Piso Tertullinus</td>
<td>Synnada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMA VI 374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Q. Claudius Pollio</td>
<td>Hierapolis, Akmoneia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMA XI 100; SNG von Aulock 8386; BMC Phrygia 265 no. 1 and 4; 267 no. 14; 268 no. 15; Coll. Wadd. 6186;6187;6189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>M. Claudius Valerianus</td>
<td>Eumeneia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domitian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BMC Phrygia p. 218, no. 47f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>(M.) Claudius Valerianus Tertullianus</td>
<td>Eumeneia</td>
<td>son of M. Claudius Valerianus (no. 16)</td>
<td>Hadrian</td>
<td>MAMA IV 336; SEG XXVIII 1115; 1116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Demetrios</td>
<td>Synnada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First half of the 3rd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMA IV 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Euethios</td>
<td>Laodikeia on the Lykos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEG XLVII 1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Flavius Iulianus</td>
<td>Aizanoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brother of no. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ca 150 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEG XLV 1712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMA VI List 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Flavius Pardalas</td>
<td>Aizanoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brother of no. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ca 150 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEG XLV 1712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Flavius Priscus</td>
<td>Akmoneia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Septimius Severus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mionnet IV p. 201, no. 31; Imhoof-Blumer p. 391, no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>M. Flavius Valerianus</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας</td>
<td>Possible grandson of M. Claudius Valerianus (no. 16) and nephew of (M.) Claudius Valerianus Tertullianus (no. 17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terentullianus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd century</td>
<td>SEG LII 1342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Iulia Marcellina</td>
<td>Synnada</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεία τῆς Ἀσίας ναὸν τῶν ἐν Περγάμῳ</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius</td>
<td>MAMA VI 373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>M. Iulius Aquila</td>
<td>Amorion</td>
<td>ἀσιάρχης, ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας ναὸν τῶν ἐν Ἑφέσῳ</td>
<td>Second half of 2nd century</td>
<td>SEG XXXVII 1099bis; IEph 686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>C. Iulius A… Saturninus</td>
<td>Dorylaion</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς Ἀσίας</td>
<td>Husband of Claudia/Claudiane (no. 10)</td>
<td>Echos d’Orient 10 (1907), p. 77, no. 2 = MAMA V Lists I 183, 154-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>C. Iulius Cleon</td>
<td>Eumeneia</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς Ἀσίας</td>
<td>Tiberius/Nero</td>
<td>IEph 688; RPC I 3149–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Proclianus Trypho</td>
<td>Apameia</td>
<td>Ἀσίας ἀρχιερεὺς</td>
<td>Husband of archierea Aeliana Regina (no. 3); possibly related to asiarch (P.) Aelius Trypho (no. 4)</td>
<td>Valerianus and Gallienus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>M. Sestullios Severus</td>
<td>Appia</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας</td>
<td>200-225 AD</td>
<td>MAMA X, 70, 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flavianus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Ulpia Carminia</td>
<td>Attouda</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεία Ἀσίας</td>
<td>Daughter of M.</td>
<td>Early 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ulpia Claudia Carminia Procle</td>
<td>Wife of M. Ulpius Carminius Claudianus neoteros (no. 36), mother of archiereia Asias Ulpia Carminia Claudiana (no. 31)</td>
<td>Second half of 2nd century, van Bremen 1996, p. 352, no. 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>M. Ulpius Appuleius Eurykles</td>
<td>Grandson of archiereus Asias M. Ulpius Appuleius Flavianus (no. 34)</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius, Lucius Verus, Commodus, MAMA IX P18; OGIS 508, IApH2007 12.538; MAMA VIII 505; IGR IV 573-576 = MAMA IX P6-P9; SEG XXXV 1365; SEG XLII 1185-1188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>M. Ulpius Apulleius Flavianus</td>
<td>Grandfather of M. Ulpius Appuleius Eurykles (no. 33)</td>
<td>Hadrian ?, SEG XXXV 1365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>M. Ulpius Carminius Claudianus</td>
<td>Son of M. Ulpius Carminius Polydeukes Claudianus (no. 37, husband of)</td>
<td>First half of the 2nd century, IApH2007 12.1111; MAMA VI 74-75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>M. Ulpius Carminius Claudianus neoteros</td>
<td>Attouda</td>
<td>36. M. Ulpius Carminius Claudianus neoteros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>archiereia Asias Flavia Appia from Aphrodisias, father of senator T. Carminius Flavius Athenagoras Claudianus and asiarch M. Ulpius Carminius Claudianus neoteros (no. 36)</td>
<td>Son of archiereus Asias M. Ulpius Carminius Claudianus (no. 35), husband of archiereia Asias Ulpia Claudia Carminia Procle (no. 32), father of archiereia Asias Ulpia Carminia Claudiana (no. 31)</td>
<td>Second half of 2nd century</td>
<td>MAMA VI 74; SNG Von Aulock 2501, 2505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>M. Ulpius Carminius Polydeukes Claudianus</td>
<td>Attouda</td>
<td>37. M. Ulpius Carminius Polydeukes Claudianus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>archiereus Ἄσιας ἀσιάρχης</td>
<td>Father of archiereus Asias M. Ulpius Carminius Claudianus (no. 33)</td>
<td>Beginning of the 2nd century</td>
<td>IApH2007 12.1111; SEG LV 1408-1409; Col. Wadd. 2268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>praefectus cohortis I Ulpiae Galatarum</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd century?</td>
<td>IGR IV 882; PME U 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>C. Voc(onius) Aelius Stratonikos</td>
<td>Dorylaion</td>
<td>άρχιερευς Ἄσιας</td>
<td>Second half of 2nd century</td>
<td>IGR IV 525 = MAMA V List 181, 33; PME A 64 = PME V 122bis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Anonymi</td>
<td>Synnada</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεῖς Ἄσιας</td>
<td>Beginning of the 2nd century</td>
<td>MAMA VI 373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Anonymi</td>
<td>Aizanoi</td>
<td>Ἄσιας ἀρχιερεῖς</td>
<td>Second half of the 2nd century</td>
<td>IGR IV 578=MAMA IX P48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Anonymi</td>
<td>Akmoneia</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεῖς Ἄσιας</td>
<td>Second half of the 2nd century</td>
<td>MAMA XI 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Anonymi</td>
<td>Temenothyrai</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεῖς Ἄσιας</td>
<td>End of the 2nd century</td>
<td>IGR IV 617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>Akmoneia</td>
<td>ἁσιάρχης</td>
<td>Father of Flavius Priscus (perhaps identical with asiarch)</td>
<td>SNG Phrygia 34, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flavius Priscus no. 23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
City officials in the cities of Roman Lydia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Relatives</th>
<th>Type of inscription</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sardeis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apoll...</td>
<td>āγορονοθέτης</td>
<td></td>
<td>Descendant of the consular family</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>I. Sardis 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruntius –inus Aquilinus Italicianus</td>
<td>γραμματεύς āγορονοθέτης</td>
<td>Severus Alexander</td>
<td>Great-grandson of asiarch Aruntius Maternus (LAA 8) and son of equestrian Aruntius Antoninus (LE 4)</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>I. Sardis 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Chryseros</td>
<td>āγορανόμος</td>
<td>200-250 AD</td>
<td>Dedication of images of Eros</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>I. Sardis 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Sokrates Philippianus</td>
<td>ἄρχων</td>
<td>Around 200 AD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>I. Sardis 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celsus</td>
<td>āγορανόμος</td>
<td>1st century BC-1st century AD</td>
<td>Possibly an ancestor of senator Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaenus</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>I. Sardis 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudius Menogenes</td>
<td>ἴερευς στρατηγός στεφανήφορος</td>
<td>26-130 AD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>I. Sardis 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tib. Claudius Silanius</td>
<td>στεφανήφορος</td>
<td>1st –early 2nd century AD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>I. Sardis 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti. Claudius Theogenes Lachanas</td>
<td>āγορανόμος γραμματεύς τού δήμου</td>
<td>ca 50 AD</td>
<td>mother/daughter Claudia, ἴερεα Δήμητρος</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>SEG XLVIII 1472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavius Eisigonos</td>
<td>γυμνασιάρχης στρατηγός γραμματεύς τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἑλλήνων</td>
<td>ca 96 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>I. Sardis 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>ἀγοσωνοθέτης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>I. Sardis 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>ἀλυτάρχης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>I. Sardis 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Magnesia ad Sipylum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Aelius Apollonius</td>
<td>στεφανηφόρος</td>
<td>ca 150 AD</td>
<td>Foundation of an eternal stephanephoria</td>
<td>TAM V2 1345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apolonios, son of Apolonios</td>
<td>ἀρχων</td>
<td>Septimius Severus</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>TAM V2 1362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti. Cl. Iolas Restitutus</td>
<td>πρῶτος στρατηγός</td>
