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ABSTRACT

In various cities throughout Asia Minor, associations called *gerousiai* existed under the Roman Empire. These groups are most easily studied from the inscriptions which have been excavated and published for each city; in fact, epigraphic evidence is often the only source which sheds light on the nature of any particular *gerousia*. It has been customary to divide the *gerousia* as an institution into two groups: the Asiatic *gerousia*, namely the *gerousiai* of the Roman provinces of Asia Minor, and the Doric *gerousia*, which is most well known from the board of twenty-eight elders who advised the kings of Sparta.

The initial purpose of this study was to examine the Asiatic *gerousiai* in order to determine the position of these bodies in their cities, particularly with respect to the *boule* and *demos* of those cities. It quickly became apparent from the quantity of available inscriptions, however, that such a topic was somewhat too large for a mere dissertation. I have chosen, therefore, to limit myself to the Ionian city of Ephesus (modern Selçuk).

The intensive focus on the Ephesian *gerousia* allows a greater degree of detail than would have been permitted in a more general study of similar size. The abundance of evidence for this city has made it possible to draw conclusions about several aspects of a single *gerousia* without introducing the assumption, implicit or explicit, that all Asiatic *gerousiai* were the same. This is a study of the *gerousia* of the Ephesus and does not purport to make any conclusions about a general Asiatic *gerousia*.

The large number of inscriptions from Ephesus available for this study also offers a further advantage, as I hope will emerge in the following pages: we cannot speak of a “Hellenistic *gerousia*” and a “Roman *gerousia*” as two distinct entities. Certainly there was a *gerousia* in Hellenistic period and one in the Roman period, and the terms Hellenistic *gerousia* and Roman *gerousia* may well be used in the course of this work, but not as archetypes.
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1. INTRODUCTION: THE GEROUSIA

The inscriptions of Ephesus are numerous, with over five thousand available in *Die Inschriften von Ephesos*, and new finds published regularly by the Austrian Archaeological Institute in the *Jahresheft des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts*. Among these inscriptions are a significant number of references to a body called the *gerousia* or its members; Ephesus alone accounts for almost 30% of the approximately three hundred and sixty references to the *gerousia* in the inscriptions of Asia Minor. In the case of some cities, such as Priene and Colophon, the *gerousia* appears in very few inscriptions. Ephesus, on the other hand, has produced over ninety inscriptions which mention the *gerousia* in various capacities, to which may also be added a few fragments. No other city in Asia Minor has provided such a large body of evidence for the *gerousia*: Aphrodisias has produced the second most references to this body, but not more than forty to date, that is, quantitatively less than half of the evidence available in Ephesus. A study of the *gerousia* must, therefore, place a decided emphasis on the evidence from Ephesus, not only because of the abundance of evidence, but also because of the variety: the *gerousia* appears in several different contexts in Ephesus, whereas it is not uncommon for it to appear almost exclusively in a single context in other cities, for example, in funerary or honorary inscriptions. For reasons which will be laid out below, the present work focuses exclusively on Ephesus, but this is not to disparage the evidence from other cities.

The abundance of testimony, however, has not rendered the nature of the *gerousia* in the civic and social structure of Greek cities Asia Minor during either the Hellenistic or the Roman Imperial periods clear. Although there have been few studies of the *gerousia*
itself, theories about it have been put forth in the context of larger works on civic structure, provincial organization, epigraphic commentaries, and even general histories.\footnote{The major English monograph is J.H. Oliver’s *The Sacred Gerousia* (1941); the gerousia is also the subject of a more recent Dutch dissertation, J.A. van Rossum’s *De Gerousia in de Griekse Steden van het Romeinse Rijk* (1988). The conclusions of both works will be discussed briefly below.}

The term *gerousia* encourages scholars to certain initial assumptions, since the Greek word is quite clearly derived from *geron*, old man; *gerousia*, consequently, literally means a body of old men. As such, a comparison with the Latin *senex* and *senatus* is inescapable. *Geron* and *senex* may be synonymous, but the same cannot be said to be true of *gerousia* and *senatus*. *Gerousia* is, it is true, used virtually interchangeably with *boule*, *sugkletos* and *sunhedrion* by several Greek historians in reference to the Roman senate.\footnote{*Gerousia*: Dion. Hal., *Ant. Rom.*, 2.12.3, 30.3, 6.18.3; Plut., *Mor.*, 789E; Caes., 18.5, 29.5, 33.5; *Fab. Max.*, 18.5; *Marc.*, 23.1; *boule*: Dion. Hal., *Ant. Rom.*, 2.12.1, 14.2, 14.3, 6.18.1; Plut., *Mor.*, 790E; *Fab. Max.*, 17.5, 18.4; *sugkletos*: Plut., *Mor.* 789E, 790C; Caes., 33.4, 57.4; *Marc.*, 23.1; Polyb., I.20.1, 36.4.4, 5.3; Diod. Sic., 28.13.1, 37.6.1, 6.3; *sunhedrion*: Dion. Hal., *Ant. Rom.*, 2.11.1, 14.2, 30.3.} Dionysius of Halicarnassus asserts that the prerogatives of the original Roman Senate, namely to deliberate and vote on matters submitted by the King, were taken over directly from the Spartan model; he also states that Romulus called this body a *senatus* as a translation of the Spartan *gerousia*.\footnote{Dion. Hal., *Ant. Rom.*, 2.14.2.} Despite this synonymous use, though, several authors recognized a distinction between *sugkletos*, *boule* and *sunhedrion*, and the *gerousiai* of certain cities. Romulus may have named and modelled his senate after the Spartan *gerousia*, but Greek authors did not employ the same range of synonyms when discussing Spartan *gerousia*. Only once are alternative terms used, *presbugeneas* and *gerontes*; Plutarch reports that the former term was used in Delphi and that the latter was Lycurgus’ term for the body.\footnote{Plut., *Mor.*, 789E.} With these exceptions, the Spartan
gerousia is called simply that. Dionysius and Plutarch appear always to use gerousia when referring to the advisory body to the Spartan kings.\(^5\)

Carthage, according to Polybius, possessed both a sugkletos and a gerousia. He mentions the sugkletos of the Carthaginians only twice, but in each case it is closely associated with the gerousia: representatives from both bodies were sent by Magon to Gaius Laelius, and the sons of members of both orders were given as hostages after the peace treaty with the Carthaginians.\(^6\) Elsewhere in Polybius, gerousia appears to be used as an advisory board, particularly in matters concerning the army.\(^7\)

Of all ancient authors, Josephus employs the term gerousia most often; he also uses sunhedrion relatively frequently. It must be noted, though, that he does not use the two words interchangeably. When he uses gerousia, he is clearly referring to the council presided over by the Jewish high-priest, or to the elders of an individual town; this term, however, appears primarily in the first half of his Antiquitates Iudaicae, and only once in his Bellum Iudaicum. Josephus uses sunhedrion somewhat less judiciously: it can refer to the Sanhedrin, of course, but it can also identify a meeting or a gathering of advisors selected from the friends and family of, for example, Augustus or Herod; this seems to be the most common sense of the word in both works.\(^8\)

It is clear, consequently, that gerousia was not simply a translation of senatus, though it could be used as such. This distinction is blurred in literary sources, but it is

\(^5\) Dion. Hal., Ant. Rom., 2.14.2; Plut., Lyc., 6.1; Pyrr., 27.2.

\(^6\) Polyb., 10.18.1, 36.4.6: δόο μὲν γὰρ ἰδαίαν καταλημμένοι τῶν εἰκ τῆς γερουσίας, πέντε δὲ καὶ δέκα τῶν εἰκ τῆς συγκλήτου; εἰκαμενοι δὲ τῶν ῥήματος τούς ύπος τῶν εἰκ <τῆς> συγκλήτου καὶ τῆς γερουσίας.

\(^7\) Polyb., 1.21.7, 68.5, 87.3, 79.1, 10.18.1, 15.19.2, 36.4.6.

clearer in epigraphic sources. Even so, inscriptions, despite their numbers, do not render the exact nature of the *gerousia* clear. It is no surprise, therefore, that different theories have been proposed to account for the presence and activities of the *gerousia* in Asia Minor. There are as many theories as authors, so it may be well to review these.

Th. Mommsen takes the view that the *gerousia* was primarily a social institution, analogous to the *neoi*, the association for young men who had passed through the ephebic order but continued their activities in the gymnasias. The *gerousia* was an assembly of older citizens meeting in the equivalent of a modern clubhouse: Vitruvius reports that the palace of Croesus in Sardis had been given over to the *gerousia*. 9 The Roman *gerousia* had Hellenistic precedents, but, Mommsen believes, it was not identical with the Hellenistic *gerousia*; he believes that the *gerousia* of the inscriptions, which is primarily the Roman *gerousia*, had nothing in common with the one of Ephesus which Strabo mentions. 10 Under the Empire, there was no significant variation between the *gerousiai* of the different cities of Asia. It was not a group concerned with the welfare of the poor, but they were not exclusively aristocratic either; the *gerousia*, Mommsen argues, was open to all citizens. Once enrolled, the members of the *gerousia* appointed a gymnasiarch for themselves who was responsible primarily for the provisioning of oil. 11

A.H.M. Jones argues, like Mommsen, that the close connection which exists between the gymnasium and the *gerousia* in a city indicates that *gerousiai* were primarily social organisations. 12 Although *gerousiai* do appear in honorific decrees, the *neoi*, which were social groups, also appear in such decrees and so an appearance in these does

9 Vitr., 2.8.10.
10 Strabo, 14.1.21.
11 Mommsen (1921): 326, n. 2.
not necessarily give an administrative or political function to gerousiai. Membership in the gerousia was more exclusive than membership in the neoi, with fees being charged in some cases, but the two groups were essentially parallel organisations for citizens of different ages, Jones argues.¹³ Both received a basic supply of oil from the city and supplemented this with funds received from endowments by wealthy benefactors. The gerousia had no political prerogatives, but in some cities performed religious functions, such as the conduct of cults.¹⁴

D. Magie agrees with Jones that the gerousia had no political powers: it was a social institution whose members exercised influence through the respect they received from their fellow citizens.¹⁵ The existence of two early Hellenistic honorary decrees indicates that the gerousia did not exercise supreme power over the affairs of the city at that time since these are subject to the approval of the boule and demos.¹⁶ Like the epheses and neoi, the gerousia centred on a gymnasium and, although it was of more importance because of the respect paid to its members, it was before and after Lysimachus and under the Roman Empire a social organization.

C. Curtius suggests that the gerousia and boule were similar institutions. The gerousia was a distinct organization which could and did own property and which lent money to private citizens. He argues that it cannot be identical with the boule in Ephesus or other cities in Asia Minor, since the two bodies often appear in the same inscriptions,

¹³ Jones (1940): 353, n.31.
¹⁴ Jones (1940): 226.
¹⁵ Magie (1988): 63, 600, 856, 1534.
¹⁶ The boule and demos may be defined as the senate and popular assembly of a Greek city. These two bodies debated proposals and passed laws for the city. Their authority, however, was much reduced under the Roman Empire, with the majority of decrees passed by the boule and demos conferring citizenship rather than directing domestic and foreign policy; cat. nos. 1 & 2.
and each appears to have had its own property. Instead, he accepts the argument of Boeckh that the gerousia was a standing committee of the boule, consisting of special authorities, annually elected from the bouleutai who had served for a lengthy period of time. He suggests that the word sunhedrion, in the case of Ephesus, might refer to a meeting of the gerousia; gerontes and presbeuteroi can refer to the gerousia. He believes that the gerousia of Ephesus was originally associated with the Temple of Artemis, from which it derived its initial funds; later, however, the gerousia found other sources of income, including fines paid for tomb violations. Curtius concludes that the gerousiai in Ephesus and other Ionian cities were similar to the Areopagus council in Athens and exercised a great influence over the public affairs of their respective cities through the dignity and respect they earned through their membership.

I. Lévy identifies the conflicting features of the gerousia: it was a limited body whose membership conferred honour and whose members often received shares in money-distributions which were equal to or only slightly less than those received by the members of the boule. At the same time, though, it had a role in funding the festival of Artemis, it had a grammateus (secretary), and a curator was appointed by the Emperor when the gerousia of Ephesus was unable to collect on a debt. The first group of features suggests a private, or at least an exclusive, group, while the second suggests a public

---

17 Curtius (1870): 181.
18 Curtius (1870): 224-225; Boeckh, CIG II.2811: Πᾶσα ἡ βουλὴ sic habetur etiam n. 2782.37.: καὶ ἕτεραι δὲ διανομαῖς δεδωκότα πολλάκις τῇ βουλῇ πάσῃ καὶ τῇ γεροσκιᾳ, quo loco collato conicerim γεροσκίαν fuisse partem βουλῆς eximiam, ut Athenis πρυτάνεις. If this is the case, the members of the gerousia (a collegium ex βουλῇ selectum, in Boeckh's words) would receive a double share of the dianomai. It is more likely, though, the distributions mentioned here are similar to those arranged by Salutaris at the beginning of the second century AD (cf. cat. nos. 54 & 56, and below, Chapter Four, pp. 96-100) in which the entire boule but only a portion of the gerousia received shares.
19 Curtius (1870): 224-225; cf. Polyb., 36.4.4, 36.6.4. Presbeuteros could also be spelled without the second epsilon (i.e., presbteros). Both spellings are used in the course of this work, reflecting the spelling the in the inscriptions.
group. Lévy denies that the *gerousia* was a division of the *boule* or simply an assembly of elder citizens. It played an honorific role in the administration of municipal affairs, he suggests, and was not significantly involved in the religious affairs of the city. Its primary concerns were not religious matters. The *gerousia*, he argues, only met exceptional expenses in the sacred games of Artemis when the public treasury was unable to do so. It was the *boule* and *demos*, not the *gerousia*, which approved and regulated the sacred processions in Ephesus. Lysimachus created the *gerousia* in 302 BC, giving it access to the treasury of the Temple of Artemis and significant political influence. Following its establishment, a continuing struggle between the *boule* and *demos* with the priesthood of the temple gradually diminished the authority of the *gerousia*. Despite this loss of power, though, the *gerousia* continued to exercise a degree of control over the treasury of the temple without interruption. The *gerousia* spread from Ephesus to the other Greek cities of Asia Minor, but new *gerousiai* were almost all private organisations. Many of these groups were established and enrolled by the *boule* and *demos* with the approval of Imperial authorities after the Hellenistic period. Membership, though limited in places, was open to all citizens, men and women. Lévy cites the acts of a Syrian apostle which portray, in caricature, the members of the *gerousia* drinking, eating, singing and indulging in perfumes: the primary concerns of the Roman *gerousia* were the comforts of its members, and not religious or municipal

---

21 Lévy (1895): 233-234.
22 Lévy (1895): 235.
23 Lévy (1895): 237.
24 Lévy (1895): 239.
matters. The administrative associations which it retained under the Empire are remnants of its original functions.

E.L. Hicks remarks that early gerousiai of Roman Asia Minor tend to appear in regions which were once subject to Lysimachus, and suggests on this basis that the Hellenistic and Roman gerousiai may not be entirely distinct. The connotations of the word gerousia are various in Greek literature: in Homer and in Euripides' Rhesus, the word implies a group of elders, official or otherwise. The Spartan gerousia, on the other hand, implies oligarchy and mastery to Demosthenes, while Plutarch also refers to the oligarchic nature of the gerousia in Sparta. Since Antigonus and Demetrius, whom Lysimachus had expelled from Ephesus, had favoured democrats, Hicks suggests that Lysimachus installed oligarchic bodies to replace democratic groups and the Antigonid legacy. Thus, he argues, the gerousia replaced the boule while the epikletoi replaced the ekklesia. Lysimachus used the gerousia to formalise the previously undefined influence of the temple-authorities, who might be expected to favour oligarchic forms and, therefore, to favour Lysimachus himself. Given the widespread appearance of the gerousia under the Roman Empire, it is probable that the Romans encouraged this body in the Greek cities, though there is evidence that a gerousia existed before the arrival of the Romans in Asia Minor in Sardis, Nysa, Lampsacus and Erythrae. These may have been remnants of Lysimachus' gerousiai. The Roman gerousia was a public body, similar to but distinct from the boule. Hicks takes the Ephesian gerousia as

---

27 Hicks (1890): 75; Homer, ll. 2.53; Plut., Lyc., 5, Ages 8; Dem., Lept., 107; Arist., Pol., 5.1305b8.
28 Hicks (1890): 75.
29 Hicks (1890): 75.
representative of many other cities in Asia Minor, and suggests that one of the gymnasiiarchs of the city was always a member of the *gerousia*.

I. Menadier accepts that the citizen body of a city may have been divided into groups of younger and older citizens, but he argues that the *gerousia* was not one of these groups, as Mommsen had suggested. Instead, it and the *boule* were groups of the same type, but not identical. Some of Pliny's correspondence with Trajan suggests to Menadier that the *gerousia* could not have been a private, social club: Trajan outlawed such clubs in Bithynia. Furthermore, Pliny calls the meeting place of the *gerousia* a public building. The *gerousia* was established by Lysimachus in Ephesus and in many other cities, since the institution appears in many of the cities which were subject to him. The *gerousia* had administrative and deliberative functions and was involved mainly in religious affairs, but contributed to the funds of the Temple of Artemis only in extraordinary circumstances. Alternate expressions for the *gerousia* may have existed; Menadier believes that *sustemata* should be understood as the *gerousia*, as should *sunhedrion* when it is not qualified by a genitive noun, such as *chrysophoron*.

D.G. Hogarth follows Menadier in many respects, adding that the *gerousia* could not have been a social club if it was limited in number, which it seems to have been. Although women are not commonly known to have been members, Hogarth suggests that even their occasional presence also refutes the idea that the *gerousia* was nothing more
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than a social club. In many respects Hogarth accepts that the gerousiai of different cities were similar. They had responsibility for some festivals and possibly for the general supervision of religious affairs in different cities. Whereas Menadier suggests that the gymnasiarch was the lowest ranking official of the gerousia, Hogarth argues that this officer was actually the highest ranking member. He believes that the neoi and the gerousiastai were both associated with the gymnasium, but that they had little else in common. Hogarth cites an inscription from Sidyma in which the members of the gerousia are elected by the boule and demos, a practice which is never followed in the case of the neoi; furthermore, the neoi had no administrative functions. The Hellenistic and Roman gerousiai were not continuous. Members of the Roman gerousia were members of the boule who were over a certain age, and demotai with "proper qualifications"; the numbers of the gerousia were limited.

V. Chapot notes that there are several different names for the gerousia, and he is of the opinion that the precise nature of this body must have varied from city to city; there were, nevertheless, features which were common to most gerousiai in Asia Minor. Members held an elevated position in the social structure of their cities, and they were probably less numerous than the members of the boule in the same city. Gerousiastai, to judge from the name of their association, were men of a certain age, though experience in the administration of civic affairs may have been a more important criterion for membership than age. Despite this, it was not a political college and had no authority in

---

37 Hogarth (1891): 70-72.
38 Hogarth (1891): 73.
39 Menadier (1880): 51; Hogarth (1891): 73.
40 Hogarth (1891): 74; also cited by Mommsen (1921): 326, n. 2; TAM II.175 & 176.
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The gerousia consisted not of members of the boule, but of citizens who had influence in the city and wealth, with no actual political role; that is, gerousiastai were drawn from the same social order as the bouleutai. The gerousia and the neoi, Chapot maintains, are not parallel, in part because the existence of one in a given city does not require the presence of the other. He argues that the epikletoi whom Strabo mentions in conjunction with the gerousia of Ephesus were added to a pre-existing body in the city by Lysimachus after the defeat of Antigonus in 302 BC. This was a means of adding an oligarchic element to the administration of the city while maintaining the democratic forms of the boule and demos. Following Lévy, Chapot believes that the gerousia initially had control over the funds of the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus, but, in an ongoing conflict with the boule and demos, it gradually lost this influence; it remained active in the festivals and sacred processions. In Magnesia on the Maeander, on the other hand, the gerousia was much more social: that body passed a decree providing an oil supplement to the daily quota granted by the city, while some of its officers were responsible for the heating of the baths or the provision of wood for fuel. The gerousia may have been divided into different groups which alternated through its offices, since an inscription of Hierapolis records that the eighth puxion of the gerousia of that city received a legacy. Chapot argues that the Ephesian gerousia was able to maintain its original character of a religious and financial group, although most other gerousiai
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dwindled to little more than social groups, because it was closely watched over by the provincial governor, whose seat was in Ephesus.\(^{49}\)

J.H. Oliver provides a comparative study of the *gerousiai* of Athens and Ephesus and, to a lesser extent, several other cities in Asia Minor.\(^{50}\) He argues that there were two primary types of *gerousia*, of which one type was a public corporation with the management of estates owned by a temple.\(^{51}\) Oliver maintains against Lévy that the term *hiera* (sacred) when applied to the *gerousia* "expresses the essential character of the organization" and that it is not merely an epithet intended to enhance the status of the association.\(^{52}\) The majority of Asiatic *gerousiai* to which the adjective is not applied were simply social organisations of older citizens. The *hierai gerousiai* are those which began to take a role in the administration of economic affairs in local sanctuaries, and this is the type which existed in Roman Ephesus.\(^{53}\) The original *gerousia* in Ephesus, Oliver argues, was an association of citizens until Lysimachus transferred the financial and secular concerns of the priests of Artemis to these older citizens and added additional members, the *epikletoi*. The *gerousia* was intended to be a body like the Amphictyonic council at Delphi.\(^{54}\) It was a council which had influence over the *boule* and *demos* based on the prestige of its members rather than their actual political power.\(^{55}\) As the Temple of Artemis lost its financial resources over the course of the Hellenistic period, Oliver argues, the *gerousia* dwindled in importance until it became insignificant. During the early second century AD, though, the Ephesian *gerousia* began to recover as Empire-
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wide reforms began. Thus, under Commodus it renewed the practice of performing sacrifices to Artemis which had formerly been discontinued due to a lack of money.\textsuperscript{56} Oliver deduces from a letter addressed by Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus to a \textit{logistes} of the \textit{gerousia} that that body was connected with the Imperial cult, though Magie denies such a connection.\textsuperscript{57} Oliver argues that this connection to the cult was simply the logical consequence of the collocation of the Imperial cult and the worship of Artemis. He concludes that the \textit{gerousia} of Ephesus and those to which the adjective \textit{hiera} is applied were economico-religious bodies, whose purpose was “to provide support for the more splendid celebration of one or more festivals,” noting that the phrase \textit{hierai gerousiai} does not appear before Roman rule in Asia.\textsuperscript{58}

Van Berchem considers the question of whether the \textit{gerousia} of the early Hellenistic period as it appears in two decrees is a direct antecedent of the \textit{gerousiai} of the later Hellenistic and Roman periods.\textsuperscript{59} He places his emphasis on the \textit{gerousia} of Ephesus. He argues that during the Hellenistic period it was a body in charge of the sanctuary of Artemis, but that under the Empire it was an association of elder citizens without a specific connection with the Temple of Artemis.\textsuperscript{60} Van Berchem questions Strabo’s account, often accepted as crediting Lysimachus with the association of the \textit{epikletoi} with the \textit{gerousia}, asking whether this was done by Lysimachus in order to secure his political interests in the city and temple. His conclusion is negative: the proposals of the \textit{gerousia} required approval from the \textit{boule} and \textit{demos}, so that it, even
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with the *epikletoi*, could not impose the wishes of the king.\(^{61}\) Such a *gerousia*, however, no longer existed at the end of the first century BC when Strabo described it: van Berchem argues that Strabo’s description of the *gerousia* is an element derived from a lost Aristotelian *Constitution of Ephesus*, noted by Strabo precisely because it was a novelty which no longer existed in his day.\(^{62}\) Ephesus, he suggests, was once governed by an oligarchic council of elders, the *gerousia*, which was then enlarged by the addition of the *epikletoi*. A form of this council still existed at the beginning of the Hellenistic age. Van Berchem argues that the civic organization of Ephesus underwent a significant change during one of its relocations, when a large influx of inhabitants caused the addition of new tribes for the citizens. Though it has been suggested that the tyrant Pythagorus was responsible for this change, van Berchem proposes that it was the Lydian king Croesus who was the cause of this reorganization in the sixth century BC. Since such a removal and the coeval restructuring of the tribes would also be an opportune time for other municipal changes, he puts forth the suggestion that the restriction of the *gerousia* and *epikletoi* to religious affairs took place at the same time.\(^{63}\) Van Berchem sees the origins of the *gerousia* in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, where elders hold an important position of influence.\(^{64}\) He suggests that the Ephesian *gerousia* in its original form was a model for the Roman Senate of the sixth century BC, citing several other historical and quasi-historical connections between Rome and Ephesus.\(^{65}\) Even after the changes, membership was hereditary, though the members were not necessarily elderly:
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citizens could gain membership – if there was an opening – because of authority or prestige gained through wealth and birth.\textsuperscript{66}

Van Rossum notes that the \textit{gerousiai} of the different cities in Asia must have undergone individual evolutions, so that it is virtually impossible to develop a theory which accounts for the origin and nature of the \textit{gerousia}; this is possible in the case of individual \textit{gerousiai}, but not of a general Asiatic institution.\textsuperscript{67} Nonetheless, he observes that it is possible to form general conclusions about the \textit{gerousia} based on the epigraphic evidence from all of Asia and beyond. Age and wealth were criteria for membership, as three papyri from Oxyryynchus seem to indicate, and potential members had to be approved by the civic authorities, though it is not clear what the minimum age for entrance was.\textsuperscript{68} Members of the \textit{gerousia} enjoyed privileges similar to those enjoyed by members of the \textit{boule}, but they were not responsible for discharging civic duties.\textsuperscript{69} He argues that there is no difference between Oliver’s ‘sacred’ \textit{gerousiai} and unqualified \textit{gerousiai}, but that all \textit{gerousiai} were sacred in the sense that their members took part in religious feasts.\textsuperscript{70}

Such are the theories regarding the \textit{gerousia}. They are inconsistent with one another in large part because most scholars have based their arguments on different combinations of inscriptions form Asia Minor, so that conclusions about the \textit{gerousia} of one city are often applied to the \textit{gerousiai} of all cities. Once established, whether by a single individual or by imitating a neighbour, each \textit{gerousia} will have undergone changes and developments according to the pressures facing each city; it is surprising that only
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van Rossum, in the most recent study of the *gerousia*, appears to have noted this. Each *gerousia*, therefore, is more or less unique; a general study of the *gerousia* will not necessarily result in conclusions applicable to every city in which a *gerousia* is known.

There were, of course, similarities between the *gerousiai* in different cities. Hicks, however, was too precipitous in his assumption that the *gerousia* of Ephesus could be taken as representative of *gerousiai* throughout Asia.\(^71\) This is tantamount to assuming that the magisterial organization of Ephesus is representative of that of another city: the variety of civic titles from the Asian Greek cities manifestly demonstrates that this is not the case.\(^72\) Hicks, however, is the only scholar of those discussed here to acknowledge that an assumption has been made: that evidence drawn from any city in which a *gerousia* is known to have existed can be applied indiscriminately to the *gerousia* of any other city.\(^73\) Nonetheless, each of the scholars in question makes this assumption to one degree or another.

Thus, Mommsen’s citations of meeting places in Nysa, Nicomedia and Sardis cannot be used to support the existence of such a structure in Ephesus. It is not impossible or even improbable that the Ephesian *gerousia* did have a building which could be described as its own, but Mommsen’s suggestion that the *gerousia* was the equivalent of a modern gentleman’s club does not necessitate such a building in Ephesus. The *gerousia* of Ephesus did, in fact, have an increasingly social character as it evolved, but there is little evidence to support a ‘clubhouse’ dedicated to the use of the *gerousia*.\(^74\)
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Similarly, Mommsen's suggestion that the *neoi* and *gerousiastai* are parallel does not appear to be true in Ephesus: the *neoi* appear far more rarely in the inscriptions. They are used infrequently in the inscriptions. Two inscriptions mentioning this group are decrees of the *boule* and *demos* about the *neoi*, but the *neoi* do not appear alongside the *boule* and *demos* as the *gerousia* does. A third inscription records the dedication of a statue by the *neoi* alone from their own funds.

Mommsen, it will be recalled, also noted the importance of the gymnasiarch within the *gerousia*, a feature of his interpretation which Jones and others upheld. There is, however, no evidence that the members of the Ephesian *gerousia* enjoyed either the exclusive use of one of the city's gymnasia or an allowance of oil at civic expense, as seems to have been the case in Magnesia on the Maeander. Several gymnasiarchs of the *gerousia* are known from Ephesus, but there is no mention of a gymnasion of the *gerousia*. This does not prove that there was no significant connection between the *gerousia* and the gymnasion, but it does validate caution in assuming that the *gerousia* was centered on a gymnasion. Mommsen's conclusions about the *gerousia*, therefore, may have little bearing on the Ephesian *gerousia*.

The evidence to support the public orientation of the *gerousia* as opposed to Mommsen's private orientation can be summarized briefly, but will be treated in greater detail in the subsequent chapters. Most scholars agree that the *gerousiai* of various cities had access to their own funds, whether from endowments or from public grants. This in itself would not be inconsistent with the identification of the *gerousia* as a social group.
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77 Scherrer (2001): 73 suggests that the gymnasion located in front of the theatre (no. 24 in Figure 2) was that of the *gerousia*. It must be noted, though, that Scherrer does not incontrovertibly identify this building in this way; he cautiously says, "I would like to identify it with the Gymnasium of the *gerousia*, frequently mentioned in inscriptions from the third decade of the 1st c. AD onward." In fact, though, a gymnasion of the *gerousia* is not mentioned in the inscriptions from Ephesus; gymnasiarchs of the *gerousia* are (cat. nos. 12, 13 & 31; cf. cat. nos. 4, 38 & 52).
but the appointment of a logistes to review and oversee the finances of the Ephesian gerousia suggests that this particular group was not simply social. Furthermore, this gerousia appears in several cases – in Ephesus and in other cities – as the officially appointed guardian of graves, occasionally alongside the boule, which would give it religious, if not public, responsibilities. Furthermore, the gerousia, like the boule and demos, is occasionally identified as ton Ephesion, suggesting strongly that it was a public body of the city.

It is, however, probable that the Ephesian gerousia was not complementary to or a part of the boule, as Boeckh and Curtius propose. Members of the boule and gerousia are mentioned as separate recipients of different amounts in distributions of money, which implies a clear distinction. Furthermore, the gerousia appears in only two citizenship decrees, both times as a supporter, although there are many such decrees of the boule and demos from the Hellenistic period. Dio Chrysostom refers to dissension between the boule and demos and the gerousia in Tarsus, which suggests at the very least that it cannot be maintained that members of the gerousia everywhere were or had been members of the boule as well: one would expect in this case that the interests of the gerousiastai and bouleutai would coincide. Curtius’ suggestion that the sunhedrion could refer to a meeting of the gerousia shows an awareness that the terms were not always synonymous.
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Chapot's suggestion that the *gerousia* of Ephesus was allowed to remain a semi-political organization because it was under the direct supervision of the proconsul is an inadequate theory for its continued existence and apparent importance. Ephesus may have been the most frequently occupied assize centre of the province, but it was only one of ten or thirteen judicial centres in Asia, so that the *gerousiai* of other assize centres would have been only slightly less subject to supervision and, it follows, only slightly less prominent. Furthermore, Nicomedia in Bithynia, which Cassius Dio couples with Ephesus as one of the two most important cities in their provinces under Augustus, has four of approximately four hundred inscriptions mentioning the *gerousia*. Proportionately, therefore, Nicomedia has only slightly fewer *gerousia*-inscriptions than Ephesus, 1% as opposed to less than 2%. This does not mean that the Nicomdeian *gerousia* was more prominent in the total number of inscriptions originally erected in that city, but it does suggest that the Ephesian *gerousia* may not have continued to exist simply because the city was an assize centre.