<td>Septimius Severus</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>TAM V2 1362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dikaphenes, son of Dikaphenes</td>
<td>στεφανηφόρος ἱερεύς γυμνασιάρχης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>TAM V2 1367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermogenes, son of Karikos</td>
<td>πρῶτος ἀρχων</td>
<td>Septimius Severus</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>TAM V2 1361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preimos Hosios</td>
<td>ἀρχων</td>
<td>Septimius Severus</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>TAM V2 1362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seios Optatos Kleomachos</td>
<td>πρῶτος ἀρχων</td>
<td>Septimius Severus</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>TAM V2 1363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatianos Teimotheos</td>
<td>ἀρχων</td>
<td>Septimius Severus</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>TAM V2 1362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hierokaisareia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antigenes, son of</td>
<td>ἱερονόμος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>TAM V2 1246; SEG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>inscription XXXV 1156; I Manisa Museum 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apellas, son of Apellas</td>
<td>ierovmou, dekaprotos, stratroge, grammateus, tov demou epistates ergon</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V2 1266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemidoros</td>
<td>iereus Dio Sabazios</td>
<td>Early imperial period</td>
<td>Dedication to Zeus Sabazios Malay, Researches no. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemidoros, son of Diogenes</td>
<td>archon</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V2 1246; SEG XXXV 1156; I Manisa Museum 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemidoros, son of Dionysios</td>
<td>ierovmou</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Building inscription TAM V2 1246; SEG XXXV 1156; I Manisa Museum 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemidoros, son of Polybios</td>
<td>agonothetai</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V2 1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Attalos</td>
<td>agonothetai</td>
<td>3rd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V2 1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Diogenes</td>
<td>stefanforos</td>
<td>3rd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V2 1267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Dionysios</td>
<td>agonothetai</td>
<td>3rd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V2 1271; 1274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Diophanes</td>
<td>agonothetai</td>
<td>3rd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V2 1272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Glykon</td>
<td>boylarchos</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>TAM V2 1268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biton, son of Roustios</td>
<td>ierovmou</td>
<td>Reign of Claudius</td>
<td>Dedication to the goddess of TAM V2 1252; SEG XXXV 1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaius, son of Gaius</td>
<td>ἀρχων</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>SEG</em> LVII 1164 (Herrmann, Malay <em>New Documents</em> no. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermocrates Aischronios</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>Reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Imhoof-Blumer</em> no. 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulius Iulianus</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>Reign of Antonius Pius</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>BMC</em> Lydia no. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kretinos, son of Artemidoros</td>
<td>ἱερωνόμος</td>
<td>Reign of Claudius</td>
<td>Dedication to the goddess of the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>TAM</em> V2 1252; <em>SEG</em> XXXV 1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menandros, son of Menandros</td>
<td>ἀρχων Β′</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>SEG</em> LVII 1164 (Herrmann, Malay <em>New Documents</em> no. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menodoros</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>Reign of Marcus Aurelius</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mionnet IV</em> no. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippos</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεύς</td>
<td>Reign of Commodus and Septimius Severus</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Imhoof-Blumer</em> no. 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratoneike, daughter of Apollonides</td>
<td>ἱερεία τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος</td>
<td>2nd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription Malayan, <em>Researches</em> no. 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelius Glykon</td>
<td>πρύτανις ἀγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>TAM</em> V2 929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publius Aelius Menogenes Pyrichos</td>
<td>στρατηγός ἀγορανόμος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>TAM</em> V2 930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcianus</td>
<td>grammatēς bouλῆς δήμου ἐφήβαρχος τριτευτής δεκάπρωτος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonius Bassus</td>
<td>ἐπιμελητής</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollodotos, son of Menodotos</td>
<td>στρατηγός ἐργεπιστάτης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Dedication to the emperors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariston, son of Ploutiados</td>
<td>γυμνασίαρχης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemidoros, son of Artemidoros</td>
<td>grammatēς</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemidoros, son of Meth[- - - ]</td>
<td>πρύτανις στρατηγός γραμματεύς δεκάπρωτος τριτευτής βουλευτής</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asklepiades, son of Tryphon</td>
<td>πρύτανις ἱερεύς τῆς Ῥώμης στρατηγός σειτώνης τριτευτής γραμματεύς bouλῆς δήμου δεκάπρωτος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Abaskantos</td>
<td>δεκάπρωτος ἐργεπιστάτης στρατηγός γραμματεύς δήμου</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Aurelius Aristomenos</td>
<td>ἁγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Son of L. Aurelius Aristomenos and Aurelia Tatia, archiereis Asias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Artemidoros, son of Artemidoros</td>
<td>ἁγωνοθέτης δεκάπρωτος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Artemagoros, son of Glykonos</td>
<td>στρατηγός ἐπιστάτης ἔργων δεκάπρωτος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Asklepiades, son of Marcus</td>
<td>γραμματεὺς βουλῆς δήμου δεκάπρωτος σειτώνης ἁγορανόμος ἵππαρχος στρατηγός (in the name of his sons)</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Asklepiades Diogenes, son of Aurelius Diogenes</td>
<td>ἁγωνοθέτης δεκάπρωτος σειτώνης στρατηγός</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aur. Polythallos Frontonos</td>
<td>ἁγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Ammia</td>
<td>ιέρεα τῶν Σεβαστῶν ἀρχιέρεα τῆς πολέως διὰ βίου ἁγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Husband Tiberius Claudius Antillos, possibly niece of C. Iulius Lepidus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Relation</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius Claudius Antyllus</td>
<td>gymnasiarchis tris</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Wife Claudia Ammia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius Claudius Glykonos</td>
<td>gymnasiarchis prutanas</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius Claudius Kyrinos Antyllos</td>
<td>gymnasiarchis dizes</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius Claudius Socrates</td>
<td>aganonothetis gymnasiarchis</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Father of Ti. Claudius Socrates Sacerdotianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti. Claudius Socrates Sacerdotianus</td>
<td>steфанифорос prutanes dizes aganonothetis archierewes ton sebaston dia bion iereus to diouvsou</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Son of Tiberius Claudius Socrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelia At[...]</td>
<td>aganonothetis</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Flavius Alexander</td>
<td>argoranomos kourator ton Romaiow koubento</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.Flavius Marcius Polianus</td>
<td>ephiparchos steфанифорos</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hephestion, son of Apollodoros</td>
<td>aganonothetis</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Inscribed gem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulia Iuliana</td>
<td>aganonothetis</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Daughter of C. Iulius Celsius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulianus Solonos, son of Iulianus Germanus</td>
<td>eirinarchis dekaprowtos</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Iulius Celsius</td>
<td>stratetgos argoranomos</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Father of Iulia Iuliana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title/Position</td>
<td>Relationship/Details</td>
<td>Inscriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Iulius Dionysios Aquilianus</td>
<td>Ípparpìkoς δεκάπρωτος τριτευτής</td>
<td>his son was M. Iulius Menelaos</td>
<td>TAM V 960; 965; 969; 992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Iulius Lepidus</td>
<td>ἄγωνοθέτης διὰ βίου γυμνασίαρχης ἐ'</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V2 968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Iulius Menelaos</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεύς βούλαρχος διὰ βίου ἄγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>reign of Caracalla</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V2 969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Iulius Nikomachos</td>
<td>δεκάπρωτος πανηγυριάρχης γυμνασίαρχης γραμματεύς ἐργεπιστάτης σειτώνιος ίππαρχος στρατηγός ἀγορανόμος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V2 968; 970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laibianos, son of Kalistratos</td>
<td>τριτευτής σειτώνιος ἀγορανόμος δεκάπρωτος ἐργεπιστάτης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V2 982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makedonos</td>
<td>εἰρηνάρχης ἀγορανόμος στρατηγός</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V2 989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Father/Child</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus, son of Menandros</td>
<td>δεκάπρωτος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>TAM V2 991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Marcius Pollianus</td>
<td>πρώτος στρατηγός ἀγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>TAM V2 990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrodoros, son of Metrodoros</td>
<td>ἀγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>TAM V2 993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Plautus Erechtheos</td>
<td>γραμματεύς</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>TAM V2 975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polios Euboulos</td>
<td>ἀγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>TAM V2 1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sallustius</td>
<td>στεφανήφορος στρατηγός</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>TAM V2 998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sallustius Aristophanus</td>
<td>δεκάπρωτος ἀγωνοθέτης σειτώνης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>TAM V2 998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secundus (?), son of Aurelius</td>
<td>στρατηγός σειτώνης δεκάπρωτος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>TAM V2 999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tryphosianos</td>
<td>ἀγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>TAM V2 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>δεκάπρωτος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>TAM V2 1024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἐφήβαρχος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Apollonios, son of Apollonios</td>
<td>γυμνασιάρχης ἱππότης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristoboulos, son of Aristoboulos</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aur. Attikos</td>
<td></td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>241-244 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aur. Auxanontos Hermos</td>
<td></td>
<td>πρώτος στρατηγός</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damonikos, son of Demetrios</td>
<td></td>
<td>γυμνασιάρχης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triphon (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>γυμνασιάρχης ἱππότης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonyma</td>
<td></td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td></td>
<td>στρατηγός σειτώνης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td></td>
<td>γυμνασιάρχης τρίς στρατηγός</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daldis</td>
<td>Menecrates, son of Polyneidos</td>
<td>λογιστής στρατηγός γυμνασιάρχης πρύτανης ἀγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhos</td>
<td>Áγωνοθέτης στεφανήφορος ἱερεύς</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iulia Gordos</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandros, son of Alexandros</td>
<td>στεφανήφορος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonios, son of Artemidoros</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>First quarter of the 1st century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemidoros, son of Asklepiades</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asklepidēs, son of Hephaistōn</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>First quarter of the 1st century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenodoros, son of Athenodoros</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>75/76 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attalos, son of Menandros</td>
<td>δεκάπρωτος ἀγορανόμος στρατηγός στεφανήφορος</td>
<td>First quarter of the 1st century AD</td>
<td>Brother of Kleon, possibly related to Menandros, son of Demetrios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tib. Claudius Kyrenios</td>
<td>δεκάπρωτος λαμπάδαρχης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Son of Tib. Claudius Stratoneikianos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tib. Claudius Stratoneikianos</td>
<td>δεκάπρωτος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Father of Tib. Claudius Kyrenios and Tib. Claudius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaius Iulius Theodotos</td>
<td>γραμματεύς τοῦ δήμου</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraklides, son of Apolonios</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulianus Florus</td>
<td>πρώτος ἄρχων</td>
<td>Reign od M. Aurelius and L. Commodus</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleon, son of Menandros</td>
<td>δεκάπρωτος</td>
<td>First quarter of the 1st century AD</td>
<td>Brother of Attalos, possibly related to Menandros, son of Demetrios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menandros, son of Menandros</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>75/76 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrophanes, son of Neon</td>
<td>γραμματεύς τοῦ δήμου</td>
<td>First quarter of the 1st century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papios, son of Apollonios</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>First quarter of the 1st century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platon, son of Agemachos</td>
<td>γραμματεύς τοῦ δήμου</td>
<td>First quarter of the 1st century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyneitos, son of Dionysios</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>75/76 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...], son of Asklepiades</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saïttai</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andronikos</td>
<td>εἰρηνάρχης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl. Herklanos</td>
<td>ἀρχων</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glykonos</td>
<td>στεφανήφορος</td>
<td>100/101 AD</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okta. Kinbros</td>
<td>ἀρχων</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sos. Charikles</td>
<td>ἀρχων α’</td>
<td>Iulia Domna and Caracalla</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titianos</td>
<td>ἀρχων α’</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...], son of Andronikos</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus Aelius Glykon Papias</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεύς λογιστής (τής ιερᾶς βουλῆς)</td>
<td>2nd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulus Hostius Hieron</td>
<td>βουλαρχός</td>
<td>2nd or 3rd century</td>
<td>TAM V3 1480; 1481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Antonius Agathopus</td>
<td>κουρατόρ δεκάπρωτος πανηγυράρχης</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td>TAM V3 1476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucius Antonius Polianos</td>
<td>σειτοδότης στεφανήφωρος</td>
<td>2nd century AD</td>
<td>TAM V3 1463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[- - -] Aurelius [- - -]</td>
<td>βουλευτής</td>
<td>2nd or 3rd century</td>
<td>TAM V3 1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Aurelius Diodorus</td>
<td>βουλευτής γερουσιαστής ἀγορανόμος τάμιας ἐφήβαρχος βουλάρχος</td>
<td>229/230 AD</td>
<td>kinsman of asiarch M. Aurelius Manilius Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Dionysius Quintus</td>
<td>πανηγυριάρχης</td>
<td>3rd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Hephaiston Paitianos</td>
<td>πρῶτος στρατηγός</td>
<td>Around 220 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Hermippos</td>
<td>ξυστάρχης ἱερεύς τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος</td>
<td>After 212 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Lollianos Menandros</td>
<td>πρῶτος στρατηγός</td>
<td>3rd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Niketes, son of Diadumenos</td>
<td>ἀργυροταμίας τῆς γερουσίας</td>
<td>2nd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Aurelius Pius, son</td>
<td>(Δαλδιανός)</td>
<td>253-260 AD</td>
<td>Agonistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date/Period</td>
<td>Inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Socrates</td>
<td>Bouleutēs</td>
<td>209-211 AD</td>
<td>Inscribed stamp TAM V3 1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudius Basileides</td>
<td>ἰδικάπρωτος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius Claudius Iulianos</td>
<td>στρατηγός δίς στεφανήφορος γυμνασιάρχης</td>
<td>Early imperial period ?</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V3 1448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publius Cornelius Priscus</td>
<td>ἀγορανόμος</td>
<td>2nd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V3 1474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius Zelotos</td>
<td>δεκάπρωτος κουρατὸρ πανηγυριάρχης</td>
<td>2nd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V3 1474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crispus Nikanor, son of Crispus</td>
<td>βουλάρχος</td>
<td>2nd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscriptions TAM V3 1460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus Flavius Artemidoros</td>
<td>ξυστάρχης διὰ βίου</td>
<td>Probably Flavian period</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V3 1505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus Flavius Athenodoros</td>
<td>στεφανήφορος δεκάπρωτος τάμιας</td>
<td>1st or 2nd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V3 1455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus Flavius Praxeas, son of Hermogenes</td>
<td>πρώτος ἄρχων</td>
<td>Between 88 and 92 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription TAM V3 1453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glykon Papias</td>
<td>βουλάρχος</td>
<td>2nd century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heliodoros, son of Heliodoros</td>
<td>βουλάρχος στρατηγός ἀγορανόμος ἱππαρχὸς σειτώνης πανηγυριάρχης νομοφύλαξ ἀρχιερεὺς</td>
<td>2nd or 3rd century</td>
<td>TAM V3 1484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermocrates, son of</td>
<td>γραμματεύς τήν</td>
<td>2nd or 3rd</td>
<td>Building TAM V3 1522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Century</td>
<td>Inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermocrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermogenes Maximus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Iulius Makedon Aurelianus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucius, son of Corbulo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcellus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcellus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikanor, son of Nikanor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pardala, son of Ulpius Pardala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ - - - ], son of Hermippos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ - - - ], son of Neoptolemos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Century</td>