The nature and prominence of the *gerousia* of Ephesus are not the only points of issue which arise from the theories discussed above. The absence of evidence after approximately 281 BC has in general been seen as a sign of a decline in the importance of the *gerousia*. Since this argument is based on silence, it cannot be proven. Oliver tentatively supported this view because the *gerousia* appears in two inscriptions from the beginning of the second century BC, but is otherwise unattested in the Hellenistic period. At the time of the publication of his *Sacred Gerousia* (1941), there was, in fact, no evidence beyond the two decrees from the beginning of the 3rd century BC for this
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body in Ephesus before AD 104. It is clear, though, that the gerousia was not in a state of recovery at this time, but had in fact existed throughout the first century AD and before: the publication in 1993 of a series of letters from, among others, Augustus, Germanicus and the proconsul of Asia has confirmed the existence of a gerousia of some importance in the late first century BC and early first century AD. The theory that a decline in the wealth of Artemis might have caused a corresponding decline in the gerousia, therefore, requires revision. The existence of the gerousia in 302-281 BC, 45 BC-AD 30 and beyond AD 104 is most easily accounted for by the supposition that it existed continuously from at least the beginning of the third century BC, with no descents into obscurity and sudden revivals. Furthermore, if it is necessary for the gerousia and the Temple of Artemis to parallel each another – an assumption – it must be noted that the temple seems to have thrived throughout this period.

A common failing of the discussions of the scholars noted above is that the gerousia seems to be viewed as a static institution under Roman rule. It is acknowledged that the gerousia of the Hellenistic period and that of the Roman period are different, but little attention is paid to the changes and developments which took place in the gerousia during the first, second and third centuries AD, not to mention those which must have taken place during the Hellenistic period for which there is as yet no evidence. It will be suggested below that overall the gerousia experienced an evolution from a significant political body within the city of Ephesus to a group which was by and large a social club for relatively wealthy citizens but which nevertheless did perform some public functions. A study which draws evidence indiscriminately from the first three centuries is, therefore,
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as flawed as a study of The Asiatic *Gerousia* – the former assumes *a priori* that no changes took place after the city fell into the hands of the Romans, the latter that *gerousiai* were the same throughout Asia Minor. The sixth chapter of this study, focusing on the activities and privileges of the *gerousia*, therefore, considers the evidence for the imperial *gerousia* in three chronological sections, the late first century BC and early first century AD, the second century AD, and the late second to early third century AD.

At the same time, it should not be assumed that all changes which can be identified are the result of rule by the Romans. As MacMullen argues, “romanization” in the East was in many ways a process that was overwhelmed by “hellenization” as Roman citizens and other immigrants from the west were absorbed into the Hellenistic culture that had been introduced centuries earlier. Roman rule did undoubtedly have an effect on the *gerousia* of Ephesus and other institutions of other cities; the process of transformation, though, was a natural evolution of the body.

The discovery of new evidence makes a re-evaluation of the various theories on the nature of the *gerousia* not only possible, but also desirable. At the same time, though, the study of *gerousia* itself can be conducted in light of advances in other aspects of ancient history, notably prosopography. Ongoing epigraphic discoveries inevitably lead to an increase in the overall number of individuals known throughout the empire. This in turn leads to the possibility of studying the *gerousia* on a more personal basis, considering the *gerousiastai* as members of the city at large. Such an approach has been partially available to previous scholars, but only Oliver appears to have considered the individual officers of the *gerousia*, and that only briefly. A more detailed examination of
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the men identified as gerousiastai is necessary if the position of the gerousia within the city is to be determined and is possible with the abundant evidence from Ephesus; such an examination marks the Ephesian gerousia as a body distinct from the boule.

Just as the nature and prominence of the gerousia of Ephesus do not seem to be fully accounted for in the various theories proposed, the origins of the Ephesian institution may go beyond the currently available explanations. Van Berchem considers this question at length, but his model for the early gerousia of Ephesus is, as he himself admits, highly theoretical. Nonetheless, several of his arguments are compelling, particularly the existence of a gerousia in Ephesus long before Lysimachus' capture of the city. Certainly he is right to look to early Greek literature for clues to the origins of the gerousia, of both the Doric and the Asiatic types. The highly hypothetical reconstruction of van Berchem incorporates several elements which are capable of alternate interpretation, though. The origins of the gerousia, therefore, are by no means settled, and will be considered at length in the second chapter.

The very early history of the Ephesian gerousia cannot be reconstructed from epigraphic sources, since there are none available. The third chapter presents a brief discussion of the epigraphic evidence for the gerousia in Ephesus which will serve as the documentary foundation for the fourth, fifth and sixth chapters of this study. The first half of this chapter indicated the existence of synonymous or nearly synonymous terms for the gerousia; the third chapter, consequently, also includes a brief discussion of the relevance of the terms sunhedrion, sustema(ta) and presbeuteroi, all of which appear in the inscriptions, to the study of the gerousia. The inscriptions themselves, each accompanied by a translation of my own, are presented in the first appendix.
Chapter Four considers the individual members of the *gerousia*. It argues that a civic decree from Sidyma, which records the registration of fifty-one *bouleutai* and forty-nine *demotai* as the first members of the *gerousia*, should not be used as a model for reconstructing the membership of the Ephesian *gerousia*. Although no similar document survives from Ephesus, sufficient evidence does survive to show that there was not a similar demographic split in the Ephesian institution. This chapter also considers the size of the *gerousia* at different points in its existence in relation to the population of Ephesus. Finally, the names of known *gerousiastai* are presented in this chapter.

The offices within the *gerousia* form the subject of Chapter Five. Here the duties of each attested officer are considered briefly, as is their relative position to one another in the hierarchy of the *gerousia*. This chapter also questions whether a title such as *logistes* of the *gerousia* identifies its bearer as a member of the *gerousia*, or an external official appointed to oversee and correct certain aspects of the *gerousia*. The second half of this chapter considers the offices which the members of the *gerousia* held within the city. These offices help to indicate the social status of the *gerousia* and its members in Ephesus.

Chapter Six examines in detail the activities in which the *gerousia* can be seen to have engaged, and the rights which it seems to have enjoyed. This examination is conducted on a chronological basis, attempting to demonstrate that the *gerousia* underwent a gradual decline from a significant political body in the city to an association of a much more social nature.
2. EPHESUS AND THE GEROUSIA

2.1. A Brief History of Ephesus

An institution cannot be studied in isolation, whether it is a public body governing a state or city, or a private group attending only to the interests of its own members. Whether native or foreign to a city, any given institution will inevitably be affected by the pressures and needs facing that particular city. The *gerousia* of Ephesus, therefore, must be considered in relation to the history of the city and the region, particularly since Asia Minor as a whole was a part of various kingdoms and empires during the period covered by this study. A summary of Ephesus’ history, then, is called for before a detailed consideration of the history of the Ephesian *gerousia* itself can be undertaken.

Ephesus, like most Greek cities, had a mythological tradition surrounding its foundation. Androclus, the son of the Athenian king Codrus, sailed to Asia Minor with his followers and the approval of Artemis and Poseidon. On the voyage to Asia Minor, they conquered Samos. After crossing to the mainland, Androclus sent to the oracle at Delphi to inquire where he should build his city. In accordance with the oracle, Coressus was founded on the spot where Androclus killed a boar, believed to be the region near the remains of the *macellum* and stadium.¹ According to the tradition found in Strabo, Androclus drove out the Carian and Lelegian inhabitants of the region.² Under his guidance, the city grew. Androclus himself was killed in battle while helping the people of neighbouring Priene repel the Carians. Alternatively, Pliny the Elder records that Ephesus was founded by Amazons, and that it had had several different names during its
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early history. Vitruvius provides a third version of the foundation of Ephesus, in which Ion led an expedition from Athens to Asia, where he established the thirteen Ionian cities, including Ephesus.

The site of Ephesus has been occupied since the fifth millennium BC, and excavations of the city, conducted by the Österreichischen Archäologischen Institut since the early twentieth century, have revealed pottery and obsidian remains from the early bronze age in the area around the Church of St. John. The site continued to be inhabited thereafter; remains of houses have also been discovered below the Hellenistic and Roman Tetragonus Agora which have been identified as remnants of the village of ancient Smyrna, mentioned by Strabo. The earliest phase of these houses appears to date to the last third of the eighth century BC; because of the rising sea level and ground-water level the inhabitants seem to have abandoned the area in the early sixth century. The area continued to be used by craftsmen.

Ephesus, emerging from a synoikism of the villages in the area, was ruled by the descendants of Androclus, the Basilidae, until around 600 BC, when the tyrant Pythagoras established himself. It was the first of the Ionian cities which Croesus attacked after succeeding his father Alyattes to the Lydian throne. After overcoming the tyrant Pindarus, Croesus compelled the citizens to move down from the slopes of Mt. Coressus to the area surrounding the Artemision; the remains of this settlement have not yet been identified, but Croesus probably attempted to unite the native Carians and Lydians with the Greeks in this settlement. Prior to Croesus’ relocation, the ancient city,
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like its Hellenistic and Roman incarnations, had been a distance of seven *stades* from the sanctuary of Artemis.\(^7\) The Artemision was a source of refuge for citizens, and throughout the history of the ancient city the territorial extent of its asylum was expanded and reduced by kings and generals until the time of Augustus.\(^8\)

After Cyrus the Great defeated Croesus, Ephesus and eleven other cities joined together to resist, unsuccessfully, the Persian army. Under the Persian Empire, the city was an important port, serving as the landing site of the Athenian fleet during the Ionian Revolt.\(^9\) Although the Athenian army, after sacking Sardis, was followed back to Ephesus by the Persian army, the city was the only one which was not burnt after Darius I finally suppressed the revolt. A century later, the Spartan admiral Lysander used Ephesus as his base of operations at the end of the Peloponnesian War, encouraging oligarchic government through the creation of a decarchy; the Coressos harbour was again used as a landing point by the Athenians in 409 BC, though less successfully this time.\(^10\)

The status of Ephesus and other Ionian cities after the Peloponnesian war is not certainly known. The city was subjected to the Persian Empire in 411 BC, and probably continued to be so until Cyrus' revolt in 402 BC.\(^11\) The Peace of Antalcidas of 387/6 acknowledged Persian control over the Greek cities of Asia Minor, including Ephesus.\(^12\) During this time, Lysander’s decarchy may have been replaced with a more democratic constitution: J-F. Bommelaer argues that the reception of exiled democrats from Samos

---

\(^8\) Strabo, 14.1.23; cf. SEG 41, 971.
\(^9\) Hdt., 5.100.
\(^12\) Xen., *Hell.*, 5.1.29-32.
by Ephesus at the end of the fifth century may be indicative of such a democratic restoration. Lysander, therefore, may have been eager to return to Asia in 397 BC in order to restore the decarchies which he had formerly established, but Xenophon suggests that the cities of Asia may have been at this time in political turmoil with neither democrats nor decarchs securely established. Officially, Lysander's decarchies had been abolished by the Ephors; the actual situation, however, need not reflect the ideal situation envisioned by the Ephors. Similarly, a potential democratic restoration does not mean that the decarchies must have vanished.

When Tissaphernes regained control of Asia after the death of Cyrus at the end of the fifth century BC, it is probable that the cities were subject to decarchies and moderate oligarchies – that is, the political turmoil suggested by Xenophon probably still remained but with oligarchs enjoying satrapal support; Bommelaer tentatively adds the possibility of democracies in some cities. Whatever the constitutional character of the cities, Tissaphernes devoted himself to driving out Lysander's appointees. This may suggest support for democracies, but a seemingly more expedient means of removing Lysander's decarchs would be to establish other oligarchs in opposition to them. A decarchical or oligarchical constitution for Ephesus is, therefore, a very real possibility at the beginning of the fourth century BC, particularly since such a constitution did exist in the city at the time of Alexander's conquest.

Alexander the Great defeated Darius III in the battle at the Granicus River in 334 BC, after which Sardis and the cities along the coast surrendered without contest to him,
with the exception of Miletus and Halicarnassus.\textsuperscript{18} Upon his arrival in Ephesus, Alexander removed the authority of the small oligarchic governing class and replaced it with democratic institutions, as he did throughout Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{19} It does not take a great deal of imagination to see this ruling oligarchic class as a remnant or evolution of Tissaphernes' proposed oligarchs.

After Alexander's death, Antigonus I controlled Asia Minor in 319 BC, and retained Ephesus until 302 BC, when it surrendered to Prepelaus, a general of Lysimachus.\textsuperscript{20} Demetrius, Antigonus' son, had recovered the city by the end of that year or the following year, and installed a garrison of his own after expelling Prepelaus' troops.\textsuperscript{21} Although Lysimachus and Antiochus defeated Antigonus and Demetrius in 301 BC at the Battle of Ipsus, Demetrius retained Ephesus until 295 BC, when Lysimachus captured the city once again.\textsuperscript{22}

Lysimachus laid out a new wall for the city and built public buildings within the new circuit at a distance from the existing settlement around the temple (overlapping the site of the original site), but he was unable to persuade the Ephesians to relocate. According to tradition, therefore, he blocked the sewers of the city during a heavy rainstorm and thereby compelled the citizens to move to his new city, Arsinoë. Among the buildings constructed under Lysimachus, a long rectangular building (approximately 43.40 x 11.50m) with two rows of 7-9 chambers has been found in the southwest corner of the Tetragonous Agora.\textsuperscript{23} According to Strabo, a gerousia was registered and a body

\textsuperscript{18} Plut., Alex., 17.
\textsuperscript{19} Arr., Anab., 1.17.10.
\textsuperscript{20} Diod. Sic., 18.52.7, 20.107.
\textsuperscript{21} Diod. Sic., 20.111.3; for Antigonus and Demetrius at Ephesus, IEph 1448, 1452, 1453.
\textsuperscript{22} Plut., Dem., 30; Cohen (1995): 177-178.
which was called the *epikletoi* were associated with it; they are said to have managed everything.\(^{24}\) The meaning of Strabo’s final sentence is unclear. It has long been recognized that the *gerousia* and *epikletoi* could not have governed everything: their earliest appearances show them honouring two individuals *through* the *boule* and the *demos*, bodies to which they were subordinate. One might suppose that Strabo simply meant that at some point in the city’s history the *gerousia* and *epikletoi* διωκόντα πάντα; alternatively, since Strabo’s next point refers to the temple, πάντα could be interpreted as referring specifically to temple affairs rather than civic affairs; equally possibly, πάντα may refer to the business associated with the relocation of the city and the construction of new buildings.\(^{25}\)

After murdering his son Agathocles by his first wife in 286 BC, or simply allowing his second wife to murder him, Lysimachus was defeated by Philetaerus, to whom he had entrusted Pergamum, and Seleucus I; he lost Asia Minor, Ephesus and his life in 281 BC.\(^{26}\) During the following eighty years, Ephesus passed to and from the Attalids, Seleucids and Ptolemies until the end of the third century. Antiochus III had captured many of Attalus I’s territories by 214/3 BC, and in 197 BC, he began his attempt to restore western Asia Minor to his kingdom. After capturing the Ptolemaic holdings, Antiochus was able to spend the winter of that year in Ephesus, which he had captured after it may have enjoyed a brief period of independence.\(^{27}\) Following this, the city

---

\(^{24}\) Strabo, 14.1.21: Λυσίμαχος δὲ τὴν νῦν πόλιν τείχισαν, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων μεθισταμένων, τηρήσας καταρράκτην δέμβρον συνήργησε καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ τοὺς μινύχοις ἐνέφραξεν, ὡσε Κατακλύσας τὴν πόλιν ώδε μετέστιχαν ἀνέμου. ἐκκάλεσε δὲ Ἀριστοκράτην ἀπὸ τῆς γυναικὸς τὴν πόλιν, ἐπεκράτησε μέντοι τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἰνόμα. ἤν δὲ γερουσία καταγραφαμένη, τούτως δὲ συνήργουν ὁ ἐπίκλησον καλοῦμενον καὶ διάφορος πάντα; Paus. 1.9.7; cf. below, Chapter Two, pp. 47-50.

\(^{25}\) These possibilities were all raised during discussion at a workshop held at die Kommission für alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts in Munich on May 18, 2006.

\(^{26}\) Paus. 1.10.4.

served as a base of operations during his further campaigns in Asia Minor against his rivals and against the Romans. It was here that several meetings between Antiochus and embassies from Rome took place.\textsuperscript{28} After his defeat in 193 BC at Magnesia, the city voluntarily joined the Romans, and was subsequently used as a Roman base of operations until the end of the war. It was awarded to the Pergamene king Eumenes II after the eventual defeat of Antiochus under the terms of the Peace of Apamea and remained for the next sixty years a part of the Attalid kingdom.\textsuperscript{29} The city was specifically named with several others as subject and tributary to Eumenes II.\textsuperscript{30}

When Attalus III died childless in 133 BC, he left his kingdom to the Roman Republic, though he granted freedom to several cities. When the Senate finally took action on the matter of the bequest, they proceeded slowly, sending a commission to Asia to organize the settlement. This resulted in the dismemberment of the kingdom through territorial grants to various kings rather than outright annexation. The provincial organization did not violate Attalus’ bequest: those cities which had been freed by the king were not reduced to subject status. This organization of the province – or, as Gruen argues, a protectorate initially – took time, interrupted by the revolt of Aristonicus, an illegitimate son of Eumenes II.\textsuperscript{31} Asia may not have officially become a province until the mid-120s, but Ephesus was used as an assize centre when the provincial organization had been completed.\textsuperscript{32} The city was included among the ‘friends and allies’ of Rome.

\textsuperscript{28} Antiochus at Ephesus: eg., Livy, 33.38, 49; 35.13, 15; 36.20-21; 36.41, 42-43; 37.10ff; Embassies, eg.: 35.14-19.
\textsuperscript{29} Surrender of Ephesus; Livy, 37.45; awarded to Eumenes: 37.55-56; Peace of Apamea: 38.37-39.
\textsuperscript{32} Rogers (1991): 3, n. 9; Pl., \textit{HN.}, 5.95-122.
'Friend and Ally' was a nominal status, eventually reserved for those states which had benefited Rome in some way. Ephesus, during the revolt of Aristonicus, had defeated the rebel fleet, so that it may have had a double claim to the free status which it enjoyed: Attalus' will and service to Rome. This status resulted in civic autonomy and "limited material and fiscal privileges within the provincial system." In 98/7 or 94/3 BC, the proconsul of Asia, Quintus Mucius Scaevola, sent a letter to the boule and demos of the Ephesians, in which he refers to a state of 'friendship' with the Romans. That a state of friendship existed between Rome and Ephesus might suggest that the city was at this point a free one.

Though free, Ephesus was not beyond the reach of Roman tax-collectors. The publicani diverted the revenue of two nearby lakes from the Temple of Artemis to their own purposes, prompting the despatch of an embassy led by one Artemidorus to Rome. This embassy succeeded in having the lakes returned once more to the goddess, possibly at the end of the second or beginning of the first century BC. That the publicani were able to collect taxes from the territory of Artemis and of Ephesus itself suggests that the free status of Ephesus or of any other city depended on the cities insisting on that status.

---

33 Originally, of course, 'friend and ally' was an important indicator of status. It seems, though, that the use of the phrase ἡ συμμαχία καὶ φίλια by various Greek cities during the third century BC was "a relationship of informal amicitia: mere inter-state 'friendship' with no formal, legally binding treaty of alliance" (Eckstein [1999]).
34 Hansen (1971): 153; Strabo, 14.1.38. Ephesus' service as a port during the war against Antiochus III at the beginning of the century should not be forgotten.
37 Strabo describes one of these lakes as "a lake that runs inland from the sea, called Selinusia"; the second is not named, but is said to be confluent with Selinusia. Both are to the north of the outlet of the Cayster river. (Strabo, 14.1.26: μετά δὲ τὴν ἱερολήγον τοῦ Καυστροῦ λίμνη ἐστίν ἐκ τοῦ πελάγους ἀναχρομένην, καλεῖται δὲ Σελίνυσια, καὶ ἐφεξῆς ἄλλη στρέμματος σύνη)
39 Millar (1977): 420-447 cites numerous instances of cities sending embassies to the Emperor to request, confirm and restore benefits and privileges such as immunity from taxes. Similarly, Tacitus reports an embassy from Ephesus justifying its privileges before Tiberius (Ann., 3.61).
Even the payment of taxes, though, does not necessarily contradict so-called free status: Stratonicea may have been paying taxes to Rome before and after the invasion of Mithridates VI, but it is still termed a friend and ally of Rome; similarly, Aphrodisias, which did enjoy free status, was obliged to seek confirmation of that freedom repeatedly in order to avoid tax collectors.  

Mithridates VI, the king of Pontus, invaded Asia in 88 BC and won over many cities.\textsuperscript{41} Even before the war, however, Asia, Greece and Africa were said to be revolting from Rome because of the cupidity of the generals who had been active in those provinces. Furthermore, the \textit{publicani}, bankers and merchants from Rome, through their own rapacity, had played a role in encouraging the commoners of Ephesus and other cities to support Mithridates as a ‘Liberator of the Greeks’.\textsuperscript{42} Initially, Mithridates fulfilled this role, winning the first battles, invading Ionia while the Roman generals were wintering at Apamea, Pergamum and Rhodes, and ‘freeing’ many Greek cities from the Romans.\textsuperscript{43} He captured the Roman generals and proceeded to Ephesus, where he was well-received in 88 BC. During his stay in the city, the Ephesians are said to have overthrown statues of Romans which had been erected in their city.\textsuperscript{44}

Before Sulla arrived to take up the war, Mithridates ordered his satraps and governors to kill all the Romans and Italians in their cities on a single day in 88 BC. He promised rewards for those who revealed Romans in hiding, and slaves who killed their

\textsuperscript{41} Sherwin-White (1984): 240; App., \textit{Mith.}, 16-21.
\textsuperscript{42} App., \textit{Mith.}, 16, 18-19; Diod. Sic., 37.26-27.1; Rogers (1991): 5-6.
\textsuperscript{43} App., \textit{Mith.}, 19-20.
\textsuperscript{44} App., \textit{Mith.}, 21.
masters received their freedom. Memnon reports that eighty thousand Romans were killed as a result of Mithridates' action, but he implies that not all the cities of Asia Minor obeyed the instructions. Ephesus, however, is reported to have been especially enthusiastic: the citizens are said to have torn Roman and Italian suppliants away from the Artemision in order to kill them.

The numbers reported for the slaughtered Romans may be assumed to have been exaggerated. In a discussion of population size and change, Walter Scheidel notes that "the large majority of references [to the reporting of numbers] are no more than symbolic values, at best indicative of a certain order of magnitude and deployed to lend colour or emphasis to the author's exposition;" this is how Memnon's figure ought to be interpreted, as a way of intensifying the atrocity of Mithridates' order. Although Appian similarly emphasises the brutality of the slaughtering of the Romans, he undermines this aspect of his own narrative: the proconsul of Asia, Lucius Cassius, escaped to Rhodes, which suggests either previous knowledge of the plot, or that there were sympathisers who helped Cassius and, presumably, other Roman citizens. It is evident that

46 App., Mith., 23; the citizens of Pergamum treated suppliants in the sanctuary of Aesclepius in the same manner. While at Ephesus, Mithridates extended the area included under the protection of the Artemision to a little over a stadion (Strabo, 14.1.23).
47 If Herodotus' statement that Xerxes' army consisted of three million soldiers can be rejected as exaggeration, there is no reason why Memnon's figure of eighty thousand should be accepted at face value. Roman and Italian citizens would have been settling and visiting the Hellenistic East from at least the beginning of the second century BC. Soldiers may have settled in various regions of the east soon after Rome's first expeditions across the Mediterranean, and merchants will have followed them closely - if they did not in fact precede settlers of military background. In many ways, these Romans will have been assimilated into the Greek population, becoming, for all intents and purposes, Greeks themselves (MacMullen [2000]: 1-7). It must therefore be asked how likely it is that Greeks would murder not only their fellow citizens - who in many cases may have been of Greek descent - but also those citizens whose presence must have contributed in no small part to the prosperity of many cities. If MacMullen is correct in his estimate that the number of Romans - including those of Greek descent or those who had themselves been Hellenized - exceeded one hundred thousand at its peak (MacMullen [2000]: 27), one must ask whether the number of Roman citizens who were in actual danger of being murdered - that is, those who had not been in the east sufficiently long to have become Hellenized - could have been eighty thousand.
Mithridates’ promises of rewards for revealing those Romans who concealed themselves did not achieve their intended goal in every case. The use of rewards can, in fact, be seen as an indication of reluctance to obey Mithridates’ command.\(^4^9\) Furthermore, support for Mithridates in Ephesus may only have been a result of his presence and his victories: the citizens of Ephesus rejected his agent Zenobius after his losses in Greece and a deportation of the citizens of Chios.\(^5^0\) The enthusiasm on the part of the Ephesians reported by Appian and Memnon may have been remarkable because it was against the overall persuasion of the city; the executions may have been the work of relatively few fanatics.

Approximately three years after the execution of the Romans, at the end of 86 or beginning of 85, Mithridates had had successes in both Asia and Greece but his armies were beginning to undergo large defeats; he became more and more despotic, no longer playing the role of a liberator. This, and the exportation of the Chians by Zenobius, encouraged the Ephesians to kill that officer when he came to the city while the king was at Pergamum. Again, Ephesian loyalty to Mithridates appears to have been lacking during Mithridates’ absence, upheld, perhaps, only by a minority of the inhabitants.\(^5^1\) The citizens reversed their former position, attempting to rejoin the Romans by declaring war on Mithridates and attributing their obedience to his commands to the suddenness of his attack and the terrifying size of his forces. The Ephesians passed a decree to this effect, although it did not protect them from punishment in Sulla’s settlement after Mithridates’ surrender and retirement to Pontus.\(^5^2\) Appian reports that the citizens were

\(^{4^9}\) App., *Mith.*, 24.

\(^{5^0}\) App., *Mith.*, 46-48.

\(^{5^1}\) App., *Mith.*, 46; Magie (1988): 224-225.

\(^{5^2}\) IEph 8; SIG\(^3\) 742=Sherk (1984): 73-74, no. 61.
punished very severely (*ekolazonto pikros*), and that Sulla required the province to pay five years of taxes at once in addition to the cost of the war. Ephesus was not alone in being punished: Sulla stripped some cities of their freedom and fiscal immunities; only a few, for especial services, retained their freedom, but not necessarily their fiscal immunities. Ephesus and other cities became responsible for taxes formerly collected by the *publicani*.

The legal status of Ephesus after Sulla’s settlement is disputed. Magie and Sherwin-White assume that Sulla stripped the city of its free status, because, as they argue, such status was regained between 48 and 46 BC. There is, however, debate about from whom it received the restoration of free status. There are two potential benefactors, Publius Servilius Isauricus, who was consul in 48 and 41, and proconsul of Asia in 46; and Caesar, who was Isauricus’ consular colleague and present in Asia in 48 BC.

Both Servilius and Caesar were the recipients of divine honours in Asia. Two Ephesian inscriptions from the time of Hadrian record honours for two priests of Servilius and Roma, while others from Ephesus and Pergamum honour Caesar as a descendant of Ares and Aphrodite, a manifest god, and the saviour of human life. On the basis of these honours and an inscription from Pergamum which honours him as having “restored to the city its ancestral laws and its democracy without restrictions,”

---

55 Sherwin-White (1984): 40-46; Magie (1988): 474, 955, 1271 n. 42. E. Guerber (1995) provides a detailed study of the question of Ephesus’ status under the Empire, with the conclusion that the city was by then, and probably under the Republic, among “les cités stipendiaires de la province dont elle était la capitale” (409); he also provides a summary of the earlier scholarship on this question, pp. 389-390, nn. 1-4.  
56 Servilius: *IEph* 702, 3066; Caesar: *SIG* 3 760=Sherk (1984): 100, no. 79d.
Magie argues that Servilius restored freedom to both Ephesus and Pergamum during his proconsulship.  

Sherk argues that Caesar restored freedom to Pergamum as a favour to a citizen of the city, Mithridates, who had come to his aid at Alexandria; if Caesar did restore freedom to Pergamum, a contemporary restoration to Ephesus would make sense. The inscription on which the restoration of autonomy is based, however, is fragmentary, and no copies exist of the final portion which identifies precisely what Caesar restored to Pergamum; Servilius, however, receives commendation for the same reasons in Pergamum, that is, for the restoration of autonomy and rights of asylum to the temple of Asclepius. There is no secure evidence that Servilius restored free status to Ephesus, or that Caesar restored this status to Pergamum, let alone Ephesus. The inscriptions honouring Servilius and Caesar may have been erected in response to restorations affecting only the temples, not the overall status of the cities.

Sherk concedes that it is not actually stated in any source that Caesar restored freedom to Pergamum at the request of his rescuer, Mithridates. The same may be said of the revocation of free status from both cities. The debate about who restored Ephesus to free status is irresolvable because it is possible that the city did not lose this status in Sulla’s arrangements. Appian records Sulla’s settlement of Asia Minor after the end of

---

the Mithridatic war, listing several cities and regions that were granted freedom for their loyalty during Mithridates’ invasion. Those that supported and obeyed Mithridates’ commands, on the other hand, were severely punished, “especially the Ephesians, who had treated the Roman offerings in their temples with shameless indignity.” Sulla summoned the supporters of Mithridates to Ephesus where he informed them of their punishment. He required the province to pay five years of taxes immediately, in addition to the costs of the war and whatever additional expenses Sulla incurred in the restoration of order as was noted above.

Appian is regularly cited in support of the statement that Sulla revoked Ephesus’ free status, along with that of other previously free cities, as part of the punishment for supporting Mithridates. In fact, though, Appian does not even suggest this, and would seem to be saying the opposite. The punishment is recorded in a speech which Appian composed himself. The omission of a revocation of free status, however, is not the result of this secondary composition. Appian hints at punishment for the Ephesians at the time of the killing of the citizens and Mithridates’ entry into the city. He suggests early in his account of the Mithridatic wars that Ephesus was strongly chastised after Sulla’s campaigns in Greece and his arrival in Asia. It is unlikely, therefore, that Appian would fail to mention a loss of free status in his speech if that was included in Sulla’s settlements. Ephesus is the only city named among the “Cappadocianisers”, upon all of whom the indemnity is imposed. Since this punishment is specified immediately after the

---

61 App., Mith., 61: ὁ τε καππαδοκισάντων ἄνδρες ἡ πόλεις ἔκολαξομεν πικρῶς, καὶ μᾶλλον ἀυτῶν Ἐφέσοι, σὺν ἄχρι Κολοκεία πρὸς τὰς Ρωμαίους ἀντιθέματα ὑβρίζαντες. Ilium, Chios, Lycia, Rhodes and Magnesia received freedom; Magnesia had been among the cities which received Mithridates (21).
62 App., Mith., 62.
64 App., Mith., 21, 23.
statement that Ephesus and the other cities which had supported Mithridates were severely punished, the large indemnity should be taken as the “severe punishment” 65. So severe was the indemnity that Asia still owed a part of it in 69 BC. Surely Appian would have added the loss of freedom, picking up on his earlier hints, and demonstrating the full extent of the severity of the punishment.