<td>Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polykrates</td>
<td>ξυστάρχης διὰ βίου βουλευτῆς</td>
<td>Reign of Severi</td>
<td>Agonistic inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>ξυστάρχης διὰ βίου</td>
<td>3rd century AD</td>
<td>Agonistic inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tralleis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Aurelius Euarestos</td>
<td>Βουλαρχός ἀγορανόμος εἰρηνάρχης στρατηγὸς δεκάπρωτος σειτώνης τάμιας</td>
<td>second half of the 2nd / first half of the 3rd century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Aurelius Soterichos</td>
<td>Γραμματεύς</td>
<td>second half of the 2nd / first half of the 3rd century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[M. Claudius ? ]</td>
<td>Βερενικιανός</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti. Iulius Claudianus</td>
<td>Στεφανηφόρος Γραμματεύς τοῦ δήμου Βουλαρχός εἰρηνάρχης ἀγορανόμος σειτώνης χρυσοφόρος παραφύλαξ</td>
<td>1st or 2nd century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sextus Bassus</td>
<td>βουλευτής</td>
<td>1st or 2nd century</td>
<td><em>IK Trralleis 145</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypaipa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandros, son of Apollonides</td>
<td>γραμματεύς τού δήμου νεωκόρος</td>
<td>First half of the 1st century AD</td>
<td><em>IEph 3801 I</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonios Tatianos</td>
<td>ἀγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>3rd century AD</td>
<td><em>SEG XXVII 787; IEph 3812 a</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aur. Croesus, son of Dionysios</td>
<td>ἀγορανόμος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td><em>IEph 3854</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aur. Alexandros, son of Hermogenes</td>
<td>ἀγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td><em>IEph 3813</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aur. Attalos Tatianos</td>
<td>στρατηγός πρῶτος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td><em>Nummi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aur. Moschionos</td>
<td>ἀγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Son of an asiarch Attalos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Flavius Lucius Hierax</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td><em>IEph 3809; 3810</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouras</td>
<td>στρατηγός το β’ πρῶτος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td><em>Nummi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>βουλαρχός</td>
<td>301 AD</td>
<td><em>IEph 3803 e</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>ἀγορανόμος χρεοφύλαξ</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Son of Aur. Croesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unknown provenance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Aur. Attinas Tatianus Valentillianus</td>
<td>πρύτανις ἀγωνοθέτης στεφανήφορος</td>
<td>2nd/3rd century AD</td>
<td><em>SEG L 1194</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymi</td>
<td>πρώτος στρατηγός</td>
<td>2nd/3rd century AD</td>
<td>ancestors of M. Aur. Attinas Tatianus Valentillianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχιερείς πρωτάνεις στρατηγοὶ ἀγωνοθέται στεφανηφόροι</td>
<td>prôtos stratêgos</td>
<td>2nd/3rd century AD</td>
<td>ancestors of M. Aur. Attinas Tatianus Valentillianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laodikeia on the Lykos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonia</td>
<td>γυμνασιὰρχης</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} or 2\textsuperscript{nd} century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Apphianus Philetianos</td>
<td>ἄγορανόμος</td>
<td>After 212 AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Zosimus</td>
<td>στρατηγὸς τῆς διὰ νυκτὸς</td>
<td>254/255 AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Claudius Sostratos</td>
<td>στρατηγὸς</td>
<td>Last third of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diokles, son of Metrophilos</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεύς στεφανήφορος</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} century AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[- - - ] Glaucianus</td>
<td>στρατηγὸς</td>
<td>Reign of Commodus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Iulius Paterc(u)lus</td>
<td>βουλευτὴς</td>
<td>Middle of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longinus, son of Longinus</td>
<td>πρύτανις τῆς φυλῆς</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neikomachos</td>
<td>γυμνασιὰρχης σειτωνῆς δεκάπρωτος ἐπιμελητὴς</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title/Position</td>
<td>Time Period</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Pomponius Flaccus</td>
<td>strathgÒj tÁj pÒlewj ¢goranÒmoj nomofÚlax strathgÒj di¦ nuktÕj presbjeutîs</td>
<td>1st or 2nd century</td>
<td>Honorary inscription (posthumous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucius Sedatius Theophilus</td>
<td>νομοφύλαξ</td>
<td>Second half of the 2nd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>βουλευτής</td>
<td>Reign of Commodus</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>βουλευτής</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>στρατηγός τής διά νυκτός</td>
<td>Last third of the 2nd century</td>
<td>Dedications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelianos</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>2nd-3rd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Aelius Zenon Iulianus</td>
<td>ἀγωνοθέτης διὰ βίου</td>
<td>180-192 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Ageleios Apollonides</td>
<td>βουλευτής στρατηγός ἀγορανόμος δεκάπρωτος κονβεντορχήσας τῶν Ῥωμαιον ἐργαπιστάτης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Antonius Vitellianus</td>
<td>χρεωφύλαξ ἀγορανόμος βουλάρχος</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tib. Claudius Epa[...]tos</td>
<td>στεφανήφορος γυμνασίαρχης</td>
<td>2nd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tib. Claudius Zotikos Boa</td>
<td>στρατηγός ἀγωνοθέτησις γραμματεύς ναών τῶν ἐν Ασίᾳ πρεσβευτῆς ἀρχιερεύς</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dekmos Iounios Pompeianos</td>
<td>στεφανήφορος ἀγορανόμος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrios</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>2nd-3rd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diphilos, son of Diphilos</td>
<td>ἀρχων β’</td>
<td>Beginning of the 1st century AD</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryas</td>
<td>γραμματεύς</td>
<td>Beginning of the 1st century AD</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iollas, son of Iollas</td>
<td>γραμματεύς</td>
<td>Beginning of the 1st century AD</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ioulia Tryphose</td>
<td>στεφανήφορος</td>
<td>221/2 or 270/1 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeuxidos, son of Menestratos</td>
<td>ἀγορανόμος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>ἀγορανόμος</td>
<td>2nd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaundos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl. Aurelius Eilos</td>
<td>στρατηγός στεφανήφορος</td>
<td>May 227 AD</td>
<td>Relatives of senatorial and equestrian status, ancestors ἀρχιερεύς Ἀσίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius Rufus</td>
<td>ἀγορανόμος</td>
<td>2nd / 3rd century</td>
<td>Funerary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**348**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandros, also known as Acholis</td>
<td>bouleutής ἀγορανόμος σειτώνης πανηγυριάρχης στρατηγός</td>
<td>2nd / 3rd century</td>
<td>Funerary bomos</td>
<td>MAMA XI 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aur. Frougianos</td>
<td>ἀγορανόμος σειτώνης στρατηγός παραφυλακή</td>
<td>248/249 AD</td>
<td>Funerary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA VI 335a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Claudius Capito</td>
<td>στεφανήφορος</td>
<td>cca 200 AD</td>
<td>father of C. Claudius Lucianus</td>
<td>SEG LVI 1493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Claudius Capitonus</td>
<td>στεφανήφορος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA VI Lists p. 149 no. 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaius Claudius Egnatius Vigellius Valerius Ulpius Antonius Pollio Terentullianus</td>
<td>ιερεύς διὰ βίου θεοῦ Ἅσκληπιοῦ ἄγωνοθέτης τῶν μεγάλων Ἅσκληπειῶν</td>
<td>150-200 AD</td>
<td>Descendant of Archereis Asias</td>
<td>MAMA XI 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Claudius Iulianus</td>
<td>ἀγορανόμος σειτώνης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA VI Lists p. 149 no. 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Claudius Lucianus</td>
<td>στεφανήφορος ἀγορανόμος ἀργυροταμίας γραμματεύς εἰρηνάρχης (τὸ δεύτερον)</td>
<td>200-250 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>SEG LVI 1493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title/Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Monument Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudius Menecleus</td>
<td>στεφανήφορος</td>
<td>cca 180 AD</td>
<td>grandfather</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Claudius Severus</td>
<td>στεφανήφορος</td>
<td>cca 200 AD</td>
<td>uncle</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Flavius Alexander</td>
<td>εἰρηνάρχης βουλάρχης ἀγορανόμος στρατηγός σειτώνης</td>
<td>244 AD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Flavius Aponianus</td>
<td>ἀρχιερεύς τῆς πόλεως</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkios Silonos</td>
<td>στεφανήφορος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikias Loukios, son of Asklepiodoros</td>
<td>ἀγορανόμος ἱερεύς Σεβαστῆς Εὐβοσίας δίὰ βίου στρατηγός γυμνασίαρχης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Pac(onius) Peisoneinos</td>
<td>πρῶτος ἄρχον</td>
<td>c. 215 AD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statue base for an emperor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulianus</td>
<td>βουλευτής</td>
<td>3rd century AD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funerary bomos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>δεκάπροτος χρεωφύλαξ ἀργυροταμίας ἀγορανόμος στρατηγός</td>
<td>Middle of the 3rd century AD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funerary doorstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traianopolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelianus Valerius</td>
<td>ἄρχον</td>
<td>197/198 AD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honorary inscription for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemon, son of Hermogenes</td>
<td>ἀρχων</td>
<td>167 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription for the emperors</td>
<td>MAMA XI 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysios, son of Pythodoros</td>
<td>γραμματεύς</td>
<td>167 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription for the emperors</td>
<td>MAMA XI 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl. Priscus</td>
<td>λογιστής</td>
<td>197/198 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription for Septimius Severus</td>
<td>MAMA XI 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaius Onesimos</td>
<td>γραμματεύς</td>
<td>197/198 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription for Septimius Severus</td>
<td>MAMA XI 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierokles, son of Archeteimos</td>
<td>ἀρχων τὸ β´</td>
<td>167 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription for the emperors</td>
<td>MAMA XI 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menandros Celer</td>
<td>ἀρχων</td>
<td>197/198 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription for Septimius Severus</td>
<td>MAMA XI 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthos, son of Tryphon</td>
<td>ἀρχων</td>
<td>167 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription for the emperors</td>
<td>MAMA XI 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippos Euodos</td>
<td>ἀρχων</td>
<td>197/198 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription for Septimius Severus</td>
<td>MAMA XI 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title/Title of Rank</td>
<td>Date/Period</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td>Inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kidyessos</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aur(elius) Glykon, son of Glykon</td>
<td>Βουλευτής</td>
<td>3rd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA XI 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aizanoi</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeneas, son of Dionysios</td>
<td>ἔπιμελητής</td>
<td>Mid-1st century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA IX 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemidoros, son of Menophilos</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA IX P36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemidoros, son of Trophimos</td>
<td>ἔπιμελητής</td>
<td>2nd or 3rd century AD</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>MAMA IX 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Euphemos</td>
<td>πρῶτος ἀρχων βουλάρχος στρατηγός δῖς</td>
<td>3rd century</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMA IX 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aur. Philippos</td>
<td>πρῶτος στρατηγός ἐπιμελητής</td>
<td>244-249 or 251-260 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA IX 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aur. Zenon</td>
<td>ἄρχων</td>
<td>260-268 AD</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
<td>BMC Phrygia p. 43 no. 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudioz Apollinarios</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA IX P34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tib. Claudius Apollinarios</td>
<td>ἐπιμελητής</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA IX P48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tib. Claudius Campanus Aurelianus</td>
<td>στρατηγός</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA IX P48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl. Rufinianus</td>
<td>ἄρχων</td>
<td>211-217 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription for Caracalla</td>
<td>MAMA IX P20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl. Tatianos</td>
<td>ἄρχων α'</td>
<td>180-192 AD</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
<td>BMC Phrygia p. 39 no. 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hordeoios, son of Antiochos</td>
<td>νεωκόρος τοῦ Διὸς ἀγορανόμος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA IX P41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ioulianos Tryphonos</td>
<td>στρατηγός βουλάρχος χρεωφύλαξ δίς</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA IX P39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrodoros, son of Menophilos</td>
<td>ἄρχων</td>
<td>First half of the 1st century AD</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMA IX 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menophilos, son of Apollonios</td>
<td>στρατηγός γραμματεύς χρεωφύλαξ πανηγυριάρχης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA IX P43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappos, son of Menogenes</td>
<td>νεακόρος τοῦ Διώς διὰ βίου ἀγορανόμος</td>
<td>1st-2nd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA IX 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippos Sotas</td>
<td>γραμματεύς τῆς γερουσίας</td>
<td>98-102 AD</td>
<td>Milestone</td>
<td>MAMA IX 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulpicius</td>
<td>ἄρχων</td>
<td>Mid-3rd century AD</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
<td>BMC Phrygia p. 42 no. 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ulpius Appuleianus Flavianus</td>
<td>ἁγωνοθέτης εἰρηνάρχης δίς βουλάρχος στρατηγός πρύτανις ἱερεύς τοῦ Διώς διὰ βίου</td>
<td>before 156/157 AD</td>
<td>His father was M. Ulpius Apuleius Flavianus, ἀρχιερεύς Ἀσίας ναὸν τῶν ἐν Περγάμῳ; his son was M. Ulpius Appuleius Eurykles</td>
<td>SEG XXXV 1365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Ulpius Appuleius Eurykles</td>
<td>άγωνοθέτης βουλάρχος πρώτος άρχων?</td>
<td>169/170 AD</td>
<td>His grandfather was M. Ulpius Apulleius Flavianus, ἀρχιερεύς Ἀσίας ναὸν τῶν ἐν Περγάμῳ; his father was M. Ulpius Appuleianus Flavianus</td>
<td>Honorary inscriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>στεφανήφορος άγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>180-192 AD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dorylaion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P. Aelius Sabinianos Demosthenes</th>
<th>στεφανήφορος</th>
<th>Not specified</th>
<th></th>
<th>Funerary inscription</th>
<th>MAMA V 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antiochis, daughter of Teuthrantos</td>
<td>ιέρεια γυμνασιάρχης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Wife of Asklepiades</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA V Lists I(i) p. 182 no. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asklepiades, son of Stratonikos</td>
<td>ιερεύς ἐπιστάτης τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῆς πόλεως γυμνασιάρχης γραμματεύς δία βίου</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Husband of Antiochis</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA V Lists I(i) p. 182 no. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Aur. Timaion</td>
<td>άρχων στεφανήφορος</td>
<td>Mid-3rd century AD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nummi</td>
<td>BMC Phrygia p. 198 no. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelianos, son of Cornelios</td>
<td>άρχων β’</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA V Lists I(i) p. 181 no.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratoneikianos Timaios</td>
<td>πρώτος άρχων στεφανήφορος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA V Lists I(i) p. 181 no.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nakoleia**

<p>| Apollonios, son of Anthos | ἐπιμελητής τῆς φυλής | Not specified | | Honorary inscription | MAMA V 204 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Nummi</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Markos Ioulis Ibikos</td>
<td>πρωτάρχον</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA V 204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Synnada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Nummi</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandros, son of Alexandros</td>
<td>άρχων άγωνοθέτης άρχιερεύς β’</td>
<td>Gordian III</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
<td>BMC Phrygia p. 403 no. 56-58; cf. MAMA IV 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemenos</td>
<td>άρχιερεύς</td>
<td>Claudius</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
<td>BMC Phrygia p. 399 no. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl. Aur. Achileus</td>
<td>πρώτος άρχον</td>
<td>293-305 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA IV 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aur. Athenaios Akyllos</td>
<td>πρώτος άρχον</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA IV 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudius, son of Attalos</td>
<td>πρύτανις</td>
<td>Antonius Pius</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
<td>BMC Phrygia p. 395 no. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudius Attalos</td>
<td>πρύτανις λογιστῆς</td>
<td>Lucius Verus</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
<td>BMC Phrygia p. 401 no. 49-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euagros</td>
<td>άγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>MAMA IV 68; cf. MAMA IV 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poseidonios, son of Artemidoros</td>
<td>στεφανίφορος γραμματεύς τῆς βουλῆς σειτώνης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>BCH 17 (1893), p. 282 no. 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophrosine</td>
<td>γυμνασιάρχης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>IGR IV 708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Eumeneia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Nummi</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Aelius Pauleinos</td>
<td>Εὐμενεύς βουλευτῆς</td>
<td>not specified</td>
<td>Epitaph</td>
<td>SEG XXVIII 1165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[- - - ] Ammianus</td>
<td>βουλευτῆς πρώτος στρατηγὸς ἀγορανόμος</td>
<td>2nd / 3rd century</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA XI 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aur. Monimos Zenodotos</td>
<td>λαμπαδάρχης, ierεύς, στρατηγός, χρεωφύλαξ, λογιστής, ἀγορανόμος, εἰρηνάρχης, παραφύλαξ, γραμματεύς</td>
<td>2nd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>IGR IV 739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrokles, son of Patrokles</td>
<td>βουλευτής (Εὐκαρπεύς), κληρούχος, τρειακονάρχης</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMA XI 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentapolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funerary doorstone</td>
<td>MAMA XI 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aur(elius) Alexandros, son of Gaius</td>
<td>βουλευτής (Εὐκαρπεύς)</td>
<td>255/256 AD</td>
<td>Funerary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA XI 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Pa...</td>