It may be argued that the indemnity itself implies subject status. The payment of an indemnity and taxes does not necessarily indicate a loss of freedom, though. Early in his career, P. Servilius Isauricus introduced a decree which “protected free communities against excessive demands on the part of Roman capitalists,” a clear indication that even free cities could be liable for taxes. 66 Furthermore, Hadrian wrote in AD 119 for the express purpose of exempting the citizens of Aphrodisias from a tax on nails because the city had been removed from the structure of the province. 67 Clearly free status did not always bring freedom from taxation. It has already been noted that the publicani had confiscated the revenues of Artemis’ lakes before the beginning of the first century, and that their depredations were involved in the defection of Asia to Mithridates in the eighties. 68

---

65 App., Mith., 61-62, says that Sulla punished various cities by tearing down walls and giving them up to plunder, while granting benefits to those cities which had not favoured Mithridates. Sulla summoned representatives from these to Ephesus where he informed them of their punishment: τήν τη Ἀσία, καὶ τῆς φιλαττής Ῥωμαίων εὐφημίας σύνεκα, μόνος ἤ ποτε ἐπιγράφον πέντε ἄρα ἄρτος ἐσεντεχνεῖται αὐτίκα, καὶ τὴν τοῦ πόλεμου δαπάνην, ὅση τε γέγονεν καὶ ἢσται καθοκειμένῳ τὰ ὑπόλοιπα. Διαφημίων δὲ ταῦθ᾽ ἐγκάστοις ἐγὼ κατὰ πόλεως, καὶ τάδ᾽ ἐπεθνοὶ τῶν ἱσοφραῖς, καὶ τῶν σὺ φιλάξασθεν ἐπιθήσεσθι δικτιν ὡς πολέμως. There is no mention of a loss of freedom. Appian reports the bestowal of freedom on several cities (61), including Magnesia ad Maeandrum although this city had received Mithridates on his march, but it is possible that these cities had not enjoyed a privileged status before: Sulla enrolled them among the Friends of Rome (Ῥωμαίων ἀνέγραφε φίλους); at no point, however, does he report the revocation of freedom from Ephesus.
A Latin inscription from a dedicatory monument on the Capitoline hill in Rome records an embassy led by Heraclitus and Hermocrates expressing the gratitude of the people of Ephesus to the Romans for their *libertas*. Magie dates this inscription to 167 BC because the monument also contains an offering of thanks from the Lycians for their *libertas*, which he assumes to be the liberation from the domination of Rhodes in that year; he argues that the dedication by the Ephesians is contemporary. Ephesus, however, was subject to Eumenes II after the peace of Apamea, and there is no evidence that Rome deprived the Attalid kingdom of territory as it did the island of Rhodes. Such a deprivation is, in fact, unlikely since the situations of Rhodes and the Attalid kingdom differed. Rhodes was in danger of being attacked because it had delayed choosing a side during the Third Macedonian War, only offering to mediate between Rome and Perseus relatively late in the dispute. The island suffered for this tardiness by the exploitation of the ambiguity of the statement which had given the Rhodians authority in Lycia twenty years previously. Rhodes had maintained its position among the Hellenistic kingdoms and Rome by playing them off against one another; Eumenes, however, was in a position of strength in Asia Minor, such that the Romans were unlikely to interfere directly in his affairs by removing cities from his kingdom, no minor interference.

Mommsen, decades before Magie, had argued that the Ephesian inscription and the monument on which it appears should be dated to the period during or just after the First Mithridatic War. A.W. Lintott acknowledges that the early date supported by

---


72 Mommsen (1906): 74-75.
Magie is less likely than that proposed by Mommsen, since the letter forms would be unusual as early as the mid-second century BC. Each scholar accepts that the multiple thanksgiving inscriptions on this monument are approximately contemporary, although Lintott broadens this to argue that the inscriptions represent successive dedications recorded “at the behest of foreign embassies over a longer period from c. 100-60 BC”, accounting for the similarity of the letter forms with the supposition that the monument was re-inscribed after damage in 83 BC. In this scheme, the inscription recording the embassy led by Heraclitus and Hermocrates is dated to the end of the second century BC, after the settlement of Attalus III’s bequest. Lintott supports this date in part because of his belief that Mommsen’s suggested date placing the inscription during Sulla’s dictatorship would make it “a piece of bootlicking servility”: he accepts Appian’s statement of Ephesus’ severe punishment without examining the nature of that punishment. As argued above, though, the only punishment which Appian reports is the imposition of a massive indemnity. In this case, a thanksgiving dedication would not be a display of obsequiousness, but rather a genuine sign of gratitude for Sulla’s restraint: some cities suffered the demolition of their walls, while others were plundered. Ephesus had good reason to offer a dedication in gratitude for its situation after the end of the war. Furthermore, Lintott’s dating of the inscription to the end of the second century BC raises the significant question of why the other beneficiary cities, such as Pergamum, do not appear with Ephesus on this monument. The same question, of course, can be asked if a Sullan date is accepted: Magnesia on the Maeander became a friend and ally of

---

73 Lintott (1978): 138; Lintott notes, however, that it would not be impossible for the letter forms to have been current in the mid-second century, just unlikely.
74 Lintott (1978): 143.
75 Lintott (1978): 140.
76 App., Mith., 61.
Rome, despite having welcomed Mithridates during the war, but does not appear with Ephesus on this monument. The Ephesians, however, may have been made more aware of how much more they could have suffered by the fact that the settlement was announced in their own city. Such an expression of gratitude would be particularly appropriate for the Ephesians, since they had defected from Rome before rejoining her. Similarly, Laodicea in Lycia whose citizens had surrendered Q. Oppius and his men to Mithridates, appears on the monument; this appearance is not an instance of sycophancy, but, as in the case of Ephesus, the result of a very real sense of having been treated leniently by Sulla.  

This would then imply that Sulla in fact restored the freedom to the Ephesians, as he had to the Lycians, which they had previously enjoyed and lost under Mithridates’ domination. Such a restoration would not be remarkable if in fact Ephesus was lukewarm in its support of the Pontic king, as seems to have been the case. Although Ephesus does not appear in Appian’s list of the cities to which Sulla granted freedom, a restoration of free status is still possible because those cities which are named do not appear, from Appian’s phrasing, to have been free before Mithridates’ advance. 

The decree passed by the Ephesians to commemorate their returning to Rome makes the dating of the dedication to the time of Sulla more convincing. The decree was erected at Ephesus, but it cannot have failed to have been reported to the Roman Senate. The delegation led by Heraclitus and Hermocrates and recorded on the dedicatory
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77 App., Mih., 78-79; Mommsen (1906): 72-75, no. III.  
78 App., Mih., 61; the freed cities were inscribed among the φίλων of the Romans; Ephesus had enjoyed this status at the beginning of the first century.
monument presents an ideal opportunity for such a report. Although the dating of the monument and its inscriptions is clearly not agreed upon, the dedication by the Ephesians can be seen as support for the city's continued free status after the First Mithridatic war; neither Isauricus nor Caesar were responsible for a restoration of such status in the early forties BC.

Antony came to Ephesus after the defeat of Brutus and Cassius in 41 BC. As punishment for the support rendered by Ephesus and other cities to these generals, he required nine years' worth of taxes – Plutarch says that Antony extracted 200,000 talents from the Asian cities. During his time in Ephesus, Antony was joined by many Senators who were opposed to Octavian, a clear indication of the city's continuing importance. Possible interventions by Augustus in the affairs of the city in 38 BC, despite the fact that Ephesus lay in Antony's half of the former republic, also suggests this ongoing prominence. Octavian also imposed a pecuniary fine after the defeat of Antony in 31 BC, but distributed benefits as well. Cassius Dio writes that Octavian deprived the cities of “the limited authority over their citizens which had hitherto rested with their

79 Strabo also reports an embassy to Rome in which an orator from Adramyttium made a speech in defence of Asia, when the province was accused of “Mithridatism” (Strabo, 13.1.66).


81 Jones (1999): 92; Reynolds (1982): nos. 8 & 12; Millar (1973): 56, no. 10. Jones, perhaps, overemphasizes Augustus’ role in Ephesus at this time. Of the two Aphrodisian documents which he cites, the second (Reynolds no. 12, a letter of Augustus to the Ephesians) may not be a significant intervention in Antony’s affairs: the ambassador Solon son of Demetrius of Aphrodisias reported to Augustus (or at this time, Octavian) the sufferings of the city. As a Julian, Augustus would hardly be an unlikely recipient of the Aphrodisians’ appeal; indeed, in a second letter (Reynolds, no. 10; Millar, no. 11) Augustus emphasizes his attachment to the city: μίαν πόλιν ταύτην [ἐξ ὀλίγης τῆς Ἀσίας εμαυτῷ ἐλπίδον. τούτως οὕτω θέλω φιλαξθῆναι ὡς ἐμὸς πολέμας (cf. Reynolds, no. 6; Millar, no. 13). Reynolds suggests that Augustus’ “superior or more active benevolence” is hinted at in the letter, but it must be noted that Augustus does not directly order the Ephesians to restore the Aphrodisians’ property (specifically a statue of Eros): he acts through Antony (περὶ ὧν | πάντων Ἀντωνίου τε τῷ συναρχοντι κυνολάς | δέδοκα ὡς οὖσα ποτὲ ἀν δώθητι δ ἀν εὐρή ἄμφοτερὴς ἄντοις). Furthermore, Reynolds suggests that “Octavian had apparently come to an agreement with Antony, who recognized his special relationship with Plarasa/Aphrodisias; it was, perhaps, parallel to Antony’s special relationship with Bononia, recognized by Octavian” (98). Augustus’ involvement with the Aphrodisians affected the Ephesians, and the fact that he took the trouble to inform the latter of his actions may be a suggestion of the importance of the city of the Ephesians.
assemblies.” Ephesus may have lost its freedom at this point, but not before. Ephesus was also granted permission to consecrate areas of the city to Roma and Caesar as the most important city in Asia by Augustus; the city may now have replaced Pergamum as the administrative centre of the province, an elevation which was assisted by Augustus’ residence in the city in 29 BC. Ephesus’ status as the provincial capital virtually necessitated extensive construction, which took place primarily around the State Agora. Throughout the first century AD, emperors and proconsuls of the province took an active interest in the financial affairs of Ephesus, in large part because the status of the Artemision as a bank and the importance of the port made the city the economic centre of Asia.

The interest shown by the emperors of the first century, particularly the Julio-Claudians, is shown by the building programs of this period. Almost all major building projects between 31 BC and AD 81 were sponsored by an emperor or a provincial official. During and after the reign of Domitian, building and renovation increased significantly, with local benefactors, many of whom possessed Roman citizenship, taking a more prominent role. Domitian himself granted Ephesus a temple of the provincial cult early in his reign and instituted Olympian games in the city. The temple continued as a temple of the Flavian emperors after his assassination, and although the games were
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83 Dio Cass., 51.20.6.
84 Scherrer (2001): 69-71; Fig. 2. no. 56.
86 White (1995): 51-52; Ephesus’ stature in the eastern empire was such that Seneca could refer to the city alongside Alexandria as one which was particularly populous and thriving (Sen., Ep. 102.21: Ephesum aut Alexandriam aut si quod est etiam nunc frequentius accolis laetiusve tectis solum).
probably discontinued, Domitian's initiatives may have been involved in the building boom in Ephesus shortly after his reign.\textsuperscript{88}

The correspondence of Publius Vedius Antoninus III and Antoninus Pius indicates that the emperors in the mid-second century continued to be involved in the projects of local benefactors, both in approving the erection of public buildings and monuments and contributing to the costs of construction or decoration.\textsuperscript{89} The city's importance for the province and the Empire as a whole is shown by the fact that during the late first and early second centuries, more and more of these munificent citizens of Ephesus are known to have belonged to the senatorial order. Thus, for example, Aulus Julius Quadratus was adlected to the Senate and served as consul under Trajan, while Publius Vedius Antoninus III gained senatorial standing under Hadrian.\textsuperscript{90}

Public building appears to have declined and been limited to renovations under the Severans, until earthquakes and invasions by Gothic tribes put an end to Ephesus' prosperity in the third century; this prosperity, though, may have been declining slightly as early as the reign of Antoninus.\textsuperscript{91} Along with the city's prosperity, the population began to decrease. Ephesus was once again the recipient of Imperial aid for reconstruction during the fourth and fifth centuries.\textsuperscript{92} By this time, however, the \textit{gerousia} has passed out of the epigraphic record of the city.

\textsuperscript{89} \textit{IEph} 1491-1493.
2.2. Origins of the Ephesian Gerousia

The origins of the Ephesian gerousia are unclear. It first appears in the epigraphic record at the beginning of the third century BC, and only once thereafter before the Roman period. Strabo also reports the gerousia in existence in the third century BC; his is one of very few literary testimonies to this body in the city. The long period in which it does not appear has led many scholars to question the relationship between a Hellenistic and a Roman gerousia, usually with the conclusion that they should not be identified as the same bodies. There has, however, been little effort to understand the nature of the Hellenistic institution. Some hypotheses may be advanced, but it must be noted that much of what follows is speculation and is not meant to be in any way definitive.

Strabo reports that at the time of Lysimachus' relocation and renaming of the city there was a gerousia registered, with which was associated a body called the epikletoi. This statement is often taken to mean either that Lysimachus created both bodies, or that he attached the epikletoi to the previously existing gerousia. Van Berchem alone of the scholars discussed in the Introduction considers the early history of the gerousia at length. His suggestion that the gerousia of Ephesus served as the model for the Roman Senate is provocative, but it does not offer an hypothesis on the origins – it simply pushes the question back. His argument requires the gerousia to pre-date Lysimachus, and this element of his reconstruction is quite possibly correct. The early history and origins of

93 Strabo, 14.1.21: ἴν δὲ γερουσία καταγραφένη, τούτως δὲ συνήθεσαν οἱ ἐπίκλητοι καλοίμενοι.
95 van Berchem (1980): 37-38; Menadier’s note that Roman gerousiae appear in cities once controlled by Lysimachus does not constitute proof that Lysimachus established them (62).
the gerousia deserve further attention – even if no certain conclusions can be drawn – and will serve as a useful starting point for the subsequent chapters.

It is agreed among scholars that the Doric and Asiatic gerousiai are distinct, but this should not lead to the assumption that the two were completely unrelated throughout their histories. The Spartan gerousia was a body of twenty-eight elders and the two kings instituted by Lycurgus on the advice of the Delphic oracle; it was to be a body which prevented the kings from acting too monarchically, and the people from acting too democratically. Xenophon refers to the gerousia of Sparta as a body of the aristoi andres, while Aristotle and Demosthenes also refer to the Spartan gerousia, giving it clear oligarchic overtones, as Hicks has noted. Later Greek authors clearly saw a connection between the Spartan gerousia and the Roman Senate, and they may well be correct in their statements that the former was the model for the latter. Certainly this seems a more plausible connection to draw than van Berchem’s unattested sixth century BC Ephesian gerousia which served as the model for the Roman Senate. This is not, however, to deny the existence of such an early gerousia in Ephesus, regardless of its relationship with the Senate of Rome.

The Spartan gerousia provides the obvious starting point for an investigation of the origins of the Ephesian gerousia, but, before considering the relationship between the Spartan and Ephesian institutions, the role occasionally ascribed to Lysimachus should be reviewed. Strabo reports that the gerousia and the epikletoi governed everything in the
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96 Plut., Lyc., 5-6.
97 Xen., Mem., 4.4.16; Arist., Pol., 1306a8; Dem., Lept., 107; Hicks (1890): 75.
98 Dionysius of Halicarnassus remarks on several other elements of early Rome which he claims were modeled on Spartan practices (2.13.4, 14.2, 28.2)
city. This expression, however, has given rise to different opinions about Strabo’s exact meaning because of the two Hellenistic inscriptions in which the gerousia and epikletoi appear. These decrees are associated with the temple, and do not show supreme authority in the administration of the city.

The first is a decree of the boule and demos granting citizenship to a certain Euphronius who conducted an embassy to Lysimachus’ general Prepelaus on the authority of the gerousia and epikletoi regarding the billeting of soldiers in the temple’s properties and the taxation of Artemis. In the second document, a decree of the same bodies, a Boeotian flute player is crowned with a golden crown and proclaimed publicly. In both cases, the gerousia brings the measure before the boule and demos and appears to be subordinate to these; in fact, the psephismata of the gerousia and epikletoi are brought before the boule and demos by the neopoioi and kouretes or the neopoioi alone. To account for this apparent contradiction, it has been suggested that Lysimachus involved himself in the affairs of the gerousia. He either put the gerousia in charge of the Temple of Artemis to give the influence of the priests official sanction or to gain an element of control over the temple and its treasury, or gave it the highest authority in the city subject to the nominal approval of the boule and demos in order to give the administration an oligarchic element.  

The third possibility can be rejected with relative certainty since it rests on Strabo’s statement that the gerousia and epikletoi “governed everything.” If this is how
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99 Strabo, 14.1.21: διψκοιν πάντα; cf. above, p. 29.
100 I Eph., 1449, 1470.
101 Sanction for the priests' influence: Hicks (1890): 75; Access to temple funds: Lévy (1895): 237; Oliver (1941): 15-17; Oligarchic influences: Hicks (1890): 75; Chapot (1967): 223. Oliver argues that the epikletoi were a means of giving Lysimachus emergency access to the treasury of the temple, but this is scarcely different from gaining direct access.
the statement should be interpreted, one may suppose either that it refers to an unspecified time, or that the geographer was mistaken: the two most prominent gerousiai in the Roman world were the Spartan gerousia and the Roman Senate, both of which were authoritative administrative bodies. Furthermore, the testimonies of Aristotle and Demosthenes indicate that the word gerousia had clear oligarchic overtones. The creation of such a body, even if nominally subject to the authority of the boule and demos, would have had a significant effect on the appearance of the administration. It would have been tantamount to dissolving both bodies rather than adding a non-invasive oligarchic element. The two Hellenistic inscriptions indicate that the Ephesian gerousia was not in a position to add oligarchic elements. Alternatively, as noted above, panta could refer not to the affairs of the city as a whole, but to the construction entailed in Lysimachus' refoundation of the city or to temple affairs.

The second possible explanation for Lysimachus' supposed involvement in the affairs of the gerousia can also be rejected. The importance of the Temple of Artemis as the 'bank' of Asia Minor and the praise of the Ephesians for their restraint from using its wealth in their own difficulties suggests that Lysimachus probably could not have expected to access temple-funds through the creation of a board subject to the authority of the existing civic bodies. Surely such a change would have elicited some comment in the sources, if only to praise the Ephesians additionally in contrast to Lysimachus.

Finally, the power of the priesthood over the temple and over Ephesus itself could not have been influenced by the creation of a subordinate body any more effectively than it was already influenced by the boule and demos. The persuasive powers of the priests

---

102 Dio Chrys., Rhodian Oration 54, 55, 65; Aristides, Concerning Concord, 24; Xen., An., 5.3.6-8; Caes., B. Civ., 3.33, 105.
will have been based on their control of the temple, but also to no small extent on their own personal wealth and status in the city. Furthermore, while there are only two decrees of the Hellenistic gerousia, neither of them directly involves the priesthood, which would be unexpected if the gerousia had been created or modified to legitimise the priests' unofficial power.

The Hellenistic inscriptions provide another argument against Lysimachus as the creator of the gerousia. Prepelaus was the general who captured Ephesus for Lysimachus and, as the decree for Euphronius shows, the recipient of an embassy from the gerousia and the epikletoi.\(^{103}\) The result of the embassy was exemption for the temple from taxes and from billeting soldiers. The exemption from tax indicates that Lysimachus did not benefit from a regular payment from the temple, so that access to the temple's funds becomes an even less likely motivation. The use of the verb *huparcho* may suggest that the request for exemption from tax was a new privilege being sought, but it may also suggest a continuance of the current status. Such status probably existed prior to Lysimachus' capture of the city. Demetrius had bypassed Ephesus after his defeat at Ipsus out of the fear that his soldiers would plunder the temple: the Antigonids kept an eye on the economic welfare of the temple and so the exemption from tax may have been in existence during their period of dominance.\(^{104}\)

Furthermore, the embassy itself implies a familiarity with the affairs of the temple. Since the petition was addressed to Lysimachus' general Prepelaus instead of the new ruler, the gerousia and epikletoi may be assumed to have sent the embassy shortly after capture. It is unlikely that a newly instituted board would have been sufficiently

\(^{103}\) Diod. Sic., 20.107.4.

\(^{104}\) Plut., Dem., 30.1.
established to send a petition regarding either new or existing privileges to the general so soon after his capture of the city. It is even more unlikely that a body instituted by Lysimachus – through Prepelaus or personally – would make a request for exemptions not granted at the time of its recent establishment. Its role in the operation of the temple and its privileges would have been specified at the institution of the body. An embassy seeking confirmation of the existing rights and privileges sent at the beginning of a new reign is more appropriate than an embassy requesting additional rights and privileges from the ruler who established those privileges in the first place not long before.

It should also be noted, though it often is not, that Strabo does not say that Lysimachus or his general Prepelaus created or registered the *gerousia*; he simply says that there was a registered *gerousia*.\(^{105}\) In addition, the use of the imperfect contrasts with the use of the aorist for Lysimachus’ other actions, namely the relocation and renaming of the city. Van Berchem argues that the use of the imperfect in this case indicates that Strabo is describing an institution which no longer existed in his own time, perhaps using a lost Aristotelian *Constitution of Ephesus* as his source.\(^{106}\) In fact, van Berchem’s argument is unnecessary, as the publication in 1993 of several letters to the *gerousia* of Ephesus indicates.\(^{107}\) The *gerousia* did exist in Strabo’s time, and his use of the imperfect requires no explanation: it simply describes the continuing existence of the institution from pre-Lysimachan to post-Lysimachan Ephesus.

Lysimachus did not create the *gerousia* in Ephesus. It is, however, unclear who did create it, or when. Van Berchem, as has been noted, argues that the it was an
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105 Strabo, 14.1.21: ἡν δὲ γερουσία καταγραφομένη; καταγραφομένη is a participle used as an adjective, not as part of the verb, i.e., not ‘a *gerousia* was registered’.
106 van Berchem (1980): 28-29; one may wonder why the renaming of the city was not also reported in the imperfect if this is the case: the name Arsinoë appears not to have survived Lysimachus’ demise.
oligarchic council of ancient standing whose authority had been limited to religious affairs at an early date.\textsuperscript{108} As that scholar himself notes, his argument rests on theory and inference rather than direct evidence. He is nonetheless most likely correct in arguing for an oligarchic body which evolved into the \textit{gerousia} as it appears in the two Hellenistic inscriptions, but it may not have been of such ancient standing as he suggests.

The similarity in names suggests that an investigation into the origins of the Epehsian \textit{gerousia} might benefit from a consideration of the Spartan \textit{gerousia}. This was an oligarchic body in Sparta of limited numbers with lifelong membership.\textsuperscript{109} The initial \textit{gerousiastai} in Sparta were men who shared Lycurgus' ideal (\textit{gnome}), but age was not initially a factor in their membership.\textsuperscript{110} The honour consisted in being a member of a body of a limited number of men chosen initially for their wisdom.

There is, however, no demonstrable connection between the Spartan and Ephesian \textit{gerousiai}, but the use of the same word suggests that it may not be fruitless to speculate on a connection, particularly if the \textit{gerousia} had even nominal influence in Ephesus' public affairs. The councils which Lysander appointed in Ephesus and other cities consisted of ten members, appointed because of their eminence and their relations with himself – essentially, because they were friends of his, just as Lycurgus is said to have appointed the first Spartan \textit{gerousia}.\textsuperscript{111} If there had been a \textit{gerousia} in Ephesus before Lysander's arrival, as van Berchem suggests, it seems odd that he would establish a separate oligarchic body by the institution of a decarchy instead of supporting or

\textsuperscript{108} van Berchem (1980): 28-34.
\textsuperscript{109} Plut., \textit{Lyc.}, 5-6, 26.1; Dem., \textit{Lept.}, 107-108.
\textsuperscript{110} Plut., \textit{Lyc.}, 5, 26.1.
\textsuperscript{111} Plut., \textit{Lys.}, 5.3-4.
strengthening this body. Lysander, then, may have been involved in the creation of the Ephesian *gerousia* or, more probably, in the creation of an environment which led to it.

The decarchies which Lysander established in Ephesus and its Ionian neighbours, however, may not have survived 411 BC, when Sparta first acknowledged Persia's suzerainty over those cities.\(^\text{112}\) Xenophon gives as Lysander's motivation for accompanying Agesilaus on campaign in Asia Minor in 397 BC the desire to restore the authority of his appointed boards, and Plutarch implies that these boards had not yet lost all of their authority when the expedition set out, but that they were in the process of losing it.\(^\text{113}\) A decree of the Ephors had dissolved the decarchies which Lysander had set up, as was noted above, but it may be asked how effective such a decree would have been in the Ionian cities, which were ostensibly subject to the Persian Empire and distant from Sparta.\(^\text{114}\) Sparta's authority beyond central Greece declined with distance: authority in Asian affairs was in the hands of the navarchs; a decree of the Ephors may have carried very little weight in the Ionian cities.\(^\text{115}\) Lysander's activities in setting up decarchies had contributed to prosperity in many Greek cities, so it may be that these decarchies were not overthrown at the first opportunities even if they did not enjoy popular support.

A governing body of ten members, however, is very different from the epigraphically attested *gerousia* of AD 104 with at least three hundred and nine members. It was noted above that Tissaphernes attempted to drive out Lysander's appointees after the death of Cyrus, and that the establishment of an opposing group of oligarchs might be an ideal way to do this. Consequently, it is unlikely that Lysander's decarchy and the

\(^{113}\) Bommelaer (1981): 125; Xen., Hell. 3.4.2; Plut. Ages., 6.2.
\(^{114}\) Xen., Hell., 3.4.2.
gerousia can be identified as one and the same body. Rather, the gerousia may have originated in a group of individuals who were in opposition to the decarchs and who enjoyed satrapal support. It may be noted that Alexander dispossessed a governing oligarchy in Ephesus of its authority, an oligarchy which may have developed from such individuals.

Alternatively, the origins of the gerousia may have been somewhat more humble than this. The name might suggest that the position of its members was supported by their age or respected position within the city, independent of any Spartan connection.\textsuperscript{116} They may have been an unofficial group of citizens who quickly came to genuine authority in a time of crisis or need. Their supervision of Lysimachus' building, if that is how dioikoun panta should be interpreted, or the conflicts between the diadouchoi at the end of the fourth century might provide such an opportunity, but it is also possible that a crisis prompted their emergence earlier. Oligarchs supported by Tissaphernes are not attested, and it cannot be overly stressed that their existence is entirely hypothetical. It is, perhaps, more plausible that a group of citizens joined together at this time to keep the business of the city from collapsing. The period of disorder in some cities of Asia Minor at the beginning of the fourth century BC, during which the decline of his decarchs may have influenced Lysander's desire to return to the region, would provide an atmosphere in which the emergence of such citizens would not be unreasonable.\textsuperscript{117} These citizens may have formed an early incarnation of the gerousia and the oligarchy which Alexander replaced when he instituted a democratic restoration.

\textsuperscript{116} Cf., Plut., Lyc., 6.4; Plut., Mor., 789E-F.
\textsuperscript{117} The Persian conquest of the Ionian cities in the sixth century BC, which led to emigration and exile in many cities and possibly in Ephesus (Domínguez [1999]: 79), may have provided a similar opportunity for such citizens to join together in the interests of the city.
The fact remains, though, that the speculative origins of the *gerousia* suggested above leave that body significantly smaller than it appears in AD 104. The *epikletoi* are informative in this respect. Oliver argues that this body was attached to the pre-existing *gerousia* by Lysimachus in order to provide a supporting body should he require emergency access to the temple treasury; van Berchem argues that they had been attached to the *gerousia* much earlier in its existence.\(^{118}\)

Both Oliver and van Berchem note that an *epikletos* was in literature a guest invited not by a host, but by one who had himself been invited by the host.\(^{119}\) Oliver, therefore, takes an *epikletos* to be an outsider invited by a third party and concludes that the *epikletoi* were appointed to join the *gerousia* by a third party, that is, Lysimachus. There are major two problems with such an interpretation. First, the *epikletos* is not invited by an outside third person, but by others who had also been invited. Plutarch implies that the *epikletos* might arrive before or after his inviter, but there is no indication that the inviter himself failed to arrive. There is no indication that Lysimachus was a member of the *gerousia* – if he had been, it would be surprising that the embassy led by Euphronius would have gone to Prepelaus instead of Lysimachus himself – so that his grafting of the *epikletoi* onto the *gerousia* is not parallel to inviting a guest to a symposium.

Second, this is not a dining context like that of Plutarch’s dialogue, and there is little evidence to suggest that the *gerousia* was simply a social club at this time and therefore describable in terms from such a context: sending Euphronius on an embassy

---

\(^{118}\) Oliver (1941): 15-16; van Berchem (1980); cf. above, pp. 12-15.

\(^{119}\) Oliver (1941): 16-17; van Berchem (1980): 35; Plut., *Mor.*, 707A.
for which he receives public honours actually implies that the gerousia and epikletoi were a public body.

Lest it be objected that the chronological separation between Lysimachus and Plutarch may have witnessed a change in the interpretation of epikletos, a few remarks on that word are not out of place. Plutarch’s use of epikletos is not a second-century AD development of the word: it appears to have the same meaning in Aristophanes, that of guests at a dinner party. In addition, a second century BC decree of the Delian Society of Poseidoniasts from Berytus which Oliver cites does not use epikletos in a context parallel to that which is found in the Ephesian decrees, but rather in a festival context: the honorand may bring an epikletos to a procession and two to a celebration. Epikletos is in this case precisely parallel to the use which appears in Aristophanes and Plutarch. The meaning of epikletos in the decree from Berytus should not colour the interpretation of the two Hellenistic documents from Ephesus, nor should its appearance in Plutarch.

Tod notes Strabo’s use of the word, in his commentary on the Berytus inscription, but otherwise does not comment on the word itself. He does, however, cite two occurrences in Herodotus which are illuminating in the case of the Ephesian epikletoi. Epikletoi were advisors to the Persian king or one of his officials: they were a semi-permanent group of counsellors who could be summoned for particular purposes. It may not be accidental that a group called the epikletoi appear in a city which, under an oligarchic council, had been subject to the Persian Empire for fifty years.
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120 Ar., Pax, 1266.
121 Oliver (1941): 16-17; Tod (1934): 142, ll 36, 48.
122 Tod (1934): 152.
123 Hdt., 8.101.1, 9.42.2; cf., Hdt., 5.75, 7.8 & 7.203.
124 Arr., Anab., 1.17.10; Xen., An., 5.1.29-32.
Strabo’s use of the participle *kaloumenoi* may be relevant at this point. In the case of Plutarch, Aristophanes, and the Berytus decree, *epikletos* refers to individuals considered as individuals, not to a public body which the Ephesian inscriptions imply or to a group of advisors among the Persians. The consistent use and chronological distribution of Plutarch, Aristophanes and the Berytus decree suggest that *epikletos* was easily or even primarily understood as referring to individuals rather than a body or board. Consequently, Strabo informs his readers that the body which was associated with the *gerousia* was the ‘so-called’ *epikletoi*: the word is used in a technical sense to describe advisors such as those who appear in Herodotus. The *epikletoi* were an official or semi-official body ancillary to the regular members of the *gerousia* in Ephesus which predated Lysimachus’ resettling and renaming of the city.

Oliver leaves the question of the *epikletoi* after Lysimachus open: there is no evidence to determine whether they became permanent members of the *gerousia*, or if they ceased to exist after Lysimachus’ death. Since Lysimachus did not create either body, though, there is little reason to believe that either would have disappeared after his death. The reversion from Arsinoë-Ephesus to Ephesus may be seen as a reassertion of Ephesian identity, but there is no reason for the *epikletoi*, who were no longer a ruling body after Alexander’s conquest, to have been dissolved at Lysimachus’ death when they had survived Alexander’s. It is more probable that the *gerousia* and *epikletoi* were assimilated into a single body. If the proposition that the *epikletoi* are to be understood in
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125 Strabo 14.1.21: ἣν δὲ γερουσία καταγραφομένη, τούτων δὲ συνήθεσιν οἱ ἐπίκλητοι καλοῦμενοι καὶ δηθέντων πάντα.

126 The fact that the *epikletoi* are described in the plural rather than the singular like the *boule* and *demos* would seem to indicate that they formed a less tightly organized body, but their appearance in a decree with the *gerousia* suggests that they cannot be considered as private individuals. The argument that Strabo uses the term in a technical sense may be supported by the fact that the *epikletoi* do not appear in the Ephesian inscription with the exception of these two citizenship decrees.

127 Oliver (1941): 17.
the sense of the Persian advisors in Herodotus is correct, one would not expect a synthesised oligarchic board to have been subordinate to the *boule* and *demos* as they appear in the decrees for Euphronius and the flute player. It should be remembered, though, that Alexander restored the democratic institutions in Ephesus, stripping the small governing group of its power.\(^{128}\) It is not implausible that this governing group, simply an *oligarchia* in Arrian, was the *gerousia* with a group of advisors, the *epikletoi*. The two bodies may then have developed into a less and less political board under a single name during the Hellenistic period.