<td>βουλευτής</td>
<td>3rd century AD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apameia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemagoras</td>
<td>ἀγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>Before 211 AD</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
<td>BMC Phrygia p. 99 no. 172ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemas</td>
<td>ἀγωνοθέτης</td>
<td>Before 211 AD</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
<td>BMC Phrygia p. 98 no. 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Aur. Ariston Euklaionos</td>
<td>στρατηγός ἀγωνοθέτης εἰρηνάρχης</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA VI List p. 146 no. 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Aur. Dorotheos</td>
<td>ἀργυροταμίας</td>
<td>161-167 or 176-180 AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscriptions</td>
<td>MAMA VI 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tib. Claudius Peisonos</td>
<td>γυμνασιάρχης ιερεύς διὰ βίου Διός Κελαινέως ἐφίβαρχος</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA VI List p. 146 no. 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loukios Mounatios Anthos</td>
<td>ἐπιμελητής</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA VI List p. 146 no. 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markos Attalos</td>
<td>ἀργυροταμίας τῆς πόλεως</td>
<td>Second half of the 1st century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA VI 178-179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mythas, son of Diokleos</td>
<td>γυμνασιάρχης γραμματεύς δήμου</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA VI List p. 145 no. 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papios Deida Aidouchos</td>
<td>ἐπιμελητής</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA VI List p. 146 no. 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tryphonos Dioga</td>
<td>ἐπιμελητής</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA VI List p. 146 no. 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrannos Myta</td>
<td>ἐπιμελητής</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA VI List p. 146 no. 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolossai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappos</td>
<td>γραμματεύς</td>
<td>Mid-2nd century AD</td>
<td>Nummi</td>
<td>BMC Phrygia p. 154 no. 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymus</td>
<td>στρατηγός ἀγορανόμος βουλάρχος γραμματεύς τάμιας ἐφίβαρχος εἰρηνάρχης νομοφύλαξ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IGR IV 870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aur. Hermes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Βουλευτής</strong></td>
<td>3rd century AD</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>MAMA IV 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Κλει]ναγορεώς, son of Aristodemos</td>
<td>άγορανόμος</td>
<td>3rd century AD</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>παραφύλαξ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐπιμελητὴς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐργεπιστάτης</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐκδίκος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 9

Professional associations and occupations in Roman Lydia\(^{1396}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation /Association</th>
<th>Type of the inscription</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Source / Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ðʼ ɪατρός</td>
<td>Epitaph of Artemas</td>
<td>Sardeis</td>
<td>1(^{\text{st}}) century BC or AD</td>
<td>I Sardis 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðʼ λατύπος</td>
<td>Dedication to Zeus Sabazios</td>
<td>Kūpüler, Lydia (sanctuary of Zeus Sabazios)</td>
<td>16/17 AD</td>
<td>I. Manisa Museum 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οί βαφεῖς</td>
<td>Honorific inscription for Ti. Cl. Socrates</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>1(^{\text{st}}) century</td>
<td>TAM V2 978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαλκεῖς χαλκοτύπαι</td>
<td>Honorific inscription for M. Ant. Galates</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>50-150 AD</td>
<td>TAM V2 936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ ἐν τῷ σταταρίῳ πραγματευόμενοι</td>
<td>Honorific inscription T[... Iulius Lepidus</td>
<td>Sardeis</td>
<td>late 1(^{\text{st}}) – 2(^{\text{nd}}) century AD</td>
<td>SEG XLVI 1524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orderId 1952</td>
<td>Funerary inscription for Papinnia</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>117/118 AD</td>
<td>TAM V3 1773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ ὀμότεχνον τῶν</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Saittai</td>
<td></td>
<td>145/146 AD</td>
<td>TAM V1 85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1396}\) This table should provide general overview of attested occupations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>λαναρίων</th>
<th>Octavius Polycleitus</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἡ σύνοδος τῆς σκυτικῆς</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Preimos</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>147/148 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνβίωσις</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Pantagathon</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>151/152 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ πλατεία τῶν σκυτέων</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Apollonides the younger</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>152/153 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ συνεργασία τῶν γναφέων</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Charmides</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>152/153 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ ὀμότεχνον τῶν γναφέων</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Artemon</td>
<td>Iulia Gordos</td>
<td>152/153 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ πλατεία τῶν σκυτέων</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Artemidoros</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>153/154 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ ὀμότεχνον τῶν γναφέων</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Papias</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>154/155 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ ὀμότεχνον τῶν ὑφαντῶν</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Diodoros</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>156/157 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συμβιώσεις</td>
<td>Funerary inscription</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>156/157 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ πλατεία τῶν λεινουργῶν</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Trophimos</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>162/163 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γενικός ονόματος των επιγραφών</td>
<td>Αριθμός της επιγραφής</td>
<td>Ονομασία του θυμάτος</td>
<td>Έτος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η σύνοδος των τετκόνων</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of slave Philetairos</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>165/166 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ λατύπος</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Ionike</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>165/166 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η πλατεία τῶν σκυτέων</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Philippikos</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>166/167 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνβίωσις</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Asklepiades</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>166/167 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνβίωσις</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Zenobius</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>167/168 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ποδαρίοι</td>
<td>Funerary inscription</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>167/168 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ ὀμότεχνον τῶν λαναρίων</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Alexandros</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>168/169 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η σύνοδος τῶν νέων ποδαρίων</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Deskyllos</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>168/169 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνεργασία τῶν λαναρίων</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Leonas</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>170/171 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συμβιώσεις</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Glaphyros</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>170/171 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η σύνοδος τῶν</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Satala</td>
<td>Satala</td>
<td>170/171 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>μουσικῶν</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alypianos</strong></td>
<td><strong>Funerary inscription of Neikephoros</strong></td>
<td><strong>Saittai</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἦ πλατεία τῶν σκυτέων</td>
<td><strong>Religious inscription</strong></td>
<td><strong>Philosophical</strong></td>
<td><strong>Philadelphia</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ χαλκεύς</td>
<td><strong>Funerary inscription of Trophimas</strong></td>
<td><strong>Saittai</strong></td>
<td>183/184 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ ὀμότεχνον τῶν λεινουργῶν</td>
<td><strong>Funerary inscription of Herakleides</strong></td>
<td><strong>Saittai</strong></td>
<td>183/184 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ συνεργασία τῶν λεινουργῶν</td>
<td><strong>Funerary inscription of Pantagathos</strong></td>
<td><strong>Saittai</strong></td>
<td>183/184 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ συνεργασία τῶν λεινουργῶν</td>
<td><strong>Funerary inscription of Stratonikos</strong></td>
<td><strong>area of Saittai</strong></td>
<td>183/184 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ βαφεῖς</td>
<td><strong>Honorific inscription for M. Iul. Dionysius Aquilianus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thyateira</strong></td>
<td>before 192 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ συνεργασία τῶν λεινουργῶν</td>
<td><strong>Funerary inscription of Stratokles</strong></td>
<td><strong>area of Saittai</strong></td>