A great deal more evidence exists for the *gerousia* under the empire so that the Hellenistic period is a suitable point at which to end a summary of the *gerousia* which has been based on a series of inferences. It must be stressed that the preceding discussion has not been intended to provide a definitive account of the history of the *gerousia* in Ephesus, merely to offer some suggestions. It is hoped that the remainder of this work will supply a historical account of the *gerousia* under the empire.

This discussion has produced the following hypothesis for the early development of the *gerousia* of Ephesus. The *gerousia* arose, officially or unofficially, after Lysander's creation of a decarchy in the city and the acknowledgment of Persian suzerainty in Asia Minor and enjoyed, or came to enjoy, significant political authority, but cannot be identified with Lysander's decarchy. During the fifty years before the Alexander's capture of Ephesus, the *epikletoi* were introduced, perhaps simply as an advisory board for the *gerousia* which came to serve as an oligarchical governing body. When Alexander captured the city, he made the *gerousia* and *epikletoi* subject to the *boule* and *demos*, reducing the oligarchy and strengthening the democracy; perhaps he

---
\(^{128}\) Arr., *Anab.*, 1.17.10.
also limited the *gerousia*’s interests to the temple. Lysimachus may have favoured oligarchy after the democratic Antigonids, but it is unlikely that he undertook constitutional changes regarding the *gerousia*. During the Hellenistic period, the two bodies coalesced under a single name, and probably continued throughout this period. The absence of evidence after 281 BC may be a result of the chances of preservation rather than the complete disappearance of the *gerousia*. Oliver had concluded that the *gerousia* did not become significant again until AD 104 because of this apparent disappearance. His tentativeness in making this conclusion, though, was well grounded, as the letters published in 1993 show. It is the position taken in this work that the *gerousia* was in continual existence.

The functions which remained for the *gerousia* after the humbling of the oligarchy have not yet been considered, and it is difficult to make conclusions about these in the Hellenistic period. Nonetheless, these, the Roman functions, and the effects of the coming of Rome will be examined in the remainder of this study, following a brief general discussion of the available epigraphic evidence in the next chapter.
3. EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE

3.1. Collections of the Inscriptions of Ephesus

The evidence for the *gerousia* of Ephesus is primarily epigraphic. Beyond Strabo's brief mention of the *gerousia* and the *epikletoi*, there is no other reference to the Ephesian *gerousia* in the literary sources.¹ The *gerousia* does not appear in the numismatic evidence from Ephesus.² The Jewish *gerousia* which appears frequently in Josephus, and occasionally in Judaic inscriptions (almost always in the person of a *gerousiarch*), does not appear to have any bearing on the Ephesian *gerousia* and will not, therefore, be used for comparative purposes.³

The inscriptions of Ephesus published prior to 1981 are readily accessible in Die *Inschriften von Ephesos*, volumes 11 to 19 of the *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasië* series (1979-1981). The vast majority published since 1981 are available for consultation in various volumes of the *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts*. The catalogue in the appendix presents the text of the inscriptions which refer to the *gerousia* of Ephesus, and to the *presbuteroi* (elders), a term which some scholars have suggested refers to the *gerousia*; *sunhedrion* [tes *gerousia*] (assembly of the *gerousia*) and *sustema* (constitutional body) have also been suggested as alternate expressions.⁴ Arguments for and against the inclusion of these terms will be discussed below. For the time being, it is sufficient to note that it is not always clear whether these are in fact references to the *gerousia*, but it is certainly clear that, if the terms can refer to

---

¹ See above, pp. 1-2, for the use of *γεροῦςτα* in Greek authors.
² Head (1964): 47-115.
³ Cf. above, Introduction, pg. 3, n. 9; CII 9, 66*, 95, 106, 119, 147, 189, 301, 353, 368, 425, 511, [533], 561 600; *JJO* i.163, iii.Syr53 & Syr74.
⁴ Menadier (1890): 49; Chapot (1967): 216.
the gerousia, they do not always do so.\textsuperscript{5} Every attempt has been made to provide as comprehensive a collection as possible.

The latest reading of the text of the inscriptions is, in most cases, provided by \textit{Die Inschriften von Ephesos}. An \textit{apparatus criticus} has been provided only when such information pertains to the gerousia or its members, or when an emendation is proposed; for a complete \textit{apparatus criticus} and epigraphic commentary, the reader is directed to the references for each inscription. Traditional epigraphic notation has been used. Translations of those inscriptions which have been discussed in earlier treatments of the gerousia are available in previous publications.\textsuperscript{6} The increase in available evidence, however, has made it advisable to provide both the Greek text and a translation of each inscription.\textsuperscript{7}

### 3.2. Chronology

The epigraphic evidence for the gerousia at Ephesus covers a period of approximately six hundred years. The earliest inscriptions are two decrees of the boule and demos of the city acclaiming a benefactor and a participant in one of the religious festivals.\textsuperscript{8} The latest are not precisely dated, but on the basis of the frequent appearance of the praenomen and nomen Marcus Aurelius, they are most likely to be dated to the second half of the second century AD, if not later. The latest precisely dated inscriptions come from the reign of Philip the Arab in the mid-third century.\textsuperscript{9}

\textsuperscript{5} For example, [το ἱερώτατον] | [συν]έδριν τῶν νεσταίων (\textit{JOAI} 55 [1984]: 121-122, no. 4238); \[τ]ό ...] συνέδριον | [τ]ῶν ὑμνημών | [και] θεολόγων | [και] θεσμῶν (\textit{IEph} 645).

\textsuperscript{6} The most recent such work in English is Oliver's \textit{Sacred Gerousia} (1941); his body of evidence, however, is limited to twenty-one Ephesian inscriptions.

\textsuperscript{7} All translations in the catalogue are my own.

\textsuperscript{8} \textit{IEph} 1449, 1470 (Cat. nos. 1 & 2).

\textsuperscript{9} \textit{IEph} 737, 892 (Cat. nos. 46 & 47).
As Chart 1 (pg. 63) implies, it is possible to date forty-eight inscriptions to within fifty years and an additional seven to an approximate period around the change from the second to third century AD. More precise dating is often possible because of the abundance of inscriptions from Ephesus: the many named individuals frequently appear in the corpus of Ephesian epigraphic evidence. Many prytaneis are known, not only from dating formulae, but also from lists of priests or kouretes, so that it has been possible to identify the tenure of many of these officials and to suggest a period for their public activities. Such information makes it possible to assign a fairly accurate date to other inscriptions when a kouros, for example, is present in an honorary inscription. Occasionally, the names of the proconsuls of Asia are given in public documents, in which case a specific year can often be deduced. Letters which survive in entirety – or which preserve the necessary formula at the necessary spot – are datable to the day of postage.

Some inscriptions, on the other hand, are datable only to broad periods, if at all. The appearance of an emperor’s praenomen and nomen gentilicum indicates that the individual using those names or their ancestor may have received citizenship from or been freed by that Emperor; in the absence of other criteria, these inscriptions can be dated to a time after the beginning of that Emperor’s reign, although this is not universally the case. This results in a degree of uncertainty beginning with the reign of Marcus Aurelius: the many Marci Aurelii known in inscriptions may have received citizenship from Marcus Aurelius or Commodus (AD 161-192), or from Caracalla’s constitutio Antoniniana (AD 212 or 214), or even later from Elagabalus or Severus
Alexander.\textsuperscript{10} The dates of those inscriptions naming a Marcus Aurelius with no other explicit criteria, therefore, have been generalized to from the late second to the early third century.\textsuperscript{11} More rarely, the editores principes or subsequent editors have hazarded dates on the basis of the style of the text and palaeographic forms; with few exceptions, these dates have been accepted for the purposes of this study. The catalogue contains twenty-seven inscriptions in which there are insufficient data to estimate a date. Such a lack is often due to damage to the stone. It is not infrequent, though, that the individual or individuals mentioned in a complete or nearly complete inscription are otherwise unknown, so that their careers are not datable.

Those inscriptions which can be dated with relative certainty and precision are not evenly distributed over these five and a half centuries (Chart 1). The earliest appear to be the only two testimonies of the gerousia in the Hellenistic period. Thereafter, the gerousia seems to disappear epigraphically until the final years of the Republic and the inauguration of the Principate, when it reappears in a series of letters, beginning with one

\footnote{Although AD 212 is the traditional date for the constitutio Antoniniana, alternate dates have been proposed (Crook [1967]: 8, n. 8; Millar [1962]; Eck [1999]: 3). Millar (1962) in particular provides an informative argument for AD 214 in two parts. The first half of Millar’s argument considers Dio Cassius’ placement of the announcement of the constitutio Antoniniana in his discussion of the events at the beginning of Caracalla’s reign. Since the proclamation of the decree appears in Dio’s reports of Caracalla’s travels, “which took up every year of his reign from 213 onward” (126), Millar argues that the constitutio Antoniniana should be dated to this period, that is, after AD 213. The second portion of his argument is based on P. Giessen 40, a papyrus on which the constitutio Antoniniana and two other decrees, arranged in three columns, appear. The second decree can be dated to AD 212-213, the third to AD 215 (126). The papyrus is a collection of Imperial edicts, and since other such documents are not chronologically arranged, there is no reason that the first decree, the constitutio Antoniniana, should precede the second and third in date. A second papyrus (P. Mich. Inv. 5503i) records payments of a suntaximon at three times by an individual twice named Liberalis and once Liberalis Aurelius. The payments are dated to November 2, 214, March 27-April 26, 215 and May 1, 215. Millar proceeds to argue that the constitutio Antoniniana was therefore promulgated in the last two months of AD 214. He does, however, note that his argument is far from decisive: Dio’s text does not provide evidence for the dating of the decree (to AD 212 or 214), but it does seem to favour the later date. The papyrological evidence, however, serves only to establish the earliest date by which the effects of the constitutio may be observed.}

\footnote{So cat. nos. 22, 23, 24, 26 & 69; cat. no. 48 is also dated to the late second or early third century, but on the basis of lettering, not the presence of the nomen gentilicum Aurelius.
from Julius Caesar or Octavian to the Ephesian *gerousia*.\textsuperscript{12} It starts to appear more commonly at the end of the first century AD, but it is in the second century that the *gerousia* begins to appear consistently.

It should be noted that the statement that the *gerousia* became more prominent in Ephesus during the second century AD, when based solely on the distribution of evidence as presented in Chart One, carries the implicit assumption that the frequency with which the Ephesians erected public inscriptions remained constant throughout the period of six

\textsuperscript{12} *JÖAI* 62 (1992): 113-119, nos. 1-11 (Cat. nos. 4-14). The *gerousia* may in fact appear in AD 86/85 in a decree of the city regarding the invasion of Mithridates VI in which *sustemata* may refer to the *gerousia* (see below; *IEph* 8 [Cat. no. 3]).

\textsuperscript{13} It will be noted that only fifty-five inscriptions are represented in this chart. Twenty-seven inscriptions are undated (cat. nos. 25, 28-31, 50-52, 57, 58, 70, 76-91), and five are dated broadly to the first, second or third century AD (cat. nos. 36, 37, 43, 73 & 75); these inscriptions have not been included in the chart. Also omitted are cat. nos. 54 & 72; the appearance of the *gerousia* in cat. no. 54, Salutaris’ benefaction, is the same as that in cat. no. 15, Publius Afranius Flavianus’ letter granting confirmation for the benefaction. Cat. no. 55, which also refers to Salutaris’ benefaction, has been included because that inscription records an additional benefaction in which the *gerousia* once again appears. Cat. no. 72 is a funerary inscription for Gaius Stertinius Orpex and his daughter, who provided an endowment to fund distributions to the *gerousia* that is mentioned in both cat. nos. 34 & 72.
centuries represented in the chart. That is, the chart does not take into account any changes in the Ephesian epigraphic habit. In general, though, there is an increase in Ephesian epigraphic evidence during the second century AD when compared to the first; the exact causes of this increase cannot be absolutely determined, but probably include factors such as population growth and economic prosperity, to say nothing of the necessarily variable desires of the Ephesians themselves, both as individuals and as groups, to publicize certain information and, further, to do so on a medium as enduring as stone. Thus, the chart might be significantly altered if it were possible to take into account any commemorations which may have been consigned to perishable public display, such as, for instance, a wooden tablet. Nonetheless, it may be said that throughout the Imperial period, there was a trend for members of the gerousia to proclaim their membership on stone. Perhaps such proclamations did vary in quantity from the first to the second century, but it would seem that they also varied in quality, that is, the use of stone rather than wood. Such a choice reflects on the gerousiastai: they were able to afford stone, and the increase suggests an increase in the wealth, and social prominence, of the gerousia in the second century AD. The increase in the number of gerousia inscriptions may be directly attributable to the growth of the city and of the gerousia itself, but the use of stone suggests a degree of wealth and prominence which at the very least spanned the first two centuries, if it was not gradually increasing over that time.\textsuperscript{14}

This apparent trend should not be taken for granted, though, for several additional reasons. First, the chart does not include all the inscriptions which appear in the

\textsuperscript{14} On the population of Ephesus, see below, Chapter Four, pp. 82-91; on the growth of the gerousia, see below, Chapter Four, pp. 91-106.
catalogue, but only those which can be dated to within approximately fifty years or less. The chart is, therefore, representative of only two-thirds of the available evidence.

Second, any chronological distribution of inscriptions of any type should be viewed with caution, since there is no guarantee that the inscriptions which have been discovered are proportionately representative of those which were originally produced. It was noted above that it has commonly been assumed that the gerousia diminished in importance and prominence until a re-emergence in the second century. This mistaken supposition was based on an absence of evidence which is now available and which provides strong evidence for an active gerousia in the late first-century BC and early first-century AD.

Third, assuming an ideal situation in which all the documents inscribed and erected in any city have survived to be consulted, the inscriptions would still not provide a record of the complete activities of a group. The testimonies committed to the stone are not without bias: the commissioner of the inscription, whether an individual or a group, will have chosen what information to include in the text and, more importantly, what information to exclude. Thus, it is not at all surprising that the letters in the catalogue are all favourable replies, confirming, for example, the privileges of the gerousia. It would, however, be surprising to find an inscription in Ephesus recording a limitation or withdrawal of the privileges of the gerousia. While there must have been such letters at some time, they do not appear in Ephesus; it is possible that there is a single letter rebuking the gerousia, but this, it will be suggested below, was erected by its recipient, not the gerousia.15

15 Such inscriptions should, rather, be found in cities competing with Ephesus for provincial prominence if they had gained privileges which had been denied to Ephesus. There do not appear to be any such
These considerations, however, do not negate the value of those inscriptions which do survive in a sufficiently well-preserved state to shed light on the *gerousia*. Rather, one must recognise that the conclusions drawn in the course of this work cannot be considered to be irrefutably certain. Hypotheses may and will be advanced with the acknowledged realization that they signify only a distant and partial view of the representation of the *gerousia* by the Ephesians and the members of that group.

The *gerousia*, then, can be studied only through a series of filters: first, that of the original authors of the documents; second, that of history; and third, that of the scholar. Such biases are recurrent and inescapable in all branches of historical research. The third distortion, however much care the researcher takes to avoid it, will always be present. The second can only be corrected with ongoing scholarship as more evidence comes to light. The first bias incorporates the third, but in the case of epigraphy in particular it is perhaps the easiest to minimize. With relatively few exceptions in the case of regions and cities which have produced many inscriptions, the perspective represented is that of a wide variety of individuals. The scholar's interpretation of that point of view is, therefore, based on a collection of opinions rather than on the opinion of a single author such as, for example, Strabo.

This widespread representation of contemporary views is increased not only by the variety of individual composers, but also by the differences between the documents themselves. For the inscriptions cannot be grouped into any one simple category. The catalogue includes letters to the *gerousia*, or to the *boule* and *demos*, public decrees, honorary inscriptions and decrees, official lists of *kouretes* or benefactors, and funerary inscriptions from the cities of Asia Minor, though. Cf. below, Chapter Four, pp. 120-122, Chapter Six, p. 263-264, and cat. no. 18, a letter to an Asiarch, Aelius Martiales, which may be a chastisement of the *gerousia* by the proconsul.
inscriptions. The gerousia appears in these inscriptions as a collective group – for example, a letter to the gerousia – or as a group to which an individual belongs – for example, Aurelius Hesychion, a member of the gerousia.\textsuperscript{16} The distinction between these general groups is not always clear, particularly in the case of fragmentary inscriptions.

3.3. Organization of the Catalogue of Inscriptions

The categorization of inscriptions into different “types” is somewhat artificial, but can be useful. Each “type” has a different purpose and for that reason includes material intentionally chosen and represented. Thus, letters and public decrees can provide evidence for the official role and function of the gerousia within the city of Ephesus, while honorary decrees and funerary commemorations can represent the social position of the gerousia and its members: it is very significant that a third century individual chose to report the fact that he had hosted two Imperial officials during their stay in Ephesus.\textsuperscript{17}

The primary means of organizing the inscriptions presented in the catalogue, therefore, has been to assign them to one of several groups. The ordering of the “types” is arbitrary and is not intended to reflect the relative importance of the inscriptions for this study: that letters precede public decrees does not give greater importance to the letters. The larger sections are arranged as follows: (I) Hellenistic Inscriptions, all of which are decrees (cat. nos. 1-3); and (II) Imperial Inscriptions, which may be subdivided in the following manner: (A) Letters from Roman Officials (cat. nos. 4-18); (B) Dedicatory Inscriptions (cat. nos. 19-31); (C) Honorary Inscriptions (cat. nos. 32-52);

\textsuperscript{16} Cat. no. 80.

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. below, Chapter Five, pp. 181 & Chapter Six, pp. 255-256 & 275-256; cat. no. 45.
It must be remembered, though, that the date of an inscription is often as important as its “type”; each category is, therefore, organized chronologically. The evidence for the gerousia is spread over nearly six centuries, and it cannot be taken for granted that this body remained static during this time. Whether the gerousia maintained a constant character throughout its existence will receive consideration precisely because it is a conclusion (and incorrect), not an a priori fact.

3.4. Gerousia, Presbuteros, Sunhedrion and Sustema

Damage to inscriptions through reuse or weathering has other consequences for the catalogue of inscriptions. A careful perusal of Die Inschriften von Ephesos or the pages of the Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts will demonstrate that several inscriptions referring directly to the gerousia have, in fact, been omitted. Quite simply, this is because the inscription is so fragmentary that “gerousia” alone is legible.¹⁸

Such a perusal will also indicate that Menadier’s conjecture, that presbuteros/oi, sunhedrion and sustema(ta) are references to the gerousia, has not been accepted as true in all cases.⁹ In fact, it appears to be manifestly untrue in several cases. Sustema

---

¹⁸ This is an acknowledged bias of the student. These inscriptions, with the isolated phrase “gerousia”, appear to contribute no information beyond the presence of a gerousia; I Eph 2917: - -|περκως γερους|ταιστού (?). I Eph 2227 is a sarcophagus bearing several inscriptions, some of which have been erased. One end of the lid has an erased inscription and γερους|ταιστού; this may belong to the Christian inscription on the lid (αύτη η σοφός Ἐπιδίκον | οἰκοδόμον | καὶ γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ | Σωφρονίας), but equally may not. Because of this uncertainty, I have thought it best not to base conclusions on this example.

¹⁹ Menadier (1890): 49; cf. Chapot (1967): 216; Hicks (1880): 77 & nos. 570b & 577b (=I Eph 1570b & 1577b). It should be noted immediately that these inscriptions are just as apt to be fragmentary and
appears rarely in *Die Inschriften von Ephesos*, in one instance clearly not referring to the *gerousiai*. This instance is a fragment of a foundation decree from AD 301 in which six *sustemata* are identifiable with six guilds or groups of workers.\textsuperscript{20}

*Ta sustemata*, though, were involved in the lending of the money of Artemis certainly by the beginning of the first century BC, if not earlier.\textsuperscript{21} The *boule* and *demos* passed a decree at the time of Mithridates’ invasion of Asia in which one of the provisions was that all sacred debts should be absolved, with the exception of those which were owed to the *sustemata*. Hadrian, in AD 120/121, wrote to the *gerousia* of Ephesus, confirming its priority in the collection of debts, which renders more plausible Menadier’s suggestion that the *sustemata* in the Mithridates decree may in fact be the *gerousia*.\textsuperscript{22} Although the two inscriptions are separated by two hundred years, the connection does find support if Knibbe’s suggestion that the rights and privileges mentioned but not specified in these inscriptions include those which Hadrian confirms is correct.\textsuperscript{23} Since monetary privileges appear to be granted and confirmed in three cases, it is possible that the *sustemata* in the Mithridates decree does refer to the *gerousia*. *Sustema* does, in fact, appear in cases in which it must refer to the *gerousia*: a letter from Knibbe’s series confirming the rights and privileges of the *gerousia* is addressed to the *sustema* of the Elders (*presbeuteroi*).\textsuperscript{24} It cannot, therefore, be categorically asserted that *sustema* never refers to the *gerousia*. Consequently, the first century BC decree declaring war on Mithridates has been included in the catalogue, and an expanded argument will be

---

\textsuperscript{20} IEph 1790, 1968, 3142, 4305b.
\textsuperscript{21} IEph 3803d.
\textsuperscript{21} IEph 8.35-40 (cat. no. 3); *sustema* also appears in JÖAI 62 (1993): 116, no. 7 (cat. no. 11), as “the body of *presbeuteroi*”.
\textsuperscript{22} IEph 1486 (cat. no. 16).
\textsuperscript{23} Knibbe (1992): 120.
\textsuperscript{24} Cat. no. 11.
presented in Chapter Six to identify the *sustemata* mentioned in that decree with the *gerousia*.\(^{25}\)

The term *sunhedrion* appears more frequently in the Ephesian inscriptions than either *sustema(ta)* or *presbuterosloi*, and is often, but not always, limited by a plural genitive noun, and more rarely by a singular genitive.\(^{26}\) It is, therefore, possible, in a study of the *gerousia*, to eliminate with certainty some of those inscriptions in which *sunhedrion* appears. The limiting genitive is the singular *tes gerousias* in only two cases, but in each case one or both terms are entirely restored.\(^{27}\) Since the only clear uses of *to sunhedrion tes gerousia* are restorations, they cannot be used to support the proposition that the two terms were interchangeable or that *sunhedrion* alone could be an abbreviation for the whole phrase; *to sunhedrion tes gerousias* should not be restored without very careful consideration, if at all.\(^{28}\)

*To sunhedrion* appears in an inscription which could conceivably refer to the *gerousia*, but most likely does not.\(^{29}\) This fragment of a sarcophagus states that “the *sunhedrion* has care of this tomb”, but the final portion of *sunhedrion* is restored, so that there may originally have been a genitive noun. Several funerary inscriptions entrust the care of a tomb to the *gerousia*, or the *boule*, but *sunhedria* of specific groups are also

\(^{25}\) Cat. no. 3; cf. below, Chapter Six, pp. 211-214.

\(^{26}\) For example, [τὸ ἱερότατον] | [συν]έδριον τῶν νεοευτόν (JOAI 55 [1984]: 121-122, no. 4238); [τ]ό ... συνέδριον | [τ]έον ὑμωρόδον | [κ]αὶ θεολόγον | [κ]αὶ θεσμιδόν (IEph 645); IEph 47.2-3, 636, 951.9-10, 966, 991, 1075, 1247b, 1277b, 1577a, 2083c, 2212, 3263.2-4, 4330.3-4. There seems to be no direct connection with the Jewish Sanhedrin, which does not appear in the inscriptions of Asia Minor; *sunhedrion* is known from Herodotus and Xenophon, and is literally “a sitting together”.

\(^{27}\) IEph 27B 1. 232 (cf. 27B 1. 235), 737 [cat. nos. 54 & 46]. There are instances of *to sunedrion tes gerousias* from elsewhere in Asia Minor, but it seems to be a rare expression in all cities (eg., TAM III.3.A3 from Termessus; IPriene 246; ISmyrna 212); there appears to be the single instance of the *gerousia* in Priene, while *to sunedrion tes gerousias* is the only such association of the two terms among some twelve *gerousia*-inscriptions from Smyrna.

\(^{28}\) Eg., cat. no. 54, l. 232: τῷ τοῦ συνεδρίου τῆς γερουσίας γραμματεῖ; l. 235: τοῖς τοῦ συνεδρίου μετέχουσιν. In each case, it is possible avoid the restoration of *sunedrion*: τῆς φιλοσέβαστος τῆς γερουσίας and τοῖς τῆς γερουσίας μετέχουσιν, for example.

\(^{29}\) IEph 2420.
given this task; an individual, unspecified *sunhedrion* does not appear in funerary inscriptions from Ephesus.\(^30\) *Sunhedrion* does appear in one funerary inscription from Ephesus without a limiting genitive; the group is explicitly identified in an appositive clause, though, as the assembly of Ephesian doctors.\(^31\) A *sunhedrion*, when it appears as the caretaker in a funerary inscription, seems always to be identified by a limiting phrase, but there is no indication that this limiting phrase ever connected it to the *gerousia* of Ephesus, so there is little chance that it could be correctly restored in *IEph* 2420.

*Ta sunhedria* appear not infrequently in inscriptions in positions which could easily be occupied by *he gerousia*: on two occasions two citizens were honoured for, among other things, providing a feast. In such benefactions, it is usual for the *gerousia* to appear after the *boule* and before the *demos* among the recipients; *panta ta sunhedria* appears in precisely this position in these two inscriptions. It seems unusual, though, that, earlier or later, in the same two inscriptions individual *sunhedria* are distinguished out of the greater number by the use of a limiting genitive.\(^32\) One could expect, then, to *sunhedrion tes gerousias* to be attested if the *gerousia* was considered one of the collective *sunhedria*, but it is not. The explicit appearance of the *gerousia* or one of its members (*gerousiastes*) in these inscriptions suggests that the *gerousia* may not always have been included in the phrase, ‘all the assemblies’. It is possible, though, that it became more common to include the *gerousia* with the other assemblies as time went on: there is no case of *sunhedrion* certainly being used to refer to the *gerousia* until the mid-

\(^{30}\) *Gerousia* and/or *boule*: *IEph* 2109 (Cat. no. 73), 2266 (Cat. no. 82), 2437 (Cat. no. 87), 2549b (Cat. no. 88), 4117a-d (Cat. no. 74); *JÖAI* 55 (1984): 124 no. 4265 (Cat. no. 85); *JÖAI* 55 (1984): 140 no. 4364 (Cat. no. 86; partially restored). *Sunhedrion*: *IEph* 943 (partially restored), 2212, 2441 (partially restored).

\(^{31}\) *IEph* 2304; the *sunhedrion* of the doctors is further specified: they are the doctors from the Museion. The same group appears in a statue base of two priestesses of Artemis (*IEph* 3239).

\(^{32}\) *Panta sunhedria*: *IEph* 951.7 (cat. no. 48), 3263.10; limiting genitive: 951.9-10, 3263.2-3; cf. 1151 (cat. no. 70).
second century in a letter of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, and the two inscriptions which may include the *gerousia* in *panta ta sunhedria* are even later.\(^{33}\) It should be noted, though, that the Imperial letter does not provide evidence for the equation of the two terms: it is not the Ephesians who describe the *gerousia* as a *sunhedron*, but the emperors. Inscriptions containing the phrase *panta ta sunhedria* are not normally included in the catalogue because there are no clear means of determining whether the *gerousia* was or was not intended to be included. The two inscriptions noted above recording distributions to the *boule* and *panta ta sunhedria* are exceptions: they have been included because the phrase *panta ta sunhedria* appears where one could reasonably expect *gerousia*.\(^{34}\)

In only a single case is it possible to make a strong argument for equating *to sunhedrion* with *he gerousia*. *To sunhedrion* appears in what is often identified as a decree of the *gerousia*.\(^{35}\) This is an inscription recording the activities of a certain Nicomedes as *ekdikos* of the *sunhedrion*. Nicomedes and his sons were praised for their efforts in restoring a festival which had fallen into abeyance because of a lack of money. Nicomedes is said to have ‘found’ monetary resources for the revival of this festival in the ‘common treasury’ of the *gerousia*. Both *gerousia* and *sunhedrion* are used in this inscription, but they are not used interchangeably: an injunction is laid upon the *gerousia* and upon the members of the *sunhedrion* to preserve the arrangements made by Nicomedes. It is possible that *sunhedrion* and *sunhedrous* in this case refer to those

\(^{33}\) Cat. no. 17.

\(^{34}\) *IEph* 951.7 (cat. no. 48), 1151 (cat. no. 70), 4330 (cat. no. 45) all mention the *gerousia* in addition to *panta ta sunhedria*; the phrase *panta ta sunhedria* or a variation thereof appears without apparent reference to the *gerousia* in *IEph* 958, 969, 824, 990 & 3072.

\(^{35}\) Cat. no. 56; *IEph* 26.
members of the *gerousia* who are taking part in the sacrifice, but it is unlikely to refer to the entire *gerousia*.³⁶

A *sunhedrion* is four times described as *hieron*, sacred, and three times as *hierotaton*, most sacred. Six of these are further qualified with a genitive noun and therefore cannot refer to the *gerousia*. The seventh instance may have been limited by a genitive.³⁷ That six out of seven sacred *sunhedria* are limited suggests that the final instance also requires the restoration of a genitive noun. *Tes gerousias* is doubly unlikely in this case: the *gerousia* of Ephesus is never described as either sacred or most sacred.

There remain several occurrences of *sunhedrion* which cannot certainly be said not to refer to the *gerousia*. The first is not described as sacred, nor is it identified as the caretaker of a grave, nor is it limited by a genitive or any phrase which identifies its members.³⁸ The *sunhedrion* is described as *hairesis*, “selected”, or “elected”. The inscription is incomplete, so it is not possible to tell whether this *sunhedrion* was selected out of *ta panta sunhedria*, or if it was an elected group. If it was an elected group, though, it is unlikely to be the *gerousia*, which does not appear as an elected body in Ephesus. The second two cases appear in inscriptions which seem to have been erected by “the magistrates of the *sunhedrion*”.³⁹ Once again, there is no adjective or phrase identifying the *sunhedrion* as a specific group. It is not unreasonable in these cases to

---

³⁶ The relationship between *gerousia* and *sunhedrion* is not clear in this inscription. A distinction does seem to be drawn between the two, but the nature of that distinction is not easily determined.

³⁷ *Hieron*: IEph 966, 991, 1570b, 3263.1-4 (2); *hierotaton*: IEph 636, 1075, 1577a; the superlative form is most likely an indication of a later date rather than an important distinction in the relative standing of the *sunhedria*.

³⁸ IEph 1577b.

³⁹ IEph 742, 1057. IEph 1057 also identifies a member of the *gerousia*, and is therefore included in the catalogue (cat. no. 67); cf. IEph 15, Fabius Paulus’ provincial edict which mentions a *sunhedrion*, about which few conclusions can be made.
read *sunhedrion* as the *boule*. There is no compelling reason, at any rate, to understand *sunhedrion* in these inscriptions as the *gerousia*.

*Presbuteros* is perhaps the most difficult of these three terms to dismiss. It is a substantive use of the comparative adjective derived from *presbus*, “an old man”, and so simply means “elder”. There are several cases in which *presbuteros* simply cannot be read as a synonym for *gerousiastes* or *presbuteroi* for *gerousia*. The term is occasionally simply an indication of age, contrasting with *neoteros*, “a younger man”, particularly in inscriptions referring to gymnastic games.\(^40\) The use of the term in Christian inscriptions probably refers to the individual’s position in the Church rather than his membership in the *gerousia*.\(^41\) Often, however, it is not possible to deny that the term may be more than an indication of relative age.\(^42\) There is no direct identification in these inscriptions of the two terms, but *presbuteros* should not always be dismissed as valueless in a study of the *gerousia*: it will be recalled that Plutarch used *presbeugenes* in his description of the Spartan *gerousia*.\(^43\) In the pages which follow, ‘Elders’ will be used when *presbuteroi* refers to the *gerousia* rather than to the elder boys.

It is possible that the use of one of *sustema*, *sunhedrion*, or *presbuteros* was meant to reflect the *gerousia* or its members in different contexts, that is, *presbuteros* may have been used in place of *gerousiastes* if the individual were being associated, for example, with a gymnasium, or that *sunhedrion* may have been used to describe the *gerousia* if it

---

\(^40\) For example, *IEph* 690, 1101, 1600.27, 1687, 3142; *JÖAI* 59 (1989): 197-210, no. 37. The term does appear in contrast to the *neoteroi* and *neoi* in the context of the gymnasium in other cities in which it does not seem to refer to the *gerousia*: for example, *BE* 1955, 168: “le terme πρεσβύνερος nous introduit dans le milieu du gymnase” (Prusa ad Olympum).

\(^41\) For example, *IEph* 543, 1251, 2253b, 4305b, 4316.

\(^42\) *IEph* 702 (cat. no. 38), 707c (cat. no. 51), 803 (cat. no. 33), 940 (cat. no. 29), 1393a (cat. no. 57), 2552 (cat. no. 78), 3214 (cat. no. 53); *JÖAI* 59 (1989): 175-178, no. 9 (Cat. no. 52); *JÖAI* 62 (1993): 116, no. 7 (cat. no. 11).

\(^43\) Above, Introduction, pp. 2-3; Plut., *Lyc.*, 6.4.
were passing a decree. More so than for *sunhedrion* and *sustema*, this problem can be settled for *presbuteroi* in Ephesus: both “*presbuteros*” and “*gerousiastes*” are used as honorary titles in inscriptions: there does not seem to have been a decisive factor in the choice of *presbuteros* over *gerousiastes*, though the latter was by far the more common. Moreover, both “*gerousia*” and “*presbuteroi*” appear in decrees of the *gerousia* or decrees passed along to the *boule* and *demos*. The primary difficulties with *presbuteros* are those outlined above. Any nuances carried by *sustema* are necessarily difficult to intuit, given the low frequency with which that term appears in Ephesus, but it is possible that they are only minor: the “*sustema of the gerousia*” or the “*sustemata*” (assuming it is not a reference to guilds, as noted above) appear performing the same functions as the “*gerousia*”. One is therefore left with the question, could the *gerousia* be called a *sunhedrion* if it was acting in a particular way? There is a single clear case of the use of *sunhedrion* as a reference to the institution, but it does not seem to be functioning any differently than the *gerousia*: Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus term it a *sunhedrion* when discussing the collection of debts owed, but the *gerousia* appears as such in financial affairs during both the Hellenistic and Imperial periods, and specifically in an affair concerning debts. It may be supposed, as noted above, that *sunhedrion* could refer to members of the *gerousia* participating in a specific activity, similar to *tous parontas*, those who were present; there seems to be only a single instance of this, and even that case is not clear.

---

44 This point was brought to my attention during my stay at the Kommission für alte Geschichte und Epigraphik by several members, to whom I would like to express my acknowledgment.
45 Cat. nos. 1, 2, 56, 57; cf. cat. no. 55.
46 Cat. no. 17; cf. cat. nos. 1, 2, 4-11, 16, 23, 74, 81, 83, 84 & 90.
The catalogue of inscriptions printed in the first appendix presents, obviously, those inscriptions containing the words *gerousia* or *gerousiastes*, as well as several which mention *presbuteros*, *sustema* or *sunhedrion*. Inscriptions containing one of the latter three words which do not appear have not been omitted arbitrarily, but after careful consideration in light of the points raised in the course of this chapter.
4. THE GEROUSIASTAI PT. I – NAMES AND NUMBERS

4.1. Introduction: The *Gerousia* of Sidyma

Inevitably, the members of any group influence the outlook and nature of their assembly or association. In some cases, this effect is more pronounced and obvious. The Senate of the early Roman Republic was undeniably biased towards the patrician outlook at the expense of the plebeian. The effect of membership on the overall body, however, is not as important as the perception of that effect. The influence of any body – whether it is the Roman Senate or the Ephesian *gerousia* – is to a large extent proportionate to the perceived importance of the individual members – particularly in the Roman Republic and Empire, where personal patronage was an important feature of daily-life. Naturally, members vary in their personal influence, so that it can be argued that some members gain in personal power by their membership: the perceived importance of the body creates an expectation that all members have a similar amount of official or unofficial power, whether or not this is genuinely the case.

In many ways, therefore, a study of the *gerousia* is necessarily incomplete without an account of its members. This chapter attempts to provide such a discussion, examining the evidence for the size of the *gerousia* at various points in its existence and considering the grounds for identifying citizens of the city as members of the *gerousia*. It should be noted before proceeding that the proportion of Roman citizens among known *gerousiastai* is not treated at any great length. This is because Roman citizenship often cannot be certainly determined. Twenty-six members of the *gerousia* appear to have Roman *tria nomina*, or the remains of one, suggesting that they possessed Roman
citizenship.\textsuperscript{47} These twenty-six individuals represent approximately sixty percent of the known members of the \textit{gerousia}; if the first, second and third centuries are considered separately, a similar proportion of Roman citizens to non-Roman citizens emerges in each period, on the basis of the \textit{tria nomina}. It should be noted, however, that this is only an estimate and that it may be misleading. Judging Roman citizenship solely on the basis of the \textit{tria nomina} is a standard method, but it can never be more than an approximation. Punishment is known to have existed for the unlawful assumption of the \textit{tria nomina} and the consequent counterfeit citizenship, so that it must be acknowledged that at least some individuals claiming the \textit{tria nomina} were not truly Roman citizens.\textsuperscript{48} On the other hand, the absence of the \textit{tria nomina} does not necessitate non-citizen status. The choice between using Aurelius Orpheus or simply Orpheus makes a public statement, at least initially: to use Aurelius Orpheus is to emphasize, however slightly or unintentionally, 'romanness', genuine or otherwise; to use Orpheus is to emphasize 'greekness'.\textsuperscript{49} It is probable that the retention of a Greek name alone was more common than the unlawful assumption of a Roman name, though. It can be said with relative certainty, therefore, that a significant proportion of the \textit{gerousia} of Ephesus possessed Roman citizenship.

More important are the questions of whether Roman citizenship carried any importance within the \textit{gerousia} and whether the citizen-status of its members gained the body any advantages from Roman provincial officials. It is to be hoped that this chapter and the following one will show that the Roman citizenship of its members was not a dominant factor in the perceived or genuine influence and importance of the \textit{gerousia},

\textsuperscript{47} Cat. nos. 8, 10, 12, 13, 16, 22-28, 40, 49, 50, 51, 60-63, 67-69, 76 & 80; cf. Table 1, p. 107; cat. no. 71.
\textsuperscript{48} Badian (1967): 256 n.6: “The Roman name adopted was often incomplete: it looks as if this had been done on purpose, to avoid the appearance of illegal arrogation of citizenship.”
\textsuperscript{49} Cat. no. 50.
whatever Roman citizenship’s importance to the status of an individual: Roman citizenship was not a requirement for membership in the *gerousia*; it should not be necessary to state that it did not automatically bring with it the opportunity of belonging to the *gerousia*.

The membership of the Ephesian *gerousia* is not as convenient to study as that of the *gerousia* of Sidyma. Mommsen, in the nineteenth century, had drawn attention to an inscription from Sidyma which records that a *gerousia* was enrolled and incorporated into the social structure of the *polis* by a decree of the *boule* and *demos*.\(^50\) The names of the first one hundred members, fifty-one *bouleutai* and forty-nine *demotai*, are included, revealing that the *gerousia* of Sidyma, at least in its initial embodiment, was composed of freeborn citizens and freedmen, though there were only three of the latter. Whether a nearly equal split between *bouleutai* and *demotai* was maintained throughout the existence of this *gerousia* cannot be determined.

The inscription provides no criteria for the selection of these particular individuals. The presence of both the *bouleutai* and the *demotai* creates the impression that the *gerousia* may have bridged the gap between these two groups. Hogarth, in the final decade of the nineteenth century, believed that the members were chosen primarily on the basis of their age: the fifty-one *bouleutai* were over a certain age, and the forty-nine *demotai* were citizens who were not members of the *boule* but who possessed a specified census of wealth and were also over a specified age.\(^51\)

\(^50\) Mommsen (1921): 326, no. 1; TAM II, 175 & 176.
\(^51\) Hogarth (1891): 71.
Age was a criterion for membership in the *gerousia* at Oxyrhynchus, as three papyri from late in AD 225 demonstrate. These texts record requests by three individuals to join the *gerousia*, but do not reveal what the minimum age was: Aurelius Theon was fifty-three, Aurelius Dorion was sixty-three, and the third individual, whose name has been lost, was fifty-eight. It must be noted, however, that the *gerousia* of Oxyrhynchus seems to be different from those found in Asia Minor: one of the requests identifies the members as “those who are maintained (at public expense)”. There is nothing to indicate that the *gerousia* was intended to be a benefit society in Asia Minor. Moreover, a selection process based on age in Sidyma, though, presents problems: why would some members of the *boule*, who must have enjoyed a high status within the city, join and advertise on a prominent monument their membership in a body consisting of themselves and individuals who were not members of the *boule*, and presumably of necessarily lower social status? Is it probable that the city of Sidyma could boast fifty citizens whose wealth could be compared to that of members of the *boule*, but were themselves not *bouleutai*? A mixed *gerousia* consisting of a portion of the *boule* would, it would seem, diminish the perceived importance of the *bouleutai* as it could result in the membership in the *gerousia* of *demotai* who were over a certain age, but not as “worthy” in terms of wealth as some *bouleutai* who might have been passed over because of their youth.

If the selection process were based solely on wealth, there still remains the problem of fifty wealthy citizens who were not included in the *boule*. This problem is alleviated, though, when one considers that it is an assumption that only a portion of the

---

52 *POxy*. 3099-3101.
boule was included: if the entire boule were included in the new gerousia which was then filled out with wealthy demotai, the problems for a selection process based on age disappear: the gerousia would then become a body combining the members of the boule and those citizens whose wealth was significant, but who were not members of the boule, possibly because of limitations on the size of the boule; the combination of bouleutai and demotai would be an extension of honour to the demotai rather than a diminishment for the bouleutai, since the boule would remain a unified body none of whose members were passed over in favour of non-members.

A selection process based on age would be easily reconcilable with Mommsen’s belief that the gerousia, considered as a universal institution, was a kind of social club.54 The passage of the decree instituting the gerousia by the boule and demos and the request for proconsular approval, though, might suggest that the new gerousia also had a political element to it, however small. A comparison with Bithynia may be valid in this respect: the incorporation of an assembly of firefighters in Nicomedia was vetoed by Trajan lest it become a “political gang”.55 The citizens of Sidyma recognized the Roman mistrust towards such groups, and acted pre-emptively to present themselves in a benign light through the request for official Imperial acknowledgement and approval.56 The institution of the gerousia then becomes similar to requests for increases in the size of a city’s boule.57

The Sidyma inscription presents the problems surrounding the Ephesian gerousia very clearly. Even in the case of a gerousia, whose incorporation is recorded, it is not

54 See above, Introduction, pp. 4; Mommsen (1921): 326, n.2.
56 Oliver (1954): 165.
possible to identify certainly either its position in the city or the criteria according to which it was populated. Nonetheless, inferences can be drawn on the basis of the original members that cannot be made in many other cases. There is, for example, no similar decree among the inscriptions discovered and currently published from Ephesus. In spite of the absence of any single, equally informative inscription, the sheer volume of epigraphic evidence for the Ephesian gerousia and for the city in general may provide a more certain understanding of the size of the gerousia and the criteria influencing membership.

4.2. The Population of Ephesus

The gerousia of Sidyma is one of few to which a number of members can be assigned. The size of the Ephesian gerousia, it will be argued later in this chapter, grew, either by a continual increase or by occasional increases. The gerousia was originally much smaller than the one hundred member body in Sidyma, if the argument advanced in Chapter Two, that the Ephesian gerousia grew out of an official or unofficial oligarchy established near the beginning of the fourth century BC, is correct. At its height, the Ephesian institute was clearly larger than the Sidyan body. As a much larger city, it stands to reason that Ephesus would have not only a larger boule but also a larger gerousia. This raises the question of a correlation between the size of the population and that of the gerousia and, more importantly, whether membership in the gerousia varied with fluctuations in the population of the city. Unfortunately the inscriptions provide only rare and inconspicuous information about the number of Ephesian gerousiastai. Similarly, the population of Ephesus is not an issue which has been laid to rest.
Ephesus is variously placed in the hierarchy of cities in the Roman Empire. At its height, it was certainly one of the largest cities in the Empire, and its location made it equally important as a commercial centre, comparable, perhaps, to Alexandria.\footnote{In addition to the location, the presence of two agoras within a kilometer of the harbour and the warehouses fronting the harbour are an indication of the importance of commerce in the city. See Figure 3.} Seneca selected these two cities as examples of particularly populous and prosperous cities; he is not necessarily saying that they were the two largest cities, but this is one possible interpretation. At the very least, the conclusion can be drawn from his statement that Ephesus was a major city in the eastern half of the empire.\footnote{White (2004): 40-41; Seneca, \textit{Ep.}, 102.21: \textit{Primum [animus] humilem non accipit patriam, Ephesum aut Alexandrium aut si quod est etiamnunc frequentius accolis laetiusve tectis solum}. Seneca implies that Ephesus and Alexandria are \textit{humilem patriam}, but this is to be understood as a hyperbole.} 

In some modern accounts, Ephesus is omitted from the “giants” or “near-giants” of the empire, that is, Rome, Alexandria, Carthage and Antioch.\footnote{MacMullen (1974): 57.} The population of Rome can be taken to be less than one million, but estimates range between 500,000 – or even lower – and more than 800,000.\footnote{Hopkins (1978): 96-98; Storey (1997).} Working under the assumption that Rome was the largest city in the empire, it is safe to say that the inhabitants of Ephesus will have been fewer than one million; a population in the hundreds of thousands cannot be ruled out, though. 

4.2.1. Estimates of the Population of Ephesus

The size of the population of Ephesus has been variously estimated by scholars. One of the earliest estimates was that of J. Beloch: he assumes that each tribe consisted of five \textit{chiliastyes}, giving approximately 25,000 citizens \((5 \times 5,000)\) during the Hellenistic period. Given the city’s increased importance at the expense of Pergamum during the Imperial period, Beloch posits 50,000 citizens during this time, to which must be added...
women, children and slaves. Beloch’s estimate for the Imperial population of Ephesus is, therefore, approximately 200,000 to 225,000.\(^{62}\)

This estimate seemingly finds support in an inscription honouring Aurelius Baranus from the late second or early third century.\(^{63}\) Baranus is honoured for having feasted the boule, panta ta sunhedria and poleitas cheilious tessarakonta:

\[
\text{kai ὑποδεξάμενον τὴν τε κρατίστην Ἑφεσίων βουλήν καὶ πάντα τὰ συνέδρια, καὶ poleitas cheilious tessarakonta:}
\]

5 \(\text{and having feasted the clarissima boule} \) of the Ephesians and all the assemblies, and forty thousand citizens

Keil, who published the inscription in 1930, did not provide a translation, but remarked on the number of citizens as evidence for “\text{eine riesige Teilnehmerzahl}”. Almost all subsequent editions of the inscription have taken poleitas cheilious tessarakonta, influenced by Keil’s riesige, to mean forty thousand citizens. On this interpretation, the inscription implies a total population of men, women, children, slaves and resident foreigners corresponding to Beloch’s estimate.

The validity of this inscription for an estimate of the population, however, has been called into question by Preston Warden and Roger Bagnall.\(^{64}\) Their argument rests on the traditional ways of forming large numbers in Greek: poleitas cheilious tessarakonta, they argue, should be translated as one thousand and forty, since the phrase follows the common practice for forming numbers less than two thousand.\(^{65}\) Their argument can be supported by evidence from other Ephesian inscriptions. The equestrian

---

\(^{62}\) Beloch (1968): 230-231, 258-259. It must be noted that evidence discovered since the publication of Beloch’s work indicates that each tribe probably included six chiliastyes; furthermore, there seem to have been eight tribes in Imperial Ephesus (Knibbe [1961-1963]). With this exception, Beloch’s calculation based on the tribes and chiliastyes seems sound and the possibility of minimalizing should not be a significant issue.

\(^{63}\) Cat. no. 48; lEph., 951; Keil JOAI 26 (1930): 57-58.

\(^{64}\) Warden & Bagnall (1988).

Gaius Vibius Salutaris, for example, included a capital sum in his endowment at the beginning of the second century AD which would provide annual cash distributions for one thousand five hundred citizens.\textsuperscript{66} The similarity in the number of beneficiaries is suggestive, but it should not be over-emphasized since Salutaris provided individual gifts of cash (eight asses) whereas Baranus provided a feast.

Stronger support for the interpretation of one thousand and forty citizens may be found in an inscription, roughly contemporary with Salutaris’ foundation but nearly a century earlier than that of Baranus. Titus Flavius Montanus is honoured as a high-priest and \textit{agonothetes}, and among his benefactions is the provision of a meal for the citizens at an expense of three denarii per person.\textsuperscript{67} If the inscriptions of Baranus and Montanus are considered in conjunction, it is possible to suggest that the number of Montanus’ beneficiaries is comparable to that of Baranus’ beneficiaries, even though the two euergetic gestures were separated by approximately sixty years.

An expenditure of one hundred and twenty thousand denarii (three denarii for forty thousand citizens) is incredible; an expenditure of three thousand one hundred and twenty denarii (three denarii for one thousand and forty citizens), on the other hand, is entirely believable and is in keeping with the scale of benefactions in Ephesus in general, comparable to the benefactions of Salutaris and Montanus. It is unlikely that Baranus would have failed to specify an amount if his expenditure had been anything like one hundred and twenty thousand denarii, and instead specified the number of recipients. There is no reason to assume that Baranus’ meal was as costly as Montanus’, but even an expense of one denarius per citizen would result in a benefaction of forty thousand

\textsuperscript{66} Cat. no. 54, \textit{ll.} 246-253.

\textsuperscript{67} Cat. no. 39, \textit{ll.} 11-12: \kappa\alpha\tau\omega\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\alpha\iota\tau\iota\varsigma\pi\omega\lambda[l]\iota\tau\alpha\varsigma\tau\omega\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma\tau[\iota]\nu\nu[\kappa]\kappa\lambda\varsigma\tau\omega\delta\eta\nu\epsilon\nu\alpha\rho\iota\alpha\iota\alpha\gamma'.}
denarii. Such a gift is not impossible, but it would be surprising that such a massive benefactor should appear only in this inscription: Baranus is not only otherwise unattested in Ephesus, but he does seem to have been commemorated in any other inscription in Ionia, Caria, Lydia or Lycia. Montanus’ expense of three denarii suggests that the *poleitas cheilious tessarakonta* feasted by Baranus is more plausible as one thousand and forty than as forty thousand. An undated inscription honours Gavius Menodorus who, among other things, provided a feast for six thousand citizens. Although such a benefaction is significantly larger than that proposed for Baranus, it is in no way comparable with the interpretation of forty thousand citizens. The Baranus inscription cannot be considered to provide evidence for the population of the city, only evidence of Baranus’ generosity. Beloch’s estimate of the city’s size, two hundred thousand, may have influenced the interpretation of *poleitas cheilious tessarakonta*.

T.R.S. Broughton suggests a population of two hundred thousand for Pergamum in the second century AD, but posits an enlargement of Beloch’s estimate for Ephesus since that city was larger than Pergamum, and it had an extensive and fertile territory. Broughton does not specify the precise manner in which he arrives at his estimate of four hundred thousand, but it may be notable that taking this estimate and those which he provides for the remaining cities in the provinces of Asia Minor, he reaches a total population of twelve million, only slightly less than the census of Asia Minor-Turkey in 1935.

---

68 Flavius Montanus is known from several other Ephesian inscriptions: possibly Montanus: *IEph* 498, 528, 698 (in which he is named proconsul); certainly Montanus: *IEph* 2037, 2061 (I), 2062, 2063. None of these inscriptions mention the provision of a meal for the citizens of Ephesus. Donations on the order of forty thousand denarii are not unheard of: cf. *TAM* II(3), 671, 905 & 910.

69 Cat. no. 52; *JOAI* 59 (1989): 175-178, no. 9.

70 Broughton (1938): 812-816.
4.2.2. Growth

The Mithridatic and civil wars of the first century BC will have had consequences greater than the simply economic. The financial demands of Mithridates and the various Roman generals will have taken a heavy monetary toll on the provinces of Asia Minor, but depopulation must also be assumed: witness Fimbria's sacking of Troy. Ephesus, however, continued to issue coinage continually from 133 BC until 67 BC, when there was a nine year interval before issuance resumed. This consistency suggests a corresponding degree of prosperity. Morley's model of feeder cities, therefore, becomes applicable: in order to recover after the wars of the first century BC, there must have been significant immigration.

The large-scale building programs and benefactions which are attested in Ephesus indicate that the prosperity which allowed the city to continue issuing coins during the turmoil of the first century BC and the enormous demands of the various combatants continued into the first and second centuries AD. The new constructions also indicate a growing population. The harbour gymnasium complex and the gymnasium of Vedius, for example, would surely not have been undertaken if the city were stagnating. The continuation and increase in public building during the period of the Flavian and Antonine emperors indicate that this period in particular was one of growth.

This growth was certainly under way before the end of the first century. Philostratus records a speech composed by Apollonius of Tyana before Domitian, which

---

71 App., Mith., 53.
72 Broughton (1938): 556.
74 App. Bel. Civ., 4.73-74; 5.4-5: the cities of Asia contributed ten years worth of taxes to Brutus and Cassius in two years, and Antony thereafter demanded the same amount in one year.
he says was prepared but not actually delivered. In the course of his defence, Apollonius is said to have described Ephesus in the following terms:

[transcribed text]

Whether or not Philostratus did in fact report this speech faithfully from a genuine record of Apollonius’ speech is important to the question of the population of Ephesus, but the precise details of the description are not as important as its suggestions. Apollonius’ words can be assumed to have been coloured by his own rhetoric, and probably by Philostratus’ as well, but the picture which emerges from this description of Ephesus corresponds to that of the archaeological record: Ephesus was a very prominent and populous city whose growth had not stopped; it was a vibrant and wealthy city. Population growth will have occurred contemporaneously with the construction of public buildings, so that the underlying sense of Apollonius’ speech is perhaps more a result of his own observations in the first century than those of Philostratus in the late second and early third centuries.

Obviously, the population of neither Ephesus nor any other city in the Empire remained static. As the speech of Apollonius preserved by Philostratus suggests, one must assume a general increase. Such an increase is also supported by the creation of new citizen tribes: the tribe Hadrianea obviously dates to the second century, while

76 Philostr., VA., 8.7.8.
Antoniane may have been created under Antoninus or as late as the beginning of the third century.77

The city’s prosperity – and consequently its attraction as an immigration hub – was the result of various factors: as the capital of the Roman province, Ephesus was the seat of the proconsul and the site of the aerarium and fiscus staffs.78 Before its elevation to the capital of the province, Ephesus, as a coastal city on a major trade route, became a point of immigration for citizens from less convenient settlements on the coast and from the interior. Pompey’s suppression of much of the piracy in the Mediterranean increased the safety of sea-borne trade, and led, consequently, to immigration to growing cities. With the complete encircling of the Sea and the general peace of the provinces surrounding it, trade and immigration to trade centres must have begun to increase further. White, on the supposition that the population of Ephesus doubled from one hundred to two hundred thousand in a century, argues that a minimum of two hundred and seventy-four and a maximum of two thousand five hundred and seventy-eight individuals must have migrated to and settled in Ephesus each year.79

An influx of people from the chorai is in keeping with Alcock’s view of demographic change in the Greek mainland under the Empire, but the numbers discussed by White also provide evidence for immigrants from further abroad.80 White has

77 Hadriane: IEph 2083, 4331 & 4332b; Antoniane: IEph 957 & 2926. The tribe Antoniane is not as strong an indicator of growth as Hadriane: Knibbe (1961-1963): 30 suggests that it was created in response to the Constitutio Antoniniana, that is, immigrants as well as residents of Ephesus who had received citizenship were both factors in the creation of the new tribe.
78 Broughton (1938): 708.
80 Alcock (1993): 98-116. The appearance of depopulation in many areas may be the result of a general move toward nucleation rather than of an actual demographic loss. The pressures which Alcock notes influencing such a movement in Greece should also apply to movements in Asia Minor and Ephesus. The city provided protection against war and brigandage, but it also offered economic opportunities for those who were dispossessed by larger landowners (106). To this may be added the threat of tax collectors,
identified one hundred and fifty foreign benefactors in inscriptions.\textsuperscript{81} His count omits individuals in Imperial service, \textit{asiarchs} and priests of the Imperial cult, some of whom may have remained in Ephesus after the completion of their duties. The foreigners who remained are likely to be even more common in the inscriptions than White has shown, since it is not necessary that not all immigrants should have included a mention of their homeland. Furthermore, epigraphic commemoration assumes a degree of wealth which would not have been enjoyed by all immigrants. It is probable that many immigrants, if not most, were impoverished and came to Ephesus for that very reason, so that commissioning an inscription was simply not possible. The majority of immigrants appear to have come from other cities or regions of Asia Minor, but some are also known from, among other provinces, Syria, Armenia, Judaea, Greece, Italy and Africa. Such a migration pattern is also in keeping with Alcock's model. It may be well to note that immigration to Ephesus occurred frequently in the Hellenistic period as well. Numerous decrees were passed granting citizenship to foreigners, and it is difficult to believe that none of these recipients became permanent residents of the city.\textsuperscript{82}

The exact size of the population of Ephesus cannot be determined with accuracy for any one point during the course of the second century, but such precision is not necessary for the present study: it is sufficient to note that all of the evidence indicates growth over the period under consideration, bringing Ephesus to its greatest population in

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
the second century AD. Since all the evidence indicates a rising population, the question of growth should also be considered for the gerousia. 83

4.3. The Size of the Ephesian Gerousia

Although there is no document for Ephesus comparable to the constitution of the gerousia in Sidyma, there are several inscriptions that provide an idea of the number of Ephesian gerousiastai at various points in the body's history. Several of these texts record gifts or fines of money that are to go towards distributions of money for the gerousiastai. Inscriptions recording donations for cash distributions are not universally detailed, but the benefactor does, in some cases, provide specific details. Often, though, there is only a statement that a cash distribution was provided, with no indication of how much each individual received. Those inscriptions which do provide monetary details can be used to determine the size of the gerousia.

4.3.1. The Mid-first Century: Gaius Stertinius Orpex

Gaius Stertinius Maximus served as consul in AD 23. His freedman, Gaius Stertinius Orpex, clearly settled in Ephesus, as his grave monument shows. 84 The latter appears to have enjoyed some success in the city, whether as a trade agent for his former master or engaged in business of his own. He is known from other Ephesian inscriptions, which record honours for Orpex himself and his daughter, Marina. 85 The honours were voted to him in connection with the donation of several statues, the renovation of the

83 Obviously, the population of Ephesus cannot be assumed to have grown steadily or constantly. There was the danger of plague which would have seriously affected growth, but as a general trend the size of the city did increase (cf. Philostr., VA., 4.4, 4.7.9). An average growth of approximately 0.5% per year would be reasonable (White [2004]).
84 Cat. no. 72 (IEph 4123).
85 IEph 720 & 2113 (cat. no. 33).
stadium and the establishment of an endowment fund to provide annual distributions of money for members of the *boule* and the *gerousia*.

The inscription honouring Orpex and Marina does not provide monetary details about their endowment. These are, however, specified in their funerary inscription. The endowment consisted of two main parts in addition to the erection of statues in the gymnasium, stadium and Temple of Artemis. First, a donation of five thousand denarii was made to provide cash-distributions (*dianomai*) for the members of the *boule* and the priests, with each participant receiving the same amount. Assuming a rate of interest of 9%, four hundred and fifty denarii were available each year. Hicks, in his introduction to the Ephesian inscriptions published in 1890, identified a *boule* of four hundred and fifty members. The total number of priests envisioned in Orpex’ endowment is unknown, but it is probable that it was limited to the priests of Artemis. Ephesus did not receive its first Imperial temple until at the earliest the reign of Nero, and there is no mention of the priests of Roma and Publius Servilius Isauricus or of Caesar in the inscription. The *hierourgoi* of Artemis number four on average during the first century, to judge from the preserved *kouretes* lists. Orpex may, therefore, have envisioned a

---

86 Cat. no. 72 ll. 9-11. A common feature of *dianomai* is that only those who are present at the correct location and time are entitled to receive their gift.

87 The interest rate of 9% is an approximation, suggested on the evidence of the foundation of Gaius Vibius Salutaris in AD 104, in which this is the rate specified: the interest on the endowment of 20,000 denarii is expected to be 1,800 denarii (Cat. no. 54 ll. 220-222). It must be noted, though, the two endowments and, consequently, their rates of interest are separated by between fifty and seventy-five years.

88 Hicks (1890): 71-74. Hicks notes that it is unclear whether the size of the *boule* remained constant throughout its history. Certainly, there appear to have been only 450 members in AD 104, as provision is made for no more in Salutaris’ bequest. Hicks suggests it may have been made up of 75 individuals from each tribe, and admits the possibility that the pre-Roman *boule* had only 375 members, due to the addition of the tribe *Sebaste* under the Romans. If Knibbe is correct in identifying a pre-Roman tribe whose name is at present unknown, though, it is possible that the number of members remained consistent at 450 (Knibbe [1961-1963]).

89 Burrell (2004): 59. Servilius Isauricus: *IEph* 702 (cat. no. 38), 3066; Caesar: SIG3 760.

90 *FiE* IX/I/I b4-b21. The number of *hierourgoi* steadily increases over the first and second centuries until there is a total of seven (*FiE* IX/I/I b22-42).
maximum total of approximately four hundred and sixty recipients. The interest rate of 9% and the annual income of four hundred and fifty denarii are estimates; the interest rate may well have been higher at the time of Orpex’ endowment. Even at a rate of 9%, though, the money available was probably at least enough to provide one denarius to the recipients. Only those who were present could receive a share, and it should not be supposed that every member of the boule would make the effort of being in the city to receive a single denarius if, for instance, they maintained a residence outside the city; nor should it be assumed that the bouleutai went out of their to attend even if they were present in the city: providing a cash-distribution was far more important than being among the recipients.  

The second part of the endowment was the donation of two thousand five hundred denarii to provide annual cash distributions (dianomai) to the members of the gerousia at a rate of two denarii each. Assuming an interest rate of 9% again, two hundred and twenty-five denarii would be available each year for distribution to the gerousiastai. This would provide gifts for one hundred and twelve individuals. The same restriction should

---

91 Distributions described as dianomai were not provided with a view to relieving poverty. They were handouts which reflected the social prestige of the benefactor by the number and status of the recipients. Inscriptions recording distributions commemorate the benefactor, not the recipients.

92 It is highly unusual for the gerousiastai to receive a larger cash gift than the bouleutai. Yet this seems unavoidable in the case of Orpex’ foundation. Both distributions for the gerousiastai are explicitly stated to be annual events. This seems to be the case for the distributions for the bouleutai as, even though κοστ' ἐπιστῆσθαι ἡκοστὸν does not appear in the clauses relating to the bouleutai. A second inscription honouring Orpex and Marina specifies that the dianome for the boule is to be annual but does not include the phrase for the gerousia (cat. no. 34; IEph 2113). The two inscriptions most likely describe the same distributions: both specify that the distribution for the members of the boule is to take place in the Tetragonous Agora. Since the same verb governs the clauses relating to the boule and the gerousia in the funerary inscription (cat. no. 72), it is possible to argue that the distribution for the gerousiastai also took place in that agora. The honorary inscription, however, places the distribution to the gerousiastai in the stadium. Since the stadium and the Tetragonous Agora are by no stretch of the imagination in the same area of the city, there must either have been two distributions for both the bouleutai and the gerousiastai, or a location was not specified for the distribution of the gerousiastai in the funerary inscription. The latter is more likely, because if there had been four distributions in total, one would have expected an indication of this, such as καθὲκεκαυμένοι βίζ, rather than the verb alone. Consequently, Orpex and Marina provided only one distribution for the gerousia and the boule, but both were annual occurrences.
be applied to this distribution, even though it is not clarified, namely that only those who were present would receive their share. There was, however, an added incentive for the members of the *gerousiastai* to take part in the honouring of Orpex: an additional donation of one thousand five hundred denarii was made available to provide a lottery (*kleros*) for the *gerousia*.