<td>192/193 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ συνεργασία τῶν λεινουργῶν</td>
<td><strong>Funerary inscription of Androneikos</strong></td>
<td><strong>Saittai</strong></td>
<td>192/193 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ ἐριουργοί</td>
<td><strong>Funerary inscription of Androneikos</strong></td>
<td><strong>Saittai</strong></td>
<td>192/193 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygeinos</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Deskylos</td>
<td>area of Saittai</td>
<td>194/195 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ συνεργασία τῶν λινουργῶν</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Attalianos</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>194/195 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνβιώσεις</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Epictetus</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>194/195 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ συνεργασία τῶν λινουργῶν</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Stephanos</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>196 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ βαφεῖς</td>
<td>Honorific inscription for Claudia Ammion</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>2nd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ δακτυλοκοιλογλύφος</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Doros from Sardes</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>2nd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ ιατρὸς</td>
<td>Dedication to Tyche Epekoos</td>
<td>Unknown provenance, Lydia</td>
<td>2nd century?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ ἄρτοκόποι</td>
<td>Honorific inscription for C. Iulius Iulianus Tatianus</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>Severan dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ βυρσεῖς</td>
<td>Honorific inscription for M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>Severan dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Text</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ κεραμεῖς</td>
<td>Honorific inscription for Caracalla</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>Severan dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ βαφεῖς</td>
<td>Honorific inscription for Aur. Artemagoros</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>Severan dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ λινουργοί</td>
<td>Honorific inscription for Annianos</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>Severan dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ φυλὴ λινουργῶν</td>
<td>Inscription of tribes on the seats of the stadium</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>Second half of 2nd or 3rd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ φυλὴ τῶν σκυτέων</td>
<td>Fragmentary honorary inscription</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Second half of 2nd or 3rd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ λεντικρία</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Trophimē</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>2nd or 3rd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ σκυτότομοι</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Apollonides</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>2nd/3rd century AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ ψιλάγνασοι</td>
<td>Building inscription</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>2nd/3rd century AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ βαφεῖς</td>
<td>Honorific inscription for T. Ant. Cl. Alfenus Arignotus</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>199/200 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χάλκευς</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Kosmos</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>201/202 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ή συνεργασία τῶν λινουργῶν</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Alexandros</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>202/203 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ή συνεργασία τῶν λινουργῶν</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Iulianos</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>205/206 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ή συνεργασία τῶν χαρκέων</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Prepon</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>208/209 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ή συνεργασία τῶν σιππιναρίων</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Markellos</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>208/209 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ή συνεργασία τῶν λινουργῶν</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Hermotheostos</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>209/210 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ή συνεργασία τῶν λινουργῶν</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Ammianos</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>211/212 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ή φυλή τῶν ἐρημοχέων</td>
<td>Honorary inscription for Aur. Hermippos</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>probably after 212 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ή φυλή τῶν σκυτέων</td>
<td>Honorary inscription for Fl. Aur. Hephaisitcon Papianus</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>cca 220 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>όι λανάριοι</td>
<td>Honorific inscription for C. Perelius Aurelius Alexander</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>218-222 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ γνωφεῖς</td>
<td>Honorific inscription for C. Perelius Aurelius Alexander</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>218-222 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ συνεργασία τῶν ἑριοργῶν</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Antiochos</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>223/224 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνβίωσις</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Iulianus</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>224/225 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ συνεργασία τῶν λινουργῶν</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Aur. Hermippos</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>233/234 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ λινουργός (φράτορες)</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Alexandros</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>238/239 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συμβιωταί</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Andronikos</td>
<td>Saittai</td>
<td>293/294 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ πλήθει βαφέων?</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Aur. Pankrates the younger</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>3rd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ σκανδαλάριος</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Artemidoros</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>3rd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ πλήθος τῶν βαφέων</td>
<td>Fragment of a honorific inscription</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ βαφεῖς</td>
<td>Honorific inscription for Markos</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ βαφεῖς</td>
<td>Honorific inscription for the son of Makedon</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ σκυτοτόμοι</td>
<td>Honorific inscription for T. Fl. Alexandros</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ τοῦ σταταριού ἑργασταί ...</td>
<td>Honorific inscription for Alexandros</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προξενηταί σωμάτων Σωματέμπορος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ό βαφεῖς</td>
<td>Dedication to Theos Hypsistos</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ό κηπουροί</td>
<td>Funerary (?) fragment</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ό πραγματευόμενοι</td>
<td>Building inscription</td>
<td>Thyateira</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ό κηπουρός</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Alexandros</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ό εἰητρός</td>
<td>Dedication (to Asclepius)</td>
<td>Hierocaesarea</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ό κεραμεῖς</td>
<td>Funerary inscription of Menophilos</td>
<td>Magnesia ad Sipylum</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ κοραλλιοπλάσται</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>Magnesia ad Sipylum</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragment Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>area of Saittai</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary inscription for agoranomos</td>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funerary inscription of Hermes and Tyche</td>
<td>Tralleis</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deed of foundation</td>
<td>Hypaipa</td>
<td>301 AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topos inscription</td>
<td>Sardis</td>
<td>4th century?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEG LVII 1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IK Tralleis 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG XLVI 1436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEph 3803d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Manisa Museum 431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10
Professional associations and occupations in Roman Phrygia\textsuperscript{1397}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation / Association</th>
<th>Type of the inscription</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Source / Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὁ λατύπος</td>
<td>Dedication to Zeus Olympios Kersoulls</td>
<td>Aizanoi</td>
<td>Early Imperial period</td>
<td>SEG LVI 1463 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ συνεργασία τῶν</td>
<td>Honorary inscription for T. Flavius Mointanus</td>
<td>Akmoneia</td>
<td>late 1\textsuperscript{st} century</td>
<td>MAMA VI 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γναφωέν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ σεμνοτάτη ἐργασία</td>
<td>Honorary inscription for an unknown procurator Augusti</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>1-2nd century A.D.</td>
<td>IGR IV 816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῶν πορφυραβάφων</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ λιθωργός</td>
<td>Dedication to Zeus Abozenos</td>
<td>Tavşanli, Phrygia</td>
<td>140/141 AD</td>