Thirty denarii of the interest on this sum was marked for other purposes, but there would remain enough, approximately one hundred and five denarii, for thirty-five members of the *gerousia* at the specified rate of three denarii each. It is probable, therefore, that a greater proportion of the *gerousiastai* than of the *bouleutai* took part in the commemoration of Orpex’ monuments and foundation. One can consequently estimate a membership of between one hundred and one hundred and twenty for the *gerousia* in the first half of the first century AD.

The occasion of these dedications is not known. The funerary inscription, which provides the most detail, is incomplete, preserving only the middle portion of the details for foundation. Some suggestions may be made, however. The association of Orpex’ daughter in the establishment of the foundation can be seen as indicative of a joint office, such as a priesthood of Artemis and a *kalathephoria*. Such an association does not seem to have been a customary arrangement in Ephesus, though. There are instances of a father serving in a priesthood alongside his daughter, but such does not appear to be the case with Orpex and Marina, if only because there is no mention of any priestly office.

---

93 The distinction between a *dianome* and a *kleros* is important and is treated in somewhat more detail below. Essentially, a *dianome* is a gift handed out to those who are present where as a *kleros* is distributed on the basis of a lottery. Everyone has a share in a *dianome*, but only some have a share in a *kleros*.

94 A slightly higher interest rate (10%) would provide enough annual income to fund distributions for 125 *gerousiastai*, while a lower rate (8%) would suffice for 100 portions.

95 Cat. no. 72 (*IEph* 4123).

96 An *essene* appears with his daughter in *IEph* 957 (Cat. no. 22); a more common association is the father as *hestiouchos* and his daughter, sister or wife as *kalathephorus* (*IEph* 1070, 1070a).
The foundation that was established by Orpex and Marina was intended to generate enough interest to provide for annual distributions. Such an endowment is akin to the establishment of games: regular distributions are not as expensive as regular games, but they are a significant benefaction of a sort that is not usually associated with service as a priest or priestess of Artemis. Consequently, a more probable occasion might be the introduction of Orpex to the Ephesian boule. Such an introduction would call for a large-scale benefaction involving the inductee's family since the status gained as a member of the boule would affect the family as a whole and not simply the inductee himself.

Monetary payment is known to have been required for membership in the boule. The emperor Hadrian, approximately a half-century after Orpex' benefaction, recommended two men who had traveled with him during his sea-voyages and had requested membership into the boule. Both Lucius Erastus and Philocurius claimed to be citizens of Ephesus, so that they were probably ship captains based in the city. Significantly, Hadrian declares his willingness to pay the admittance fee for his two nominees, if the "magistrates and boule of the Ephesians" judge the men "worthy of the honour".

Orpex' generosity may well have been in response to membership in the boule, but, since the gerouusiastai are the recipients both of a dianome and a kleros, Orpex may have become a member of the gerousia instead. The payment for membership in the gerousia would have been limited to the donation of the one thousand five hundred denarii, with the two donations mentioned prior to this serving as more general

---

97 IEph 1487, 1488.
benefactions, the likes of which Pliny complains about in a letter to Trajan. This proposition, if correct, would be the only indication that there was a type of fee for membership in the gerousia; payment for membership in the boule seems more likely. One must still explain the gifts to the gerousia, though. The provision of a dianome to the members of the boule can easily be seen as Orpex' "entry fee"; the additional gifts to the gerousia demonstrate his worthiness of such a status: by giving more than one denarius to the bouleutai whom he was joining Orpex might have impressed observers – particularly the bouleutai themselves – as somewhat sycophantic, whereas by giving more to the gerousiastai he would simply appear generous.

4.3.2. The Second Century: Gaius Vibius Salutaris

Gaius Vibius Salutaris, at the beginning of the second century AD, established a foundation for the citizens of Ephesus which Guy M. Rogers has interpreted as a means of publicly and visibly proclaiming or re-asserting Ephesian identity. In short, Salutaris provided numerous statues and an endowment of twenty-one thousand five hundred denarii, the annual interest from which was to fund distributions for various members of the citizenry in celebration of the birthday of Artemis – and in celebration of Salutaris himself. Salutaris specified the distributions in great detail and had them confirmed by the boule and demos, and by the proconsul of Asia. He was allowed by the boule and

---

98 Pl., Ep. 10.116: Qui uirilem togam sumunt uel nuptias faciunt uel ineunt magistratum uel opus publicum dedicant, solent totam bulen atque etiam e plebe non exiguam numerum uocare binoque denarios uel singulos dare. Quod an celebrandum et quatenus putes, rogo scribas. Ipse enim, sicut arbitrator, praesertim ex sollemnibus causis, concedendum ius istud initiationis, ita uereor ne ii qui mille homines, interdum etiam plures uocant, modum excedere et in speciem διανομῆς incidere uideantur. (Those who are assuming the toga virilis or who are getting married or who are entering upon a magistracy or who are dedicating a public work are accustomed to assemble the entire boule and even a not-inconsiderable number of the populace and to give them one or two denarii. I am asking you to tell me what you think of this custom and to what extent it should be permitted. For myself, I believe that principally on ceremonial occasions this type of invitation ought to be permitted, but I am afraid that those who summon a thousand or even more men, will appear to exceed moderation and to turn it into a kind of διανομῆς.)

demos to have the terms of his endowment inscribed in five hundred and sixty-nine lines on the analemma of the theatre, an inscription which has been carefully reconstructed by numerous scholars.

Salutaris is identified by his offices as an equestrian: among other posts, he served as a military tribune and as subprocurator of Mauritania Tingitana and Gallia Belgica.100 There is no evidence to suggest that he was a member of the gerousia, but he does include that body among the recipients of his distributions. The endowment was made in two phases with a donation of twenty thousand denarii followed two months later by an additional donation of fifteen hundred denarii.101

Of the projected eighteen hundred denarii of annual interest at a rate of 9% on the initial capital donation, three hundred and eighty-two and a half denarii are to be given to the grammateus of the gerousia for a cash gift (kleros) to the geroustaids, the neokoroi and the asiarchs. Three hundred and nine members of the gerousia are to receive a portion of this sum, and it is agreed by editors of and commentators on this inscription that they received their share at a rate of one denarius each.102 The details for the other shares of the endowment make it clear that while Salutaris did not take into account a rate of interest of less than 9%, he did make provisions for a surplus. The four hundred and fifty members of the boule are normally to receive, like the geroustaids, one denarius

100 Cat. no. 19; I Eph 35.
101 Cat. nos. 54 & 55 (IEph 27B, 27G).
102 Cat. no. 54, ll. 231-246; Heberdey in Oliver (1941): 81-85. Kleron is entirely restored in line 234, but the restoration is confirmed by line 242, in which kleron appears entirely unredored, and by line 237, where λαξ[kleron] has been restored, a participle which appears in distributions of kleroi but not of dianomai.
each; in the case of a surplus, the additional interest is to be handed out. The gifts provided for the bouleutai and the gerousiastai, however, differ significantly.

Four hundred and fifty denarii of the total interest earned on the twenty thousand denarii are dedicated to the boule. If the interest rate were greater, the interest at that rate of the boule’s share of the total endowment, five thousand denarii, would be allotted to the grammateus of the boule for distribution. Thus, if the earned rate were 10%, five hundred denarii would be given to the grammateus of boule, and fifty members would receive an additional denarius. The same procedure would be followed for the share of the gerousia, the interest being calculated on four thousand two hundred and fifty denarii of the total.

The gift for the boule is described as a dianome, that for the gerousia a kleros:

τὸν δὲ καθερμημένον ὧπο Σαλοντα-
[πόσο δηναρίου] β' μηρίων τῇ[ε]λεσει τόκον Σαλοντάριος δραχμαίον καθ' ἐκαστον ἐνι-
[αυτον] τὰ γειν[ούμενα δημάρχεια χίλια ὡκτοκόσια, ἀφ' ὧν δίσει τῷ γραμμα-
[τεῖ τῆς β]ουλῆς δημάρχεια τετρακόσιον πεντήκοντα, ὅπως ἐπιτελεῖ διανομὴν
[τοῖς Βουλευταῖς ἐν τῷ τερῶν ἐν τῷ πρόνοῳ τῇ γενε[σίῳ τῆς μεγίστης θεᾶς Ἄρ-
[τέμιδος], ἡτὶς εστὶν μηνὸς Θαρυγ[λυ]ίον ἐκτῇ σταμένου, γεινομένης τῆς διανο-
[μῆς ἢδε τῇ]ς πέμπτης, διδομένον ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων δημαρχίαν ἐνός,
[μὴ ἔχουσιν] ἐξοσφυπτὰν τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς διανομῆς ἀπόντι δοῦναι, ἔπει ἀποτελεσά-
[τω τῆς β]ουλῆς υπὲρ ἐκαστοῦ δυνάματος τοῦ μη παραγενομένου καὶ λαβόντος
[προστείμου δηναρία]... ἐκ δὲ μειζ[ων] γει[νηται ὁ κόλλυβος, ὡστε]
[ἐις πλείονας χωρεῖν, ἔξεστι] καὶ [-------------]

[---------------------------]α ἀνά κύ[λον]ν. ὄμοιω[ς δό]-
[σει τῷ τοῦ συνεδρίου τῆς γερουσίας γ]ραμματεῖ κ[ατ' ἐνι]-
[αυτὸν ἐκαστον ἀπὸ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου τόκου δηναρία] [τρβ']
[ἀσσαρία θ', ὅπως ἐπιτελῆ κλῆρον τῇ γενεσίῳ τῆς θεοῦ]
[ἡμέρα τοῖς τοῦ συνεδρίου] μετέχουσιν εἰς ἄνδρας τῷ [ἀνά δηναρίου] α'- ἐκαν
[δὲ μειζ[ων] ἢ] γεινόμενον κόλλυβος,] ὡστε εἰς πλείο[νας]
[χωρεῖν, κληρώσει καὶ πλείονας, ἐκ]ɲςτοι τῶν λαχ[δον-]

103 This type of distribution may be thought of as being conducted by queue: after receiving a share, a recipient went to the back of the line and could receive an additional denarius until the total set aside for the bouleuta was spent. A surplus sum over 1,800 denarii was not meant to accumulate and cause the capital to grow. All interest was to be spent each year.
Of the twenty thousand denarii donated by Salutaris, Salutaris will pay 9% interest each year, making one thousand eight hundred denarii, from which he shall give to the grammateus of the Senate four hundred and fifty denarii, so that he may conduct a distribution of money to the members of the Senate in the temple in the pronaos on the birthday of the greatest goddess, Artemis, which is the sixth day of the month of Thargelion, with the distribution occurring on the fifth day, with one denarius being given to each man present; the one who is charge does not have authority to give a share of this distribution to anyone who is absent because if he does so, he shall repay to the Senate a fine of [...] denarii on behalf of each man who not present but received the gift. If the interest available is greater, so that it can provide for more, it shall be permissible also [to make a distribution at a rate of ...].

In the same way he will give to the grammateus of the assembly of the gerousia each year from the aforementioned interest three hundred and eighty-two denarii and nine asses, so that a lottery may be conducted on the birthday of the goddess for those who are members of the assembly, up to three hundred and nine men, at a rate of one denarius each. If the available interest is greater, so that it can provide for more, the he will allot more portions, but each of the recipients will receive one denarius.

There will also be given to the temple-wardens in the donor’s, that is Salutaris’, house [...] denarii for a distribution of money and to the Asiarchs whose names are inscribed [...] denarii for a lottery at the rate of eleven denarii per person, with which they will purchase the materials for the sacrifice, with this lottery taking place on the fifth day. The grammateus of the gerousia who is in charge will not have the authority to omit the distribution or the enrolment after the death of Salutaris, because if he does so he will pay the fine which was specified in these arrangements.

A dianome is a cash gift handed out by a benefactor to specified individuals, in this case, the bouleutai. Whether offered on a single occasion or repeatedly, a dianome is intended only for those who are present at the time of the distribution. Consequently, it is possible
that even when there was no surplus to be distributed some of the bouleutai could receive more than a single denarius if some of their number were absent.\textsuperscript{104}

A kleros is also a cash gift, but one which is handed out by a benefactor to recipients chosen by lot as the word and its derivatives suggest.\textsuperscript{105} The phrasing of the inscription shows that the two terms cannot be synonymous: the recipients among the gerousiastai are hoi lachontes, “those who have obtained by lot;” in the case of the boule, on the other hand, “one denarius is given to each of those who are present.”\textsuperscript{106} Thus, this distribution to the gerousia was also intended to continue until the interest dedicated to it had been exhausted, but Salutaris foresaw that the prescribed 9\% would not provide enough to give each member of the gerousia one denarius. Consequently, it cannot be doubted that the gerousia numbered more than three hundred and nine members in AD 104.

How many members there were beyond these three hundred and nine is unclear. Salutaris’ additional benefaction later in the same year is uninformative in this respect. Rogers argues that this capital endowment provided a sum of interest which was distributed in a lottery, a kleros, to five members of the gerousia.\textsuperscript{107} Since the second foundation also provides a lottery for five members of the boule, it cannot be assumed that these gerousiastai are necessarily different from the recipients named in the original benefaction. It was a second lottery, also open to all members and any one of these five recipients may also have received a share from the original lottery. This lottery,

\textsuperscript{104} The lines which describe the method of the distribution of the μετ’ ζον κόλλυμας (230-231) have not been restored in any edition of the inscription. The final phrase before the description shifts to the gifts for the gerousia, however, ὥσπερ κύκλον, suggests that the sense is, “let the grammateus give to each of those present one denarius in a circle;” the distribution is intended to continue, with each person receiving one denarius and some receiving an additional denarius until the amount to be distributed has been exhausted.

\textsuperscript{105} The basic meaning of the noun δ’ κλήρος is an allotment (LSJ, s.v. κλήρος (A); cf., κληρόν).

\textsuperscript{106} Cat. no. 54, gerousia: ll. 230-246, esp. 238-239; boule: ll. 221-231, esp. 227.

\textsuperscript{107} Rogers (1991): 42-52; Cat. no. 55, ll. 497ff.
however, was provided in order that the recipients could perform a specific function, related to the annual celebration of the birthday of Artemis; the nature of that responsibility is unknown because of the fragmentary nature of the text of the inscription at this point. The number of the recipients is not certainly known to be five, nor is it relevant to a calculation of the total membership of the gerousia in AD 104.

The inscription recording Salutaris' benefactions does not shed any light on what proportion of the gerousia could expect to receive a share in his lottery. That fifteen hundred citizens were to be allotted half a denarius in a lottery might suggest that the three hundred and nine members of the gerousia formed only a small part of the entire body. On the other hand, the equivalence of the value of the gift to individual bouleutai and geroussiastai suggests a similarity in social status and therefore indicates that three hundred and nine may have been a significant part of the gerousia.

There are several hints, in addition to the equality of the gifts, to suggest that a large proportion of the gerousia is represented in Salutaris' benefaction. First, the appearance of the title geroussiastes in numerous inscriptions indicates that it was regarded as conferring some degree of honour; moreover, seats were reserved for the geroussiastai in the theatre. Furthermore, the appearance of the term patrogeron might suggest that membership in the gerousia was regarded as somewhat aristocratic. Finally, the several letters addressed to the gerousia by emperors or provincial governors demonstrate that the gerousia of Ephesus was a significant body in that city. It seems more reasonable that a comparatively small body of individuals would enjoy, as it were,
the Emperor's ear. The *gerousia* of the early second century should, therefore, be larger than three hundred and nine, but not dramatically so.

Is the *gerousia* larger or smaller than the *boule*? There is no explicit indication. It is possible, though, to suggest an answer. Numerous *kouretes* lists have been discovered and published, most easily accessible in Knibbe's *Forschungen in Ephesos IX/I*. These lists reveal several hints about the relative sizes of the *boule* and *gerousia*. Inevitably a greater number of *bouleutai* appear in any given list. Very rarely are there more than two *gerousiastai*. This suggests that the *gerousia* was less active overall in the college of *kouretes*, but it will be seen in Chapters Four and Five that they were active in the city, so that it is more likely that their lower frequency of appearance is due to a smaller overall size. This suggests a range of between three hundred and ten and four hundred and fifty members.

This range can be narrowed. A lottery for nearly all of a single body would not make sense euergetically. To exclude a small portion of a body would not reflect well on the benefactor because it would be evident that for a slightly greater expense he could have included the entire body. Consequently, the *gerousia* must have numbered more than, say, three hundred and twenty-five. This would still result in an exclusion of only about 5%, so a larger membership would be more probable.

On the other hand, the exclusion of a significant portion of one of the major bodies in the city would also reflect poorly on the benefactor: it reduces the generosity of the euergetic act and therefore the accolades which the act would otherwise have earned.

---

111 There is no reason to assume that some would identify themselves as *gerousiastai* and others would not. The absence of such identification is due to the individual who composed the inscription and should therefore be consistently variable as authorship changed. Given that the inscriptions were annual lists, it is probable – but not certain – that there was a degree of consistency even between authors.
How great a proportion of the *gerousia* could be excluded cannot be other than an arbitrary judgment, but certainly less than 50%. A rate of exclusion of 20-30% would seem to be a energetically safe proportion: if 70-80% of the *gerousiastai* could expect to receive a gift, that would be incentive enough for the majority of the *gerousia* to take part in Salutaris’ festival while avoiding the risk of offending a relatively small number of non-recipients who did, nonetheless have the chance of benefiting from Salutaris’ arrangements; it would also allow Salutaris to claim, without stretching the truth too far, that he had given cash-gifts to the *gerousia*. A total membership of between three hundred and eighty and four hundred and fifty, therefore, is not unreasonable. In light of the *kouretes* lists, the lower portion of this range is preferable. If a round number was a consideration for the Ephesians themselves, it may be suggested that there were four hundred *gerousiastai* at the beginning of the first century AD, with the *caveat* that this is an estimate.\(^{112}\)

**4.3.3. The Late Second Century: [Tiberius Claudius] Nicomedes**

A third inscription records the establishment of another endowment half a century later.\(^{113}\) Like Salutaris, Nicomedes, a citizen of Ephesus, arranged for the investment of a sum of money to provide annual funds for a feast and a cash distribution. Nicomedes is identified in line seven of the inscription as the *katholikos ek dikos tou sunhedriou hemon*, that is, he oversaw the application and administration of the laws and rules governing ‘our assembly’, or he represented it in an official, legal capacity.\(^{114}\) If Oliver is correct in his supposition that the lacuna preceding the name of Nicomedes in the seventh line of

---

\(^{112}\) The possible desire for a round number should not be dismissed. The *gerousia* of Sidyma appears to have been filled out to include a total of one hundred members.

\(^{113}\) Cat. no. 56 (*IEph* 26).

\(^{114}\) The term *ek dikos tou sunhedriou* will be discussed below in Chapter Five.
the inscription should be restored as Tiberius Claudius, the name of a kouretes of AD
104-105, it is safe to suppose that the Nicomedes of the end of the second century was the
member of a rather wealthy Ephesian family.

On the other hand, the money which Nicomedes makes available in this
inscription seems not to be his own:

\[ \text{νῦν δὲ εὑρεθέντων διὰ] } \]
\[- - - -] Νεικομήδους, τοῦ καθο[λικοῦ ἐκδικοῦ]ν τοῦ συνεδρίου ἡμῶν, τῆς
ἀυτοῦ ἐπιμελείας<ς> ἐξ[ἀρετοῦ παρασχόντος παράδειγμα, πόρων]
[ικαν]ών

But now, since sufficient funds have been discovered through the efforts of
[Tiberius Claudius] Nicomedes, the general financial supervisor of our
sunhedrion, giving a singular sign of his diligence...

If Nicomedes had made a donation from his personal resources, this would have been
specified. The uninformative statement that Nicomedes discovered funds implies that he
arranged the diversion of a certain sum of money for his benefaction rather than paying
for it himself.\textsuperscript{115}

The endowment, as in the Salutaris foundation, specifies the purposes to which
the distributed money is to be put. Each recipient is instructed to use the gift in prayer
and sacrifice to Artemis and the Emperor Commodus on behalf of his diamone.\textsuperscript{116} In
fact, the ‘prayer and sacrifice’ takes the form of a feast for the members of the
sunhedrion, the sunhedroi. Those individuals who attend the feast are to receive an
additional Attic mina. Unfortunately, the amount of money which was set aside for this
feast and distribution is unknown, and may not have been specified at all. The number of
recipients, therefore, is also unknowable. The only amount that appears to have been

\textsuperscript{115} Cat. no. 56, ll. 6-8; cf. l.11.
\textsuperscript{116} The translation of the dative τῆς μεγίστης κυρίων ἡμῶν καὶ ἐυφανεστάτῳ αὐτοκράτορι Καίσαρι
Μάρκῳ Ᾱπρίλῳ Κομιᾶδῳ Ἀντωνινῳ Σεβαστῷ ἕστηκεν in lines 8-9 as ‘to the Emperor’ or
‘for the Emperor’ has implications for the nuances behind the Imperial cult, but need not be addressed here.
specified in the inscription was the minimum amount which could be spent on the sacrifices and feast – but this was only a portion of the funds earmarked by Nicomedes. The text containing the amount is missing.

The Nicomedes decree, then, is not informative about the numerical size of the gerousia. Even if a total sum had been specified, though, the decree would not have been more illuminating in this respect. The terms gerousia and sunhedrion are not used interchangeably and are, in fact, restorations in several instances. Moreover, the closest association of the two terms in the inscription proves ephemeral: all members or participants in the sunhedrion are to receive an unknown amount of money from the common treasury of the gerousia according to the original organization under Lysimachus.\textsuperscript{117} The terms can be understood as synonymous in this case, but the possibility that this is a case of the gerousia funding sacrifices carried out by another body should not be ruled out. Nor, as was suggested above in Chapter Three, should the possibility that sunhedroi in this inscription refers to a group within the gerousia who participated, that is, those who were present, be dismissed out of hand.

The implication of the juxtaposition of the two terms is either that they refer to two distinct groups or that sunhedrion is here literally a meeting of some but not all members of the gerousia. This distinction appears in the section of the inscription that describes the third century BC arrangements of Lysimachus, but it seems to have been a distinction which existed and was acknowledged to exist at the time of the passage of this decree; it does not mean that the gerousia was thought of as The sunhedrion throughout its existence. The addition of the adjective koinon also implies that the funds of the entire

\textsuperscript{117} Cat. no. 56, l. 5: τοὺς ἐκ τῶν κοινῶν τῆς γερουσίας χρημάτων ἐκχαρίτως λαβόντας: 'all the participants in the sunhedrion received [sum of money] apiece from the common funds of the gerousia.'


_gerousia_ were being used by a portion thereof or by an entirely different body. The reduplication of the preservation formulas in lines 11-14 emphasizes the distinctiveness of the _gerousia_ and the _sunhedrion_.

A specification of the total amount made available by Nicomedes, then, would be informative about the monetary resources of the _gerousia_, but not of the size of its membership. It cannot be determined, therefore, whether the _gerousia_ continued to grow through the second century, or if it remained a consistent size during this period. The growth from the first century to the second though suggests that it may have continued to grow.

4.4. The _Gerousiastai_

Although there is no inscription from Ephesus to answer the question of the size of its _gerousia_ corresponding to the remarkable decree from Sidyma briefly discussed at the beginning of this chapter, the sheer quantity of inscriptions from Ephesus offers an idea of what a membership-inscription might have looked like. It is possible to trace the activities of several Ephesian families over multiple generations, so that the social status of some members of the _gerousia_ can be determined with relative certainty. In the case of Sidyma, slaves and women were excluded from membership in the _gerousia_, but both freeborn and freedmen are attested. There are enough individuals named as members of the _gerousia_ in Ephesus that some similar conclusions can be drawn about its members.

At least forty-one named individuals are identifiable as members of the _gerousia_ and thirteen additional individuals may have been members (Tables 1 & 2). The Ephesian _gerousia_ was predominantly an organization composed of men, probably

---

118 Cf. above, Chapter Three, pp. 70-74.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Cat. No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Euphronius, son of Hegemon (pp. 109-110)</td>
<td>294-281 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Herogeiton (pp. 109-110)</td>
<td>294-181 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Theodorus (?)* (pp. 110-113)</td>
<td>50-1 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Curtius Proculus* (pp. 110-113)</td>
<td>AD 12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Menodotus (?)* (pp. 110-113)</td>
<td>AD 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tiberius Claudius D...* (pp. 110-113)</td>
<td>AD 1-4 or AD 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tiberius Julius Heras* (pp. 110-113)</td>
<td>AD 29/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lucius Cosinnius* (pp. 110-113)</td>
<td>AD 30/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Alexander son of Alexander* (pp. 110-113)</td>
<td>AD 31/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Titus Flavius Asclepiodorus*</td>
<td>AD 80/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Julius Menecrates*</td>
<td>Before AD 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Diodotus Ephesius son of Asclepides*, Gaius Liciniius Euarestus†, Tiberius Claudius Nicomedes‡ &amp; Asclepiodorus son of Asclepiodorus‡</td>
<td>AD 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lucius Caecilius Rufus‡</td>
<td>AD 112-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cassellius Politicus* (pp. 110-113)</td>
<td>AD 120/121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Claudius Bassus§</td>
<td>AD 117-139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Publius Aelius Isas Flavianus‡</td>
<td>AD 130-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>…Venustus‡</td>
<td>AD 130-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Bacchius son of Zeuxius‡ &amp; Onesimus‡</td>
<td>AD 150-192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Eutyches (?)†</td>
<td>AD 161-181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The son of Saturninus (p. 119)</td>
<td>Late 2nd-early 3rd C. AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius Artemidorus§</td>
<td>Late 2nd-early 3rd C. AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Falcidius Epigonus (p. 119)</td>
<td>Late 2nd-early 3rd C. AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Julius Marcianus‡</td>
<td>Early 3rd C. AD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Evandris§</td>
<td>AD 214/215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Gnaeus Julius Artemidorus§</td>
<td>AD 216/217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Zoticus Artemidorus§</td>
<td>AD 231-239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Aurelius Antoninus Julianus§</td>
<td>3rd C. AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Zoticus, freedman of the Sebastoi§</td>
<td>3rd C. AD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Aurelius Niconianus Eucarpus§</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>…Asiaticus‡</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Aurelius Orpheus son of Orpheus§</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Aphrodissius son of Cleander son of Herodes son of Herodes son of Apollonius (pp.141-2, 155).</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Claudius Antistius Antiochus§</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Menecrates§</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Aurelius Hesychion§</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Straton (p. 119)</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Lucius Pomp... (pp. 119-20)</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Named members of the Gerousia.\(^{119}\)

\(^{119}\) The membership of many of these individuals is obvious: * Membership deduced from service as ambassador; † Membership indicated in the inscription with the phrase metechon tes gerousias; ‡ Membership indicated in the inscription with the phrase ek gerousias; § Membership indicated in the inscription with the word gerousiastes. In the absence of a superscript marker, reference is made to the pages on which the membership of those individuals is discussed.
citizens. All but five of these men are attested as having held at least one office in addition to being a member of the gerousia.\(^\text{120}\) This suggests that the vast majority of gerousiastai were Ephesian citizens. In many cases membership is clear, but there are several individuals for whom it is not obvious or certain.

A number of inscriptions clearly identify members of the gerousia. The most common means of doing this is the addition of the term gerousiastes to the individual’s name, but variations do appear. Thus, ek gerousias and metechon tes gerousias are synonymous with gerousiastes.\(^\text{121}\) Although synonymous, however, these terms are not used interchangeably in the same inscription: any given inscription uses only one of them. Gerousiastes appears in a variety of inscription-types, including honorary inscriptions and dedicatory inscriptions. Ek gerousias most commonly appears in the kouretes lists; this is the only phrase used to identify a member of the gerousia in these inscriptions.

\(^{120}\) The offices of the members of the gerousia, both within that body and in the larger Ephesian state, will be discussed in Chapter Five.

\(^{121}\) Gerousiastes: cat. no. 21, 24-27, 40, 45, 49, 50, 68, 75-77, 79, 80 (cf. IEph. 2227 & 2917); ek gerousias: cat. no. 20, 28, 60-64, 66, 67; metechon tes gerousias: cat. no. 22. Oliver suggests that metechon tes gerousias is not synonymous with gerousiastes, but in fact identifies individuals who were associated with the gerousia but were not regular members (Oliver [1941]: 41). The meaning ‘to be partners’ which Oliver gives to metecho is a specialized use of the word, and there is no reason to assume that it is in this sense rather than the more common sense of ‘to partake’ or ‘to be a member’ that the word is used in cat. no. 22. Furthermore, Oliver notes that metecho and nemontes are distinct (Oliver [1941]: 41-42); this is true, one would expect that nemetès, derived from nemo, would be used rather than metechon for irregular members (cf. cat. no. 44); cf. Hdt. 8.132; P.RevLaws 14.
4.4.1. Euphronius and Herogeiton

The two earliest known members are Euphronius, the son of Hegemon, and Herogeiton, respectively the recipient and the author of a Hellenistic citizenship decree. Euphronius served as an ambassador to Lysimachus’ general Prepelaus on gerousia-business associated with the Temple of Artemis, but he was not a citizen at the time of this service. Although probable, Euphronius’ membership cannot be taken for granted because he is identified as an Acarnian, and may therefore have been a member of Prepelaus’ army. Since embassies were at all times dangerous and expensive undertakings, it may have been easier and more feasible for the gerousia to commission someone who was already going to Prepelaus’ location with its business. Two points can be made against this. First, Euphronius appears to have been a resident in or near Ephesus as he is named as a benefactor of the city. Second, the decree reports that he was “sent by the gerousia and epikletoi”. The verb, apostello, is literally “to send” or “to dispatch”, modified only by the gerousia and epikletoi as agents. If Euphronius had been commissioned by an additional body, it would be expected that this body would also have been mentioned and would have joined the gerousia in proposing honours. It is probable, therefore, that Euphronius was a member of the gerousia at the time of his embassy to Prepelaus, even though he was not a citizen until after the completion of this service.

Ephesian citizenship would not, then, seem to have been a criterion for membership in the gerousia in the third century BC. Whether this principle is true for the entire period during which the gerousia is known to have existed is unclear, but a second century gerusiastes also may not have been an Ephesian citizen. Claudius Bassus,

\[122\] Cat. no. 1; IEph 1449.
\[123\] Euphronius was a member of the gerousia or the epikletoi. Membership in either body is, in the cases of Euphronius and Herogiton, taken to be membership in the georusia for the sake of simplicity.
whom Oliver identifies with an *agonothetes* in Smyrna, was a member of the *gerousia* of Ephesus, possibly during the reign of Hadrian. That same Claudius Bassus appears in a list of individuals who promised various benefactions to Smyrna, promising to pave the *basilike*. The evidence that he was active as a benefactor in Smyrna suggests that he may have been a citizen of that city; it should be noted, however, that non-citizens could provide benefactions in a city. If Bassus was a citizen of Smyrna, though, his inscription might be an indication that non-Ephesians could be members of the *gerousia* into the Empire; it is also possible that Bassus enjoyed citizenship in both cities.

Herogeiton is identified in the Hellenistic decree as the speaker of the proposal for Euphronius' citizenship. The decree is said to be one of the *gerousia* and the *epikletoi*, but it was supported by the *neopoioi* and the *kouretes*, suggesting a connection between these four groups or a specific procedure by which the *gerousia* officially approached the *boule* and *demos*. It is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that Herogeiton, as the spokesman, was associated with each group. It will become clear that the services of *kouretes* and *neopoios* could be, and often were, performed by members of the *gerousia*. Herogeiton can, therefore, be considered to be a probable member of the *gerousia*.

**4.4.2. Ambassadors to Roman Officials**

The series of letters from Imperial officials to the *gerousia* identify multiple members of the *gerousia* (Table 1, nos. 4-9 & 42-50). Although several of the letters are too fragmentary to provide the names of the petitioners and ambassadors, others suggest that at least one member of the *gerousia* was involved in the presentation of the

---

124 Cat. no. 40. Oliver (1941): 90, no. 8; *IGRR* 4.1431; *Die Inschriften von Smyrna* 697.
125 An hypothesis has been advanced in Chapter Two about the nature of the connection between the *epikletoi* and *gerousia*.
126 Cat. nos. 4-14.
gerousia's request for each renewal of their privileges. Nineteen individuals are named in these eleven inscriptions, some only in fragmentary form, of whom seven can certainly be taken as members of the gerousia. Several of the remaining twelve names may also identify gerousiastai. The letters record the confirmation of certain pre-existing rights of the gerousia by various Roman officials. These were not written spontaneously, but in response to a petition brought to the attention of the respective officials by the gerousia itself.

The letter of Octavian, dated to 29 BC, for example, records the names of nine ambassadors.127 Knibbe identifies these men as envoys of the ekklesia who spoke "im Auftrag der gesamten Polis, da Octavian seine Antwort an Rat und Volk der Stadt adressiert hat."128 This is possible, but, as Knibbe himself notes, it does not rule out a restoration of tes gerousias in place of tes ekklesias.129 Even if one accepts Knibbe's restoration, though, it is still probable that at least some of these men were members of the gerousia. The embassy was at least in part concerned with the state of the gerousia, so that it is implausible that at least one member did not accompany the embassy of the ekklesia – if that restoration is in fact correct - to represent that body's interests.

The remainder of this series of letters are all addressed to the gerousia, so that there can be little doubt that the embassies were conducted by members of that body. At least nineteen ambassadors undertook embassies in the sixty to seventy years covered by this series of letters, although only seven can be identified as members of the gerousia with certainty: four individuals who appear as the sole ambassador in any given case are

127 Cat. no. 6.
129 The major objection to πρέσβε[ις τής γεωργίας] is the addressing of the letter to the boule and demos rather than the gerousia. This does not preclude the possibility that Octavian is informing the boule and demos of the results of the embassy.
most likely representing their own body, the *gerousia*.\textsuperscript{130} Two additional ambassadors are identified either as the *gerousia*’s own ambassador or as having been sent by that body through the use of the second person plural personal pronoun.\textsuperscript{131} Nine individuals appear in Octavian’s letter as the representatives of the *ekklesia* or the *gerousia* but it is not possible to determine whether one or all of these were members of the *gerousia*.\textsuperscript{132}

Finally, four men are named in a fragment which preserves little more than their names.\textsuperscript{133} It is clear, though, that the four individuals named in this case were divided into two groups. The first, Theodorus, appears to have been a member of the *gerousia*: his name is restored before a short lacuna after which *tes gerousias* may be read, and it is conceivable that this lacuna could be filled with the identification of Theodorus as an ambassador or gymnasiarch, that is, the ambassador of the *gerousia*. The remaining three men are separated both from Theodorus and the *gerousia* by the phrase “*kai hoi epi ton*...” which might suggest that they were representatives of a body other than the *gerousia*, although that body’s name has not survived; Knibbe suggests that this phrase...

\textsuperscript{130} Cat. nos. 10, 12, 13 & 14. For the same reason, Cassellius Politicus, who conducted an embassy to Hadrian in AD 120/121, may be identified as a member of the *gerousia* (cat. no. 16).

\textsuperscript{131} Cat. nos. 8 & 9; it should be noted that the pronoun also appears in the inscriptions noted in n. 128, but in one case (10), it appears in the phrase ‘Tiberius Claudius met me concerning your affairs;’ the combination of the pronoun and the fact that Tiberius Claudius is the only individual named make his membership quite certain. The other three inscriptions (12, 13 & 14) identify the ambassadors as “your gymnasiarch,” and it will be argued in Chapter Five that a gymnasiarch of the *gerousia* was not necessarily a member of the *gerousia*. It is, consequently, the fact that these three ambassadors appear alone in the letters that most strongly supports their membership in the *gerousia*, not the presence of the pronoun; two individuals identified only as gymnasiarchs of the *presbuteroi* have been included in Table 2 since it is not immediately clear that *presbuteroi* is a reference to *gerousia* nor, if it is, does that office guarantee their membership in the *gerousia* (cat. nos. 38 & 52).

\textsuperscript{132} Cat. no. 6; even if the restoration of *ekklesia* is correct, it is probable that at least one of the nine named individuals was an ambassador and member of the *gerousia*; τῆς γερουσιάς might equally well have been restored.

\textsuperscript{133} Cat. no. 4.
may actually have been *kai hoi epi ton chrematon* (*tes gerousias*), citing *ho epi ton chrematon* in the Salutaris dossier.  

4.4.3. Aurelius Artemidorus and Aurelius Attalus

None of the major beneficent families of the city of Ephesus, such as the Publii Vedii or the Juliani, appear among the members of the *gerousia*. There is, however, evidence that places in the *gerousia* were occupied by some significant families of the city. Marcus Aurelius Artemidorus, the son of Attalus, appears in an honorary inscription with his son, Marcus Aurelius Attalus. Artemidorus is clearly identified as a member of the *gerousia*, in addition to being a *neopoios* and an *agoranomos*. His son Attalus may also have been a member of the *gerousia* and *neopoios*. This identification, though, is based on a restoration, and raises questions because it would make Attalus the only known member of both the *boule* and the *gerousia* in Ephesus.

In fact, Attalus was not a member of both bodies. The juxtaposition of *gerousiastes* and *patroboulos* can be explained in two ways. The restoration provided in *Die Inschriften von Ephesos* makes Attalus a member of the *boule* because of his father, a *gerousiastes* and a *neopoios*. The first half of the inscription, honouring his father, does not identify Artemidorus as a member of the *boule*, so the term *patroboulos* would seem inconsistent, if not for a second inscription that supports the restoration. The restorations contained in this inscription, however, are also somewhat problematic, since it is the case endings which are restored.

---

135 Cat. no. 26 (*IEph* 1575).
136 Cat. no. 27: *Sn* 1182, *SEG* 37: 1309 ad 756 where *patroboulos* is considered to be an inherited term.
The word *patroboulos* is important for the understanding of these inscriptions, so it deserves some comment. The term appears only rarely in the provinces of Asia.\(^{137}\) Three other men are identified in Ephesus as *patrobouloi*: Lucius Junius Julianus, Lysimachus Mundicius and his son of the same name.\(^{138}\) These three men appear in lists of *kouretes* in which several others are identified as *bouleutai*, which suggests that *patroboulos* was a title distinct from *bouleutes*. The term could, therefore, refer to an individual who had been adopted by the *boule* as an honorary member; it was not a title describing an individual who owed membership in the *boule* to his father.\(^{139}\) The term *patrogeron* would appear to have been used in the same way.\(^{140}\) The conclusion of the decree recording the financial arrangements of Nicomedes discussed above in the previous section includes the provision that Nicomedes himself and his sons should be publicly proclaimed and considered *patrogerontes* as a result of his efforts to revive a religious feast, thus supporting the honorary interpretation of both titles.\(^{141}\)

*Patroboulos*, however, is not the only problematic element in the two inscriptions. The difficulty arises in the attribution of the titles *patroboulos*, *gerousiastes*, and *neopoios*. Oliver, in *The Sacred Gerousia* (1941), could not compare the two inscriptions because the second, *IEph* 972, had not yet been published. He appears, however, to have realized that the restoration later adopted in *Die Inschriften von Ephesos* would create the

\(^{137}\) The term does appear in an inscription from Cilicia (*MAMA* III.756; *SEG* 37 (1987): 1309). The interpretation of its appearance in this case is uncertain.

\(^{138}\) Julianus and Lysimachus Mundicius: *JôAI* 54 (1983): 125-126; Lysimachus Mundicius the son of Lysimachus: *IEph* 1044; cf. cat. no. 63, where Lysimachus Mundicius the son of Lysimachus is simply *bouleutes*.

\(^{139}\) Cf. Dmitriev (2005): 170, where it is argued that *patroboulos* identifies an individual who was intended to be associated with the *boule* by virtue of his family. This does not contradict the interpretation given here: association does equal equal standing within the *boule*.

\(^{140}\) *πατρογέρων* appears twice: Cat. nos. 27 & 56.

\(^{141}\) Cat. no. 56. The award of the title *patrogerontes* to Nicomedes and his son indicates that they were not members of the *gerousia*, even in an honorary sense, before this decree.
impression of a *gerousiastes* who was also a *bouleutes*; such a concurrent appearance is otherwise not attested, so that an attempt should be made to reconcile these inscriptions with the well-attested usages.

\[IEph\ 1575.8-13\ (cf.\ cat.\ no.\ 26)\]
\[\text{καὶ Μ(ἀρκος) Ἀυρ(ῆλιος) ['Αππαλος] 'Ἀρτεμ[ίδωρος] πατρό[βουλος θερο[-] σιαστής νεώ[-] ποιός [- - - - -] 'Ολυμ[πιονείκης]}
\]

\[IEph\ 972.\ 22-28\ (cf.\ cat.\ no.\ 27)\]

Fig. 1: Line drawing of *IEph* 1575 (Hicks, *GIBM* 575).

Oliver accepted Hicks’ restoration of *patro[geron gerou]siast[es]* in his version of *IEph* 1575, but in light of *IEph* 972, there can be little doubt but that *patro[boulos]* is the correct restoration.\(^{142}\) It may be argued that the restorations should be left as published in *Die Inschriften von Ephesos*, as printed above, since *patro[boulos]* is most likely an honorary term which would not necessarily identify one as a full *bouleutes* and therefore not a *gerousiastes*. This, however, does not take into account the usage of *patro[boulos]*. Although it appears only sparsely in the epigraphic record, no individual is identified as a

\(^{142}\) Hicks, *GIBM* 575; Oliver (1941): 105-106: “like his father, a member of the *gerousia*.”
patroboulos with another title such as, for example, neopoios: patroboulos appears alone. The very infrequency of its appearance, though, renders this conclusion tentative only; nonetheless, it is possible to read patroboulos as the only title of Aurelius Attalus in these two inscriptions so that it then corresponds to the other extant examples.

The attribution of the titles to father or son is obviously dependent upon their case endings. A comparison of the two inscriptions quoted above reveals that the restorations in Die Inschriften von Ephesos should not be over-hastily accepted. IEph 972 suggests that neo]poio[u, not neo]poio[s should be read in lines 11-12 of IEph 1575, particularly since lines 4-5 identify Artemidorus as neopoios. Accepting this emendation, one is virtually required to suppose the presence of a huios in one of the lacunae in order to account for the separation of Artem[idorou in line 9 and neo]poio[u in lines 11-12. If this filiation is restored in line 12, it is then possible to read lines 10-11 as gerou]siast[ou rather than gerou]siast[es, creating the double filiation which appears in IEph 972. IEph 1575 would then read: “Marcus Aurelius Attalus, son of Artemidorus, an honorary member of the boule, and the son of a member of the gerousia and neopoios. He was a victor in the Olympian games.” Thus, the status of his father becomes an additional factor in his own status. One is then obliged to read gerousia]stes in line 25 of IEph 972: “Aurelius Attalus, son of Artemidorus the gerousiastes, an honorary member of the boule, and the son of a neopoios.”

143 Father and son, then, would appear with the same titles in each inscription, if not in the same sequential arrangement:

143 This use of gerousiastes as a title of one's father is not unparalleled. A fragmentary inscription does not preserve the name of the woman concerned, but she may be identified as the daughter of ...nus, a gerousiastes (Cat. no. 25).
The reordering of the titles in the two inscriptions is easily explained. The simplest solution is to fall back on the assumption that the composer of the inscriptions was inconsistent. But more probably, the reordering may have been adopted for the purposes of identification. Artemidorus is identified in the first half of *IEph* 1575, so the simple genitive of his name in line 9 is sufficient to identify him as the father of Attalus. The subsequent mention of his offices would, instead of being an identification, be a reflection upon his son, conferring status or honour from the fact that he is the son of a member of the *gerousia* and a *neopoios*. The second inscription, *IEph* 972, does not, however, mention Artemidorus except in Attalus' filiation. There was no shortage of Aurelii Artemidori in Ephesus, with nine different individuals in addition to Attalus and...
his father in the indices of *Die Inschriften von Ephesos* alone.\textsuperscript{144} The transposition, therefore, allows the identification of Attalus immediately, before the addition of his other titles.

These emendations also avoid the simultaneous membership in the *boule* and *gerousia* which otherwise does not seem to appear. The closest instances of simultaneous membership are Nicomedes and his sons, who were honorary members because of Nicomedes' ‘generosity’, and Tiberius Claudius Moschas, who oversaw the erection of at least two statues in the mid-third century.\textsuperscript{145} In the inscription that accompanied the first of these, he is identified as *ekdikos* of the *sunhedrion*; in the second, he is *ekdikos* of the *gerousia*. Although this seems to identify the *sunhedrion* with the *gerousia*, one should not be too hasty in accepting the identification.

Elsewhere, *sunhedrion* is used as an alternative for *boule* and it was argued in Chapter Three and earlier in this chapter that *sunhedrion* is not generally equivalent to *gerousia*.\textsuperscript{146} Thus, Marcus Aurelius Artemidorus and Marcus Aurelius Telephus are identified as the *boularchoi* of the *sunhedrion*, that is, the leaders of the *boule*.\textsuperscript{147} This precedent, then, suggests that Claudius Moschas should be understood as being the *ekdikos* of the *boule* in the first inscription in which he is named.\textsuperscript{148} The second inscription, however, adds that he was *ekdikos* of the *gerousia*. It will be argued in Chapter Five, though, that the *ekdikos* was probably not a regular member of the

\textsuperscript{144} *IEph* 300, 624, 742, 3058, 3079, 3247, 3291a, 4343.

\textsuperscript{145} Cat. nos. 46 & 47 (*IEph* 737 & 892).

\textsuperscript{146} Above, Chapter Three, pp. 70-74; cf. cat. no. 54 f. 17: *bouleutikou sunhedriou*.

\textsuperscript{147} *IEph* 742; this Marcus Aurelius Artemidorus – of whom there were several in Ephesus – is distinct from Marcus Aurelius Artemidorus the son of Attalus.

\textsuperscript{148} Cat. no. 46.
gerousia, that is, Moschas may have been an external official but not necessarily a gerousiastes himself: he was the ekdikos of two different bodies.

There are three final members of the gerousia whom a few remarks will be sufficient to identify. The fragmentary inscription which appears on the same stone as that of Marcus Aurelius Agathopus contains only two legible lines. A man named Saturninus appears in the genitive, followed immediately by presbeuteron; it is possible, therefore, that the son of Saturninus was a member of the Elders.\footnote{Cat. no. 23.} Falcidius Epigonus is identified as the grammateus of the gerousia, which should be as certain a criterion as the use of gerousiastes or ek gerousias.\footnote{Cat. no. 27.} Finally, Straton is identified as the pragmatikos apo gerousias.\footnote{Cat. no. 89.} The nature of this position will be considered at greater length below in Chapter Five, so it should be sufficient to suggest that Straton’s title probably identifies him as surely as Falcidius Epigonus’ title.

The names of three individuals, Lucius Pomp..., Gaius Octavius Magnus and Herakleides Passalas, are followed by the term presbuteros.\footnote{Cat. nos. 51, 59 & 71.} Only one of these men, Lucius Pomp... has been included in Table 1, as there is no obvious reason that the term should not in his case be understood as gerousiastes. Presbuteros, however, appears to have been added to the funerary inscription of Octavius Magnus: if the term refers to membership in the gerousia in this case, it would seem to imply that he gained posthumous membership in the gerousia. While not impossible, this is unlikely. A simpler explanation for the addition of the word may be that it was added by a son who shared his name. A second Herakleides Passalas is not attested in the subscription list in
which Passalas *presbuteros* appears, but it is possible that the term still served to

distinguish an elder Herakleides Passalas from a younger, particularly as no other

individual in the preserved portions of this list have titles. The membership of Lucius
Pomp... seems probable, but that of Octavius Magnus and Herakleides Passalas is less

likely, though not impossible.

4.4.4. Non-members of the *Gerousia*\(^{153}\)

4.4.4.1 Aelius Martiales

A word remains to be said about those individuals who are certainly not members

of the *gerousia*. A letter unrelated to the series discussed at the beginning of this section

was addressed to the *gerousia* between AD 161 and 180, apparently concerning the

activities of Aelius Martiales during his service as Asiarch.\(^{154}\) Ambassadorial

*gerousiastai* may be inferable from this letter, but they are not certainly known to have

been involved, nor, if they were, are their names preserved. The letter, though

fragmentary, appears to be concerned with a dispute between the *gerousia* and Martiales:

the *gerousia* would have expected something from Martiales as Asiarch which he did not

deliver. Such a dispute is not unique. Antoninus Pius dealt with a similar matter when

he informed the magistrates and *boule* of the city that while Vedius Antoninus did not

provide games or handouts he was nonetheless deserving of public acknowledgment

because of his building activities.\(^{155}\) Antoninus Pius owed his information in that case to

Vedius Antoninus himself: he expresses displeasure at the failure of the Ephesians to

inform him of the actions which Vedius Antoninus took during his office. Martiales may

\(^{153}\) Gaius Stertinius Orpex, Gaius Vibius Salutaris and [Tiberius Claudius] Nicomedes are omitted from this
discussion since it seems clear from the terms of their benefactions that they were not members of the
*gerousia* but simply benefactors of it.

\(^{154}\) Cat. no. 18.

\(^{155}\) *IEph* 1491, dated to AD 141-146.
have similarly informed the emperors, so that the letter does not require an embassy of the gerousia to have been undertaken at all.

What the gerousia expected of Martiales is not specified, but it may have been a gesture as simple as providing distributions for the gerousia and other bodies of the city. Martiales appears to be known from only one other inscription in Asia Minor: he erected a statue to Publius Atilius Clarus in Ephesus. The emperors clearly support Martiales, as Antoninus Pius had supported Vedius Antoninus, recalling Martiales’ past services to the city (polla tekmeira) and apparently adding that in light of these services the gerousia could not reasonably expect Martiales to cater to its pleasures. His euergetic gesture is described simply as an indication of his prosekousan philoteimian, his appropriate generosity. This phrase, like the rest of the letter, leaves no doubt that the emperors looked favourably upon Martiales’ benefaction, which was probably a lasting contribution to the city, such as a building or public monument rather than, for example, a distribution of money. The letter cannot be seen as a parallel to the early Imperial letters discussed at the beginning of this section, but rather as the response to a dispute between an Asiarch and the gerousia: Martiales was neither an ambassador for nor a member of the gerousia.

The preceding interpretation of this letter fragment presents one major difficulty: if the letter is in fact a rebuke of the gerousia for failing to properly acknowledge Martiales’ philoteimia, why was it inscribed? The answer must be that Martiales himself wanted the inscription to be made plain, just as Vedius Antoninus made his situation known by the display of his correspondence with the emperor on the walls of the

---

156 Eph 621a; one other fragment mentions a Publius Aelius M... but it is too fragmentary to draw any conclusions about the full identity of Publius Aelius M... (Eph 695a).
bouleuterion. The inscription was discovered in the prytaneion, whereas the letters addressed to the gerousia were discovered in the Tetragonous agora. The prytaneion was the site of public/religious inscriptions and adjacent to the commercial agora and the bouleuterion, an area with strong Imperial associations: it was a location chosen by Martiales himself, and not by the recipients of the letter (Figure 3). Martiales had to exonerate himself from public disapproval, and the erection of an Imperial letter commending his services was the most appropriate way to do so. The only more prominent location he could have chosen would have been the Temple of the Flavian Emperors. The proximity of the bouleuterion may have been a factor in the placement of the inscription: Vedius Antoninus had inscribed the letter which exonerated him on the walls of the bouleuterion, so that Martiales’ use of the prytaneion would call the attention of the Ephesians to the benefactors whom they had failed to acclaim properly.

4.4.4.2. Marcus Aurelius Agathopus and Popillius Bassus

Oliver, in his 1941 study of the gerousia, followed Hicks’ interpretation that Marcus Aurelius Agathopus was a member of the gerousia. Agathopus appears in two inscriptions from Ephesus, both of which are dedications. The first is a thanksgiving offering to “the god” (probably Dionysus), Artemis and the Tyche of the gerousia; the inscription is concluded by the phrase ho autos grammateus kai gymnasiarchos. Hicks

---

158 Scherrer (2001): 71 suggests that the triple-aisled stoa in front of the bouleuterion and prytaneion “served as an Imperial portrait gallery, with statues of Augustus and his wife Livia (and probably his stepson and co-emperor Tiberius) placed in a separate room at the E end.”
159 Although this letter has been treated as addressed to the gerousia, the address-lines are only partially extant. It is possible, therefore, that the letter was addressed to the boule, demos and gerousia rather than to the gerousia alone. Such an extension of addressees does not alter the interpretation of the letter provided here.
160 Cat. no. 23 (IEph 1587).
identified the referent of this conclusion as Agathopus.\footnote{161} Although this is possible, *ho autos* may refer back to a named *grammateus* in a previous, related inscription.

This inscription is inscribed on a stone below a first inscription which has been partially erased, so that *ho autos grammateus* may have been named in the erased portion. The placement of the offices of *grammateus* and gymnasiarch at the end of the inscription separated from the official’s name would be unusual. These titles normally follow immediately upon the name of the individual and before the reason for the dedication. They are not separated from the name of the individual by either the text of the inscription or the intensifying *ho autos*. If the titles were meant to describe Agathopus, it seems unlikely – but not impossible – that they would have been preceded by the article, let alone the pronoun.

There is, however, a similar use of *ho autos*. An inscription recording several dedications begins with the names of Marcus Aurelius Parnassus and his son Asclepides; the phrase *ho autos* appears after Asclepides’ name.\footnote{162}

```
euy:
Μἀρ(κος) Αὐρ(ήλιος) Παρ-
 νασσὸς Ἄσσο-
 κληπίδου φιλο-
 σεβαστὸς

Μἀρ(κος) Αὐρ(ήλιος) Ἀσσακλ-
 ηπίδης Παρ-
 νασσοῦ φιλοσέ-
 βαστὸς
```

There is little reason to doubt that *ho autos hiereus* refers to Asclepides. Consequently, while the phrasing may be unusual in Agathopus’ inscription, it is not impossible that he is the *grammateus* and gymnasiarch in question.

The identification of Agathopus as the *grammateus* and gymnasiarch of the *gerousia*, however, raises problems. Let it be noted first of all, though, that Agathopus

\footnote{161} Hicks, *GIBM* 587.
\footnote{162} Cat. no. 27.
(or the individual named in the first portion, for that matter) is identified simply as a *grammateus* and gymnasiarch. The *gerousia* was hardly the only body in the city to have its own *grammateus* and a gymnasiarch need not have been a member of the group for which he provided oil. The dedication was set up by Agathopus with his children “because [he had] preserved the *pistis* of the *gerousia.*” Hicks and Oliver argue from this that Agathopus offered the dedication after he had completed service as one of the *gerousia*’s officers. *Pistis*, however, does not appear in this way in the inscriptions from Ephesus. *He Pistis* can be used to refer to an office, but the primary meaning of ‘faith’, ‘trust’ or ‘pledge’ is preferable here – “I have preserved the trust of the *gerousia.*” The verb *tereo* is only rarely used to describe the completion of an office or service. Much more common for such actions are the verbs *poieo* and *ekteleo*. The verb should be understood simply as ‘to protect, watch over’ rather than an extrapolated meaning of having filled an office.

The combination of *tereo* and *pistis* does appear elsewhere, and in the sense suggested here rather than of fulfilling an office (Hicks’ and Oliver’s interpretation). The apostle Paul, in the *Second Letter to Timothy*, claims, ‘I have fought the good fight, I have completed the course, I have preserved the faith.’ *Pistis* is used here in the sense of faith in God and Christ, so that the phrase *ten pisten tetereka* is a statement of Paul’s perseverance, of his performance of his duty. It is this sense which is conveyed in Agathopus’ dedication: he has done his duty with respect to the *gerousia*, not his office within the *gerousia*.

---

163 Schulte (1994); cf. below Chapters Four and Five.
164 *LSJ*, s.v. *τηρέω*.
165 2 Tim. 4:7: τόν καλὸν ἄγωνα ἡγάλωσαί, τόν δρόμον τετέλεκα, τήν πίστιν τετήρηκα.
Agathopus' *pistis* was not an abstract belief, but a physical thing, probably a parcel of land or a sum of money. It is known that the *gerousia* was involved in the lending and borrowing of money, so that it is entirely plausible that it should also have been in the habit of giving security for its loans, namely a *pistis*. While it is true that the parallel for this third century use of *pistis* predates Agathopus by approximately one hundred and fifty years, it is preferable to the much more rare sense in which Hicks and Oliver understand it. Agathopus, regardless of the identity of the *grammateus* and gymnasiarch, was not a member of the *gerousia*, but a creditor who had held property as collateral for a loan.

There is a second dedication to Artemis and the *gerousia*, adding the emperor among the dedicatees: an undated inscription records a dedication by Popillius Bassus. Whereas Agathopus' dedication was to the Tyche of the *gerousia*, Bassus' was dedicated to the Elders (*presbeuteroi*). *Presbeuteroi* should be interpreted as the *gerousia* in this case, since there is nothing to indicate that the inscription is in anyway related to athletic activities of the older boys. This inscription is less detailed than in the case of Agathopus, naming only the dedicatees and the dedicator himself. One would not, however, suggest that Bassus had performed an office within the *gerousia* on the sole evidence of this dedication. Because of the absence of any other testimonia of Bassus, his dedication should be viewed as similar to that of Agathopus but even less certain: he *may* have been a creditor of, rather than a member of, the *gerousia*.

---

166 On the financial activities of the *gerousia*, see below, Chapter Six.
167 Cat. no. 30 (*IEph* 711).
4.4.4.3. Trypho: *geraios epi thymiatros*

The term *geraios*, which appears ten times among the Ephesian inscriptions, has been seen as one of the indications of membership in the *gerousia.* In four instances, it follows the name of one of the *hierourgoi* of Artemis in the *kouretes* lists, Trypho. The title *geraios* appears in four out of Trypho’s nine appearances in the *kouretes* lists, consistently between his name and the specification of his role within the cult of Artemis, *epi thymiatros*. The term *akrobates* appears in four instances in place of *geraios*; only once is Trypho identified simply as *epi thymiatros*.

Titles such as *bouleutes* and *ek gerousias* are frequently placed at the end of a line, that is, after an individual’s name and his position in the cult, but this is not universally the case: *bouleutes* can be placed before the position in the cult. *Ek gerousias* (to indicate membership in the *gerousia*), however, always appears after the position in the cult. Consequently, the placement of *geraios*, if, as has been assumed, it identifies him as a member of the *gerousia*, in the case of Trypho’s name would be unusual, though not impossible. More telling are the terms which can appear in place of *geraios*, namely *hieros* or *akrobates*. The phrase *epi thymiatros* is preceded in the cases of other *epi thumiatroi* by *hieros* (fourteen times) or simply a name. Obviously, neither *akrobates* nor *hieros* is a title in the range of Ephesian offices; they are associated with the cult of Artemis. The implication, therefore, is that *geraios* also refers to the cult of Artemis.

---

168 So, for example, Engelmann, Knibbe & Merkelbach (1980): 19-21, IEph 1026-1029. The term does appear to refer to the *gerousia* in a verse inscription from Side (ISide 106, I.12).
169 *Geraios epi thymiatros*: IEph 1026-1029; *akrobates epi thymiatros*: IEph 1022-1025; *epi thymiatros*: IEph 1021.
The word can mean “old, elderly”, but it can also mean “revered”, as it does in the case of Trypho and several other individuals.

In addition to the consistent placement of *ek gerousias* in the *kouretes* lists after the position in the cult, there is a consistency in the use of *ek gerousias* in the *kouretes* lists to indicate membership in the *gerousia*.\(^1\) It may also be noted that a second *epi thymiatros*, Onesimus, is described as a *hieros epi thymiatrou ek gerousias*, suggesting that the adjective preceding *epi thymiatrou* is closely related to that position, and does not indicate a separate status: one could logically expect *geraios epi thymiatrou ek gerousias*, an instance of redundancy if *geraios* could serve to identify a member of the *gerousia*.\(^2\) Since *geraios* is in the same position in the case of Trypho, that adjective should also be understood as reflective of the office, not of Trypho himself. The lists of the *kouretes* are public religious documents, so that one would expect a certain uniformity in their language. The only term used to identify members of the *boule* in these lists is *bouleutes*. Thus, the presence of two terms to identify members of the *gerousia* must be regarded as unusual. It is, therefore, preferable to omit Trypho from a count of *gerousia* members.

The term *geraios*, however, is applied to five additional individuals in Ephesus. Tiberius Claudius Quadratus appears in a list of *leukophorountes* as a *geraios*.\(^3\) Gnaeus Julius Artemidorus also appears in the inscription, but as a *gerousiastes* rather than a *geraios*. To identify Quadratus as a member would violate the consistent trend of

---

\(^1\) Cf. above, pp. 106-108, n. 119.
\(^2\) Cat. no. 64 (*IEph* 1040). Although restored, the reading is entirely reasonable, given the consistency of names and titles in these lists. Without the introduction of a new individual, the ON at the end of line 27 must be the remains of Onesimus, who is consistently the *τερός ἐπὶ θυμιάτρος*, and *ἐκ* in these lists is regularly followed by *γεροʊσιας*.
\(^3\) Cat. no. 68; *IEph* 907.
identifying members by a single term in any given inscription. Cleander the son of Timothy identifies himself as *geraios* and as an *akrobates* in a thanksgiving dedication.\(^{174}\) Claudius Vedius I... is named in a list of *mystai* of Dionysus as a *geraios*, but he is the only individual in the preserved list who would then have a title apart from his service as a *mystes*.\(^{175}\) A Christian sarcophagus identifies a Timothy *gereos* from Sicily, with no other titles.\(^{176}\) Finally, Marcus Aurelius Alexander, like Cleander the son of Timothy, is identified as a *geraios* and an *akrobates* of Artemis in an inscription commemorating the reconstruction of a building in the region of the Artemision.\(^{177}\)

These individuals are not known from other inscriptions to have been members of the *gerousia*. If *geraios* does imply membership, Timothy of Sicily would be the only known Christian member of the Ephesian *gerousia*.\(^{178}\) The term could instead be a parallel for *neoteros*, which also precedes the mention of a role in the cult of Artemis in the *kouretes* lists, so that these individuals are identified as the elder or junior of that name, or, more probably, *geraios* was used simply as an indication of reverence or honour associated with specific activities within the cult of Artemis.

### 4.5. Conclusions

Some members of the *gerousia* belonged to wealthy families. The absence from the surviving inscriptions of any members of the well-known families of benefactors and the absence of members of the *boule* suggests that the *gerousia* was a body composed of what may be tentatively termed the lower-upper and upper classes of Ephesian citizens.

---

\(^{174}\) *IEph* 941.

\(^{175}\) *IEph* 1602 c+d.

\(^{176}\) *IEph* 2223, 2223a.

\(^{177}\) *IEph* 4327.

\(^{178}\) That Timothy was Christian is not in itself an argument against his membership in the *gerousia*; the use of *geraios* in Ephesus suggests this; cf. above, Chapter Three, p. 68, n. 18 & *IEph* 2227.
The appearance of some members of the *gerousia* in other positions, such as *agoranomos*, indicates that a moderate degree of wealth probably pervaded the *gerousia*.\(^{179}\)

The preceding discussion will have demonstrated that although no enrolment list of *gerousiastai* in the manner of the example from Sidyma has been discovered in Ephesus, many members of the Ephesian *gerousia* can nonetheless be identified. The *gerousia* was, not surprisingly, not composed of a representative cross-section of the Ephesian population: neither slaves nor females were members. There is only one attested freedman among the *gerousiastai*, but he may be a special case: Zoticus was a freedman, but he was a freedman of the *Sebastoi*, the emperors.\(^{180}\) The freedmen of regular Ephesian citizens do not appear to have belonged to the *gerousia*.