<td>SEG XL 1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὃς μυροπόλης</td>
<td>Epitaph of Ammianos</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>ca. 150-200 AD</td>
<td>Alt. v. Hierapolis 262; SEG LIV 1302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὃς χαλκεῦς</td>
<td>Dedication to Zeus</td>
<td>Phrygia</td>
<td>ca. 180-220 A.D.</td>
<td>SEG LI 1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ τέχνη τῶν βαφέων</td>
<td>Dedication of a statue? of</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>beginning 2\textsuperscript{nd} century</td>
<td>SEG XLI 1201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1397} This table should provide general overview of attested occupations, since it is not necessarily fully comprehensive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boule</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐργασία τῶν κηπουρῶν</td>
<td>Epitaph for - -eides.</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>2nd century AD ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alt. v. Hierapolis 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ εἰματιοπόλης</td>
<td>Honorary inscription</td>
<td>Laodikeia on the Lycos</td>
<td>2nd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IK Laodikeia am Lykos 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ πορφυροπόλης</td>
<td>Epitaph for M. Aur. Alexandros Moschianos</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>second half of the 2nd century AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alt. v. Hierapolis 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ λατύπος</td>
<td>Epitaph for Hermogenes</td>
<td>Aizanoi</td>
<td>Late second century AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMA IX 451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ συνέδριον τῆς</td>
<td>Funerary monument of M.</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>end 2nd century AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προεδρίας τῶν</td>
<td>Aur. Diodoros</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alt. v. Hierapolis 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πορφυραβάφων ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐργασία ἡ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θρεμματική</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ λεντιάριος</td>
<td>Epitaph of Attalos</td>
<td>Akmoneia</td>
<td>end of the 2nd or 3rd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAMA IV 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ ἐργασία τῶν</td>
<td>Funerary monument of Aurelia Paconia</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>End 2nd – 3rd century AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐρισπλυτῶν</td>
<td>Pauline</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAT 101 (1966-67), 317 no. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ ἐργασία τῶν</td>
<td>Inscription on a funerary altar</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>End 2nd – 3rd century AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βαφέων</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alt. v. Hierapolis 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συντεχνία τῶν</td>
<td>Funerary inscription for</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>End 2nd – 3rd century AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alt. v. Hierapolis 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ήλοκόπων συντεχνία τῶν χαλκέων πορφυράβαφον</td>
<td>Aur. Zoticos</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>SEG LIV 1315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ή τέχνη τῶν βαφέων</td>
<td>Funerary monument of P. Ael. Hermogenes</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>End 2nd – 3rd century AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ή έργασία τῶν λινωτῶν, φίλοπλοι</td>
<td>Funerary monument of M. Aur. Ammianos</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>End 2nd – 3rd century AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ή σεμνοτάτη έργασία τῶν κηπουργῶν</td>
<td>Funerary monument of M. Aur. Appolonios</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>end 2nd - 3rd century AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐργαστηριαρχῶν | | Hierapolis | end 2nd - 3rd century AD | Ritti (2004), 544 ineditum 
Cf. also SEG XLV 1747 |
| τὸ συνέδριον τῶν κοπιδέρμων | | Hierapolis | end 2nd - 3rd century AD | Ritti (2004), 544 ineditum 
Cf. also SEG XLV 1747 |
| θρεμματική, ἐργαστηρίαρχαι, χαλκεῖς | Α μολυβδουργός bequeaths property to a θρεμματική association, an equal amount to an association of | Hierapolis | end 2nd - 3rd century AD | Ritti (1995) 70-1 ineditum 
Cf. SEG XLV 1747 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ó λαχανοπόλης</td>
<td>Æργαστηριάρχαι, and a lesser sum to an association of χαλκείς</td>
<td>Eumeneia</td>
<td>2nd or 3rd century AD</td>
<td>SEG XXVIII 1125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ó ωθόνιοπολής</td>
<td>Funerary inscription</td>
<td>Eumeneia</td>
<td>2nd or 3rd century</td>
<td>MAMA IV 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ó λατύπος</td>
<td>Dedication to Zeus Bronton</td>
<td>Upper Tembris valley</td>
<td>2nd or 3rd century AD</td>
<td>SEG XL 1236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ προεδρία τῶν πορφυραβάφων</td>
<td>Epitaph of M. Aurelius</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>ca. 200-250 A.D.</td>
<td>SEG LIV 1323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ τέχνη τῶν πορφυροβάφων</td>
<td>Dedication of the theatre’s scene; contribution by the group</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>206-209 AD</td>
<td>SEG XXXV 1369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alt. v. Hierapolis 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ó λατύπος</td>
<td>Epitaph of Kyrilla and her family</td>
<td>Tembris valley</td>
<td>ca. 220 AD</td>
<td>SEG LIII 1547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ó λατύπος</td>
<td>Consecration of Telesphoros</td>
<td>Akmoneia</td>
<td>249 AD</td>
<td>SEG XLI 1171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ó λατύπος</td>
<td>Dedication to Zeus Ampelites</td>
<td>Kotiaion</td>
<td>early 3rd century</td>
<td>SEG LV 1419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ή σεμνοτάτη εργασία τῶν ἐριοπλυτῶν</td>
<td>Honorary inscription for Tib. Cl. Zoticos</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>early 3rd century AD</td>
<td>IGR IV 821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προεδρία τῶν πορφυρώβορων τὸ συνέδριον τῶν ἀκαιροδαπισῶν</td>
<td>Epitaph for P. Ael. Glycon Zeuxianos Ailianos</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>early 3rd century AD</td>
<td>SEG XLVI 1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ό σεμνοτάτη εργασία τῶν πορφυρώβορων</td>
<td>Honorary inscription for Tib. Cl. Zoticos</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>early 3rd century AD</td>
<td>SEG LVI 1499 = IGR IV 822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γναφεῖς βαφεῖς ἀπλουργοί</td>
<td>Fragment of funerary inscription</td>
<td>Laodikeia on the Lycos</td>
<td>3rd century AD</td>
<td>IK Laodikeia am Lykos 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ή συνεργασία... ή συνεργασία ΚΛ[...]</td>
<td>Inscription on theatre seats</td>
<td>Laodikeia on the Lycos</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td>IK Laodikeia am Lykos 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ή συνεργασία</td>
<td>Inscription on theatre seats</td>
<td>Laodikeia on the Lycos</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td>IK Laodikeia am Lykos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lycos</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ó ἀρχιτέκτων</td>
<td>Fragment of honorary (?) inscription</td>
<td>Laodikeia on the Lycos</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td>IK Laodikeia am Lykos 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ó λατύπος</td>
<td>Doorstone</td>
<td>Akmoneia</td>
<td>Imperial period</td>
<td>MAMA VI 321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ó λατύπος</td>
<td>Funerary monument</td>
<td>Akmoneia</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>MAMA VI 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ó ἐργαστής</td>
<td>Epitaph of Flavius Zeuxis</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Alt. v. Hierapolis 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ó λατύπος</td>
<td>Dedication of a temple and statue of Homonoia</td>
<td>Nakoleia</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>SEG XXVIII 1176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ ὁμοτεχνία τῶν κηπουρῶν</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>Aizanoi</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>MAMA IX 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>о ῥάστης</td>
<td>Bomos</td>
<td>Aizanoi</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>MAMA IX 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ ἐμπλέκτης</td>
<td>Doorstone</td>
<td>Synaus, Upper Tembris valley</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>MAMA X 428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ó λατύπος</td>
<td>Dedication to Zeus Andreas</td>
<td>Appia</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>SEG XXVI 1367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ λατύποι</td>
<td>Dedication to Zeus Bennios</td>
<td>Appia</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>SEG XXVI 1369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ λατύποι</td>
<td>Dedications and artists’ signature</td>
<td>Dorylaion</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>SEG XXXVIII 1311b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ó πορφυροπώλης</td>
<td>Funerary inscription</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>AAT 101 (1966-1967), 313 no. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βαφέων</td>
<td>Hermogenes Charopinos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σιλιννειτοπώλης</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Ritti (1995), 70-71 Cf. SEG XLV 1747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ μαχαιροποιός</td>
<td>Epitaph of Triphon and Nikopolis</td>
<td>Eumeneia</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ χαλκεύς</td>
<td>Dedications to Zeus Thallos</td>
<td>Phrygia</td>
<td>SEG XXVIII 1140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ χαλκεύς</td>
<td>Epitaph</td>
<td>Belçigez (Sultan Dağı)</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ λατύπος</td>
<td>Dedications to Asclepius</td>
<td>Aizanoi</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ χαλκεύς</td>
<td>Dedication to Theos</td>
<td>Akmoneia</td>
<td>SEG XXVI 1356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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