The size of the Ephesian *gerousia* can be determined with some degree of certainty only for two periods of time. The foundation of Gaius Stertinius Orpex in the mid-first century provided sufficient resources for a *dianome* for the members of the *gerousia* at a specified rate. The description of the distribution as a *dianome* indicates that all members of the *gerousia* were recipients, so that a membership of approximately one hundred to one hundred and twenty men can be postulated for this time period.

The next indication of the number of members of the *gerousia* is the endowment of Gaius Vibius Salutaris. Again, the members of the *gerousia* are the recipients of a cash distribution, but in this case it is termed a *kleros*, a term which indicates that the distribution was treated as a lottery, so that only a portion of the members of the *gerousia* would receive a gift. The interest destined to provide this distribution was sufficient for

\(^{179}\) The offices held by the *gerousiastai* at length in Chapter Five.

\(^{180}\) Cat. no. 75; *JOAI* 26 (1930):18 no. II.
three hundred and nine men. Assuming that the greater part of the gerousia received a share in Salutaris' benefaction, one can hypothesize a total membership of perhaps four hundred men at the beginning of the second century.

The three to fourfold increase in the number of gerousiastes could be considered extraordinary, except for the fact that the population of Ephesus was increasing during this period. Significant growth over a century is not remarkable, so Philostratus' comment about the size of the city may be an indication that a large part of this growth occurred in the early part of this century, that is, in the second half of the first century AD. The tripling or quadrupling of the gerousia would then correspond to a considerable increase in the overall population of Ephesus, though the city itself need not have tripled. Moreover, it will be suggested in Chapter Six that imperial officials took an active interest in the gerousia during this time, which may have contributed to its growth. The gerousia may have been continuously growing from year to year, or it may have grown through general increases from time to time. There is insufficient evidence to determine which pattern was responsible for the increase in the size of the institution, but the latter may be more probable.

Membership in the gerousia could be indicated in two ways. It could be conveyed by gerousiastes, just as bouleutes was used to indicate membership in the boule. Additionally, an individual could be identified as a member of the gerousia by the prepositional phrase ek gerousias or the participial phrase metechon ek tes gerousias. The latter two phrases were not as common as gerousiastes, and there does not seem to have been a pattern of use corresponding to the passage of time. With the exception of
such formalized documents as the *kouretes* lists of the *prytaneion*, the choice between these three phrases appears to have been left to the discretion of the individual.
5. THE GEROUSTAI PT. II - OFFICERS OF THE EPHESIAN GEROUSIA

5.1. Introduction

All modern accounts of the gerousia, whether considerations of the gerousia within a single city or of the gerousiai of multiple cities, include at the very least a brief note on at least some of the officers of the gerousia. Such analyses are in general based on the assumption that the gerousiai did not change in character during the periods for which there is evidence. Moreover, many scholars focus on identifying the leading official or officials of the body, but such identifications are distorted by the prior assumptions about the nature of the gerousia. A further presupposition underlies the process of assigning officials even relative ranks within the body, namely that the gerousia possessed an hierarchical structure.

Mommsen, on the basis of the inscription from Sidyma noted in Chapter Four, proposed that the chief officer of the gerousia was the gymnasiarch.1 Such a proposal is reasonable, since a prominent place is given to the gymnasiarch Euelthon Eutyches Telesius in that inscription, but Mommsen's conclusion should not be applied to all gerousiai indiscriminately: it presents the gerousia a priori as a social body. He is, however, correct – if the discussion is limited to Sidyma. Menadier identified the chief official of the gerousia with the general title prostates tes gerousias, assigning to the body a kind of magisterial system.2 Such an identification is consistent with his view of the gerousia as a semi-political body. There is, however, no indication in Menadier's account of what exactly the prostates would have done. A prostates does not appear in Ephesus.

1 Mommsen (1921): 326 n. 1; TAM II, 175 & 176; cf. above Chapter Four, pp. 79-82.
2 Menadier (1880): 50.
Inevitably, accounts of the officers of the *gerousia* suffer from the assumption – explicitly stated or not – that *gerousiai* did not vary significantly from city to city. Oliver, who does recognize two distinct types of *gerousiai*, does not make allowance for a variation in the officers within these two groups. Evidence for an officer from one city is often used in conjunction with evidence from another city with no consideration of whether such association is appropriate. Sviatoslov Dmitriev has recently collected and analyzed the documentary evidence for civic government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia: this work, while identifying similarities between cities, also makes clear the potential for variation between the civic government of individual cities. It must be acknowledged that the same potential exists in the case of the organization of the *gerousia*. This chapter, therefore, examines the members of the Ephesian *gerousia* and their positions both in that body.

An analysis of the positions attested within the *gerousia* will, it is hoped, reveal some details about the workings of that body, but it is important to keep in mind that the *gerousiastai* fulfilled other public roles, whether secular or sacred. Consequently, this chapter will also consider the activities of the *gerousiastai* in the public life of the city. It will become clear from the offices and positions discussed in the second part of this chapter that the members of the Ephesian *gerousia* occupied positions which were noteworthy and which conferred honour upon their occupants, but which were not of the highest rank in the city. It will also emerge that many of those offices held by the *gerousiastai* had associations with the religious life of the city.

---

5.2. Officers of the Gerousia

Lévy's account of the official positions within the gerousia in his article, "Études sur la vie municipale de l'Asie Mineure sous les Antonins", is perhaps the most detailed of all modern discussions in this respect and so will serve as a convenient starting point for this consideration. As the title of his article suggests, Lévy considers the gerousia as an institution in the provinces of Asia Minor rather than as an institution in a single city. He sees the gerousia as a type of miniature state, whose officials and titles corresponded to those of the city at large, a view which Chapot also put forth. Thus, the specific functions of officials such as the archon, prostates and grammateus would seem to be relatively clear; they are, in consequence, not discussed in any significant detail in Lévy's article. The responsibilities of other officers, however, were less clear to Lévy.

Initially, the gymnasiarch of the gerousia, as his title suggests, was probably responsible for the direction of a gymnasium, but this function appears to have been lost nearly everywhere by the period for which evidence is available. The provision of oil or of money to purchase oil, however, remained an important part of the gymnasiarchs' duties. The rank of the gymnasiarch within the structure of the gerousia is dependent on the perceived nature of the gerousia. Thus, Mommsen saw the gymnasiarch as the leading officer of the gerousia, in which belief he was followed by Hogarth, Lévy and Oliver, but opposed by Hicks and Chapot.

---

4 Lévy, (1895): 245-249.
5 Lévy (1895): 245; Chapot (1967): 228.
6 Lévy (1895): 246.
7 Mommsen (1921): 326 n. 1; Oliver (1941): 43; Hogarth (1891): 73; Lévy (1895): 246; Hicks (1870): 76; Chapot (1967): 228-229.
The *grammateus* of the *gerousia* alternately is believed to occupy the first or second position within the *gerousia*. The identification of the *grammateus* as the senior official is primarily a result of that officer's frequent appearance in the epigraphic material. Chapot's argument that the *grammateus* was the most active because he is the most frequently attested is not an unreasonable assumption, but most active does not necessarily correlate with leadership. Similarly, Oliver suggests that the *grammateus* was the eponymous official of the *gerousia*. Again, however, it should be noted that the perception of the *gerousia* as a social or as a political body affects the relative positions of the *grammateus* and the gymnasiarch in any account of the body.

Menadier proposed that the *prostates* should be seen as the chief officer of the *gerousia*, while Chapot places this official below the *grammateus*, in a secondary position. Lévy passes over this officer without further comment on his duties other than that they are not specifically known. The word itself, which can be rendered as president, would seem to indicate that this officer was a leader within the *gerousia* or at least an officer who held a representative role. This officer, in Chapot's scheme, ranks high because of the basic meaning of *prostates*, but below the *grammateus*, since he is not as frequently attested. Hogarth, on the other hand, believes that this title and that of *archon* were, because of their rarity, little more than honorary titles. Whether the *prostates* was honorary or not, there is no attested *prostates* of the Ephesian *gerousia*.

The *gerousia*'s possession of financial resources suggests that at least one member of the body should have served to administer its monetary and landed holdings.

---

8 First position: Chapot (1967): 228; Hicks (1870): 76.
9 It may be noted that the gymnasiarch is actually the most attested officer in the Ephesian *gerousia*; see below, Table 3, p. 139; pp. 149-156.
10 Oliver (1941): 43.
11 Menadier (1890): 50; Lévy (1895): 245; Chapot (1967): 228; Hogarth (1891): 73.
Various titles for this position appear to have been used in Asia Minor. Thus, a tamias is known from Cadyanda, a pragmatikos from Magnesia, a college of dioiketai from Iasos and a logistes from Trajanopolis.\(^{12}\) It may be remembered that logistoi are also known from Ephesus, as is a pragmatikos.\(^{13}\) The existence of four titles for financial officials may suggest that their duties were not limited only to the direction of the gerousia's monetary resources, but the variety also emphasizes the potential for diversity between the gerousiai of different cities, not only in the use of titles but also in activities. Certain resources were assigned, Lévy suggests, to the gymnasiarch for the maintenance of tombs and for other specified purposes by this financial officer. Lévy does not assign a rank to this individual, but Hicks suggests an unspecified "receiving officer" below the grammateus and above the gymnasiarch.\(^{14}\)

Finally, the gerousia had, either from within its membership or, more probably, at its disposal, representatives or advocates who were charged with the defence and legal representation of the body's interest. Chapot leaves this officer untitled, though Lévy notes that in Apamaea a sunegoros appears to have fulfilled this duty.\(^{15}\) It will be argued that, in the case of Ephesus, the ekdikos served in this capacity.

Occasionally, hymnodoi appear in conjunction with the gerousia. This position may be a remnant of an earlier organization, but, despite the literal meaning of the title, probably refers neither to the leader of a number of musicians within the gerousia, nor to

\(^{12}\) Lévy (1895): 249. Cadyanda: \textit{BCH} 10 (1886): 53-56, no. 10; Magnesia: \textit{BCH} 6 (1882): 204; Iasos: \textit{REG} 6 (1893): 169-171, no. 6; Trajanopolis: \textit{L-W} 1677. In the case of Cadyana, as in Sidyma, it appears that membership in the boule did not preclude membership in the gerousia: Hyperenor Cadyandes, grammateus of the boule and tamias of the gerousia, is honoured.

\(^{13}\) Logistes: Cat. nos. 17 & 41; pragmatikos: Cat. no. 89.

\(^{14}\) Hicks (1870): 76.

\(^{15}\) Chapot (1967): 229; Lévy (1895): 249; \textit{BCH} 17 (1893): 247-248, no. 18.
a singer of hymns on festive days.\textsuperscript{16} Hymnodoi known from other inscriptions were generally prominent citizens, holding magistracies and priesthoods which, in Lévy’s opinion, would have been “incompatibles avec les functions subalterns qu’on leur prête.”\textsuperscript{17} One hymnodos was a prytanis, one a director of a festival, and one a boularch, positions which hardly seem consistent with the position of a mere singer. Hymnodoi or former hymnodoi are known to have held leading positions in Ephesus as well. Thus, a hymnodos was grammateus of the boule and demos, boularch, eirenarch, strategos and agoranomos.\textsuperscript{18} Lévy suggests that the hymnodoi should be seen as a college of individuals which had a religious character and which was attached to the local temple, in the case of Ephesus, the Artemision.\textsuperscript{19}

The chrysophoroi also appear in connection with the gerousia in some cases. Four Ephesian chrysophoroi are known who were also gerousiastai.\textsuperscript{20} The chrysophoroi do not seem to have been active elsewhere in Ionia, but they do appear in Caria and other Asian regions. They were responsible for carrying the statues which Salutaris donated into the assembly on specified days, but otherwise their duties are not known.\textsuperscript{21} They were not necessarily members of the gerousia nor were gerousiastai necessarily chrysophoroi. There is only one instance of a chrysophoros of the gerousia. This appears in a dedication by a neopoios who describes himself as chrysophoroi ek gerousias philosebastou.\textsuperscript{22} In order to identify this individual as a chrysophoros of the gerousia, it is necessary to interpret ek gerousias not as ‘a member of the gerousia’

\textsuperscript{16} Lévy (1895): 246.
\textsuperscript{17} Lévy (1895): 247.
\textsuperscript{18} Lévy (1895): 247; prytanis: CIG 3160; procession director: CIG 3348; boularch: Ath. Mit. III: 57, Cat. no. 47; I Eph 892; grammateus: I Eph 1061; cf., I Eph 616, 645, 1600, 3088 & 3091.
\textsuperscript{19} Lévy (1895): 248.
\textsuperscript{20} Cat. nos. 20, 24, 27 & 68.
\textsuperscript{21} I Eph 27 E l. 419
\textsuperscript{22} Cat. no. 20.
which is its regular meaning, but rather as 'of the gerousia' as a modifier of the chrysophoros rather than of the individual himself; the use of the preposition would be unexpected if that were the intended meaning. A chrysophoros ek gerousias is not a chrysophoros of the gerousia, but a chrysophoros and a member of the gerousia. There is no evidence that either the hymnodoi or the chrysophoroi formed a college within the gerousia.

Identifying the officers of a body such as the gerousia is inevitably burdened with uncertainties. The epigraphic evidence is often not concerned with the titles of individual members. Rather, the title of gerousiastes, or a similar indication of membership in the gerousia, appears to have been a sufficient distinction without the need for additional mention of a position within that body. This deficiency has naturally led scholars to combine the evidence of the gerousiai of various cities in order to form an idea of the internal structure of the Asiatic gerousia. It is, however, incorrect to assume that the gerousiai of the various Asian cities were identical; there is no guarantee that a title attested in one city was also used in another, or that it had the same significance in all cities. The term dioiketai, for example, which seems to refer to a group within the gerousia in charge of financial resources in Iasos, does not appear in the evidence for the Ephesian gerousia.

Although there is only occasional mention of positions within the gerousia, it is possible to form an idea of the duties associated with them in the case of Ephesus. Of the fifty-four named members and probable members of the gerousia, ten are given titles to indicate their position within that body. Two of these are identified as grammateis of the

---

23 It should be noted, however, that in this case a portion of the inscription is restored, so that it reads χρυσοφόρῳ έκ τῆς γερουσίας.
24 REG 6 (1893) 169-171.
gerousia, seven as gymnasiarchoi, in two cases described as humon where the antecedent of the pronoun should be understood as the gerousia; there is one instance of a pragmatikos apo gerousias. In addition to these ten individuals, one unnamed individual is also attested as a grammateus of the Elders. A grammateus may, therefore, be included in the number of officers of the gerousia. There are, furthermore two logistai and two ekdikoi who, it will be argued, are not members of the gerousia (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Number of Individuals Attested</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammateus of the gerousia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cat. nos. 27, 31 &amp; 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasiarchos of the gerousia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cat. nos. 12-14, 24, 31, 38 &amp; 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatikos of the gerousia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cat. no. 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekdikos of the gerousia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cat. nos. 46, 47 &amp; 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistes of the gerousia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cat. nos. 17 &amp; 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Possible Officers of the gerousia

5.2.1. Grammateus of the Gerousia

The inscriptions of Ephesus reveal numerous secretaries of several different bodies. The most common grammateus to be named is the grammateus of the demos, who was responsible for certain financial affairs of the city. The lengthy inscription recording the foundation established by Gaius Vibius Salutaris suggests that these financial duties may have been more comprehensive and detailed than the financial duties of other grammateis, since the grammateus of the demos was to be entrusted with the resources to fund the distributions for the ephebes, the neoi and the baton-carrier, as well

---

25 Grammateis: cat. nos. 27 & 31; gymnasiarchoi: cat. nos. 12-14, 24, 31, 38 & 52; pragmatikos: Cat. no. 89.

26 Grammateus: Cat. no. 56.

27 The same ekdikos, Tiberius Claudius Moschas, appears in two inscriptions in the catalogue, cat. nos. 46 & 47.

28 Schulte (1994).
as the allowance for the cleaning of the statues: the *grammateus* of the *demos* was responsible for multiple distributions and allocations.\textsuperscript{29} Furthermore, this secretary was responsible for the erection of Imperial statues and letters, and for the reuse of old or damaged honorary monuments.\textsuperscript{30} The position was an influential one in the city.

The *grammateus* of the *boule* may originally have been the same individual as the *grammateus* of the *demos*.\textsuperscript{31} After the division of this original *grammateion* into two offices, the duties of the *grammateus* of the *boule* were not as broad as those of the *grammateus* of the *demos*, particularly since it seems that it was the *grammateus* of the *demos*, not the *grammateus* of the *boule*, who put matters to the vote in the *boule*.\textsuperscript{32} This secretary also appears in the Salutaris dossier, responsible for the distribution to the members of the *boule*.\textsuperscript{33} Thus, this officer had certain financial duties but he was also responsible for registering members of the *boule*. It was suggested above in Chapter Four that the distribution provided for the *bouleutai* by Salutaris was conducted by means of a simple queue, but it is no less plausible that it was conducted by name, beginning at the top and cycling through the name until the funds dedicated to this distribution were consumed.\textsuperscript{34}

The *grammateus* of the *gerousia* was more similar to the *grammateus* of the *boule* than to the *grammateus* of the *demos*. Claudia Schulte argues that specialized financial knowledge was required only occasionally of the *grammateis* of the *boule* and *gerousia*.

\textsuperscript{29} Cat. no. 54, *ll. 297-305*; Schulte (1994): 40-41.
\textsuperscript{30} Schulte (1994): 41-42.
\textsuperscript{31} Schulte (1994): 37; there are examples of the same individual serving as *grammateus* of the *boule* and of the *demos*, apparently simultaneously; cf. *IEph* 740.
\textsuperscript{32} Schulte (1994): 41.
\textsuperscript{33} Cat. no. 54; Schulte (1994): 38.
\textsuperscript{34} Above, Chapter Four, pp. 96-101, esp. n. 103.
but was a common area of expertise for the *grammateus* of the *demos*. The specific duties and actions of the *grammateus* of the *gerousia*, however, are infrequently attested. If the *grammateus* of the *gerousia* does differ from the *grammateus* of the *demos* with respect to his financial duties, his role was probably one of representing rather than of administering the *gerousia*.

Seven *grammateis* are associated with the *gerousia* in Ephesus, but only two named individuals are known indisputably to have been *grammateis* of the *gerousia*, Aphrodisius the son of Cleander and Falcidius Epigonus. The name of a third *grammateus* has been lost. Three further individuals, Perigenes, Publius Rutilius Bassus and an unknown man, also appear in connection with the *gerousia*. Finally, the series of documents recording the benefaction of Salutaris makes mention of the *grammateus* in a general, rather than a specific and individual, sense.

Aphrodisius and Epigonus appear in inscriptions which shed little light on the activities of the *grammateus* of the *gerousia*. Some conclusions, however, can be drawn from their identification. The inscription which records Aphrodisius’ position is from the architrave of a building. Although the inscription appears to have been reused, it is clear that he constructed or repaired a building, possibly in the south-western corner of the Tetragonous Agora. The phrase *grammateus kai gymnasiarchos kata to auto tes philosebastou gerousias* suggests very strongly that he held both positions simultaneously and that this building activity took place during his service in these capacities. This, in turn, would imply that the *grammateus* was in general, if not always, a wealthy

---

36 Aphrodisius: cat. no. 31. Epigonus: cat. no. 27.
37 Cat. no. 56.
38 Perigenes: cat. no. 21; Bassus: cat. no. 16; unknown: cat. no. 29.
39 Cat. no. 54, II. 232, 291.
individual. It also implies that, like other magistrates of the city, this position could have a liturgical nature. Dmitriev, however, has argued that the distinction between a liturgical office and an *arche* may have been nothing more than the manner in which it was held: the repair or construction of a building from an official’s own resources would make the office a liturgy, but a *grammateus* may not have been expected to serve *ek ton idion.*40 Whether an office was an *arche* or a *leitourgeia* was determined by the choice of the occupant, so that Aphrodisius may have decided to bestow his generosity on both the *gerousia* and the *demos.*

Falcidius Epigonus appears in what has been called a list of *grammateis* of the *gerousia,* so that the six individuals who also appear in this list may be *grammateis;* the inscription, however, is more probably a dedication which was expanded over time.41 One of these men, however, is Marcus Aurelius Attalus the son of Artemidorus who, it was argued in Chapter Four, was not a regular member of the *gerousia.*42 Furthermore, Falcidius Epigonus is identified explicitly as *grammateus gerousias,* but Aurelius Hagnas the son of Euporus is named immediately before Epigonus, and is called simply *grammateus.* When it appears unqualified in this way, *grammateus* should usually be understood as *grammateus* of the *demos. The addition of tes *gerousias* in the case of Epigonus indicates a differentiation, so that Aurelius Hagnas should be identified as the *grammateus* of the *demos* not of the *gerousia.* Epigonus’ fellows in this inscription, therefore, should not be automatically considered *grammateis* of the *gerousia.* Since he

---

41 Cat. no. 27; the other individuals are: M. Aurelius Parnassus the son of Assclepides, M. Aurelius Assclepides the son of Parnassus, M. Aurelius Gaius, Aurelius Hagnas the son of Euporus, Falcidius Zosimus the son of Epigonus, and Aurelius Attalus the son of Artemidorus.
42 Above, Chapter Four, pp. 113-118.
is clearly labelled as such, it is probable that he is the sole grammateus of the gerousia in this inscription.

The presence of Epigonus and his son, Zosimus, does shed some light on the nature of this office. Zosimus is identified as a patrogeron, an irregular, honorary member, and, importantly, the son of the grammateus. The use of huos grammateos instead of huos Epigonou suggests that this office conferred a degree of honour which it was worthwhile to make public. The grammateion may have been one of the most important offices in Epigonus' public career and an important stepping stone in the initial stages of his son's career.

One unnamed grammateus appears in the decree recording Nicomedes' reinstitution of sacrifices to Artemis and the Emperor. Schulte notes that his presence probably also indicates his responsibility for ensuring the performance of the decree, that is, his identification may serve as a guarantee of the decree's authenticity.\(^{43}\) In this, the grammateus of the gerousia is little different from the other secretaries of the city: he is the speaking partner of the members and the representative of his fellows to the city at large, possibly assuming the role which the neopoioi and kouretes played in the early Hellenistic period, namely presenting resolutions of the gerousia to the boule and demos.\(^{44}\) The grammateus may have informed the city of those affairs of the gerousia which were not limited to the interests of the gerousia alone but which had a bearing on a larger scale. The secretary, therefore, presented the resolution of the gerousia regarding the reinstitution of sacrifices to Artemis and the Emperor funded by that body to the public because those sacrifices were on a civic scale. It may be possible to deduce the

\(^{43}\) Cat. no. 56; Schulte (1994): 36.
\(^{44}\) Schulte (1994): 36.
existence of *grammateis* of the *gerousia* from two other decrees of the *gerousia*.⁴⁵ These decrees, however, are not sufficiently preserved to indicate anything more than that they are in fact decrees of the *gerousia*; neither the name nor the title of *grammateus* is legible on the stones.

Schulte argues that Marcus Aurelius Agathopus was a *grammateus* of the *gerousia*, interpreting the *pistis* recorded in that inscription as a reference to overseeing the financial affairs of the *gerousia*, that is, that Agathopus was responsible "für die korrekte Verwaltung der Gelder" of the *gerousia*.⁴⁶ It was argued in the previous chapter, though, that the *grammateus* named in the dedication of Marcus Aurelius Agathopus should not necessarily be identified as a *grammateus* of the *gerousia*; as Schulte notes, such an appearance of *grammateus* should most often be understood as the *grammateus* of the *demos*, so that the *grammateus* mentioned in Agathopus’ inscription may have been the *grammateus* of the *demos* at the time of the dedication.

A certain Perigenes appears in a thanksgiving by Favonia Flaccilla as one of five *kouretes*.⁴⁷ One of his fellow *kouretes*, Evandris, is a member of the *gerousia*. Consequently, although Perigenes is identified simply as *grammateus*, it is not impossible that this should be understood as *grammateus tes gerousias*. Such an interpretation, though, is by no means necessary, and Schulte goes no further than to identify him simply as *grammateus*.⁴⁸ If it is necessary to associate him with a particular body, that body was most likely the *demos*.

---

⁴⁵ Cat. nos. 57 & 58.
⁴⁶ Cat. no. 23; Schulte (1994): 36; cf. above, Chapter Four, pp. 122-125.
⁴⁷ Cat. no. 21.
Publius Rutilius Bassus appears several times in the corpus of Ephesian inscriptions, once in a letter of Hadrian to the *gerousia*.\(^{49}\) Since he is named in the inscribed version of Hadrian's communication, it is almost certain that he was responsible for the display of that letter. This might suggest that he should be identified as a *grammateus* of the *gerousia*. His other appearances as *grammateus*, in two dedications, do not directly contradict such an assumption.\(^{50}\) These inscriptions, however, are closely associated with the *demos* of the city, so that *grammateus* should be understood here, as is often the case, as *grammateus tou demou* – indeed, this inscription is one of Schulte's foundations for the conclusion that the *grammateus* of the *demos* was responsible for the correct display of Imperial demands, requests and instructions at the civic level.\(^{51}\)

Although Bassus was not a *grammateus* of the *gerousia*, his appearance in Hadrian's letter does reflect upon that office.\(^{52}\) The *gerousia*, as the recipient of the letter, would probably have been behind the display of the inscribed version, so that one would expect the *grammateus* of the *gerousia* to have taken some responsibility for its publication. Such does not appear to have been the case, though. It may be argued that Bassus was *grammateus* of both the *demos* and the *gerousia*. The *grammateus* of the *gerousia*, however, was most likely always a member of the *gerousia*, but there is no evidence that Bassus was a member.\(^{53}\) Such a gap in the testimonial of Bassus' career, in light of his eight appearances in the inscriptions of Ephesus, should be attributed not to the selective nature of the evidence but rather to the likelihood that he was not a member.

\(^{49}\) *IEph* 333, 1210, 1233, 1538, 2038, 3217(b); letter *IEph* 1486 (cat. no. 16).
\(^{50}\) *IEph* 1233, 2038.
\(^{52}\) Cat. no. 16.
Consequently, it is evident that the *grammateus* of the *gerousia* was not directly responsible for the erection of the documents of that body. It is probable nonetheless that the *grammateus* of the *gerousia* was involved in the publication of the *gerousia*’s documents. It was in the interests of the *gerousia* to make public the imperial support which it enjoyed, though it may have been obligated to do this through the agency of the *grammateus* of the *demos*.

A fourth individual may also be dismissed as a possible *grammateus* of the *gerousia*. A fragmentary thanksgiving to Artemis reveals that a man whose name has been lost was a voluntary *neopoios* in addition to *grammateus* of the elders and *chrysophoroi*: 54

> [ά]γαθή τής[ής] 
> [ἐπὶ ἀρχ.]ουκηπτώ[υχο[υ ...- - - -] 
> [εὐχαριστϊ]ῶ σοι κυρία Ἀρ[τεμι] 
> [- - - - -]ς νεοποιός [θβαίρετος] 
> [καὶ γραμματεύς τῶν [πρεσβυτέρων?]] 
> [καὶ τῆς συνόδου [τῶν χρυσοφόρων.] 

To Good Fortune; during the service of...as chief wand-bearer; I, ..., a voluntary *neopoios* and *grammateus* of the Elders and of the assembly of the *chrysophoroi*, give thanks to you, Queen Artemis.

It should be noted immediately that both *presbeuteron* and *chrysophoron* are entirely restored. The *chrysophoroi* are more commonly associated with the *neopoioi* and *kouretes* than with the Elders. 55 It is possible, therefore, that one of these groups should be restored in place of *presbeuteron* if the restoration *ton chrysophoron* is accepted, and the presence of *I nodou* on the stone renders *chrysophoron* more probable than *presbeuteron*. It is also possible, of course, that the dedicator of this inscription was the secretary of two independent bodies, the Elders and the *chrysophoroi*, and served each one individually rather than in combination. The fragmentary state of the inscription,

54 Cat.no. 29.
though, renders any such conclusion hypothetical and indemonstrable, so that it may be best not to include the unknown dedicator among known *grammateis* of the *gerousia*.

The Salutaris-dossier suggests a financial activity for the *grammateus* of the *gerousia*, since this individual is entrusted with that portion of the total endowment intended to fund the lotteries for the *gerousia*, the Asiarchs and the *neokoroi*. Unlike the previous inscriptions, the *grammateus* mentioned in the Salutaris-dossier is treated as an officer, not an individual: the inscription specifies general regulations for whoever happens to be *grammateus*. According to his arrangements, Salutaris undertook to provide the *grammateus* of the *gerousia* with three hundred and eighty-two and a half denarii each year for the distributions to the *gerousia*, the Asiarchs and the *neokoroi*. Although the inscription is fragmentary, the *grammateus* is clearly the recipient of this money:

\[
\text{ὅμοιω[ς δῶ-]}
\]
\[
[σει τῶ τοῦ συνεδρίου τῆ]ς γερουσ[ιας γ]ραμματεί [κ[οτ' [κυλ-]]
\]
\[
[αυτὸν ἐκαστὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ προγεγραμμέ]νου τόκου δη[νόρια] [τπβ']
\]
\[
[ἀσσάρια θ']
\]

In the same way he will give to the *grammateus* of the assembly (*sunhedrion*) of the *gerousia* each year from the aforementioned interest three hundred and eighty-two denarii and nine asses.

The *grammateus*’ responsibility for this portion of the distribution raises the question of whether the he had financial duties within the *gerousia* as a general rule, or if such duties were only exceptional. Since the Salutaris documents are the only indications at present of the financial duties of the *grammateus* of the *gerousia*, the question cannot be answered certainly, but it is not impossible that the *grammateus* was responsible to some degree for the monetary resources of the *gerousia*; it is equally possible that he was not.

---

56 Cat. no. 54, ll. 232, 291; Schulte (1994): 36.
An additional officer is attested in the Salutaris dossier as the treasurer of the gerousia. If a wealthy benefactor were to take over the administration of the total endowment fund, individual capitals could be paid to each group of recipients. Thus, five thousand denarii must be paid to the epi ton chremanon of the boule, and four thousand four hundred and fifty denarii to the epi ton chremanon of the gerousia, an office which may have existed from the beginning of the end of the Hellenistic period or earlier.\(^57\) This suggests, as Schulte notes, that the grammateus of the gerousia was little more than the distributor of the pre-counted annual interest designated for the gerousia, the Asiarchs and the neokoroi.\(^58\) It was the epi ton chremanon who required financial expertise in the gerousia, not the grammateus. The grammateus, as the individual responsible for the distribution, appears as a public representative of the gerousia as a whole, in which role this officer also appears in the Nicomedes-decree three-quarters of a century later.\(^59\)

The grammateus of the gerousia was an officer of that body whose duties can only be specified in negative terms. He was not directly responsible for the display of documents relating to the gerousia and its actions, nor was he particularly concerned with the financial aspects of his organization. Financial responsibilities may have been expected of a grammateus of the gerousia before or after AD 104; in AD 104, though, it is possible that the grammateus was an individual representative of the entire body. The Nicomedes-decree, however, suggests that even in the late-second century the grammateus of the gerousia was not engaged in financial activities on behalf of that body. His duties would seem to have been limited to representing the gerousia to the

---

\(^57\) Cat. no. 54, l. 193; the phrase is partially restored; Knibbe et al. (1993): 119 suggest that a group of individuals may appear in this position as οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν χρημάτων at the beginning of the imperial period.


\(^59\) Cat. no. 56.
public, and perhaps to directing such meetings of the gerousia as there were. Despite the absence of any clear positive evidence for his activities, the position was one which appears, like the gerousia itself, to presuppose a certain degree of wealth and to have been a position which conferred status and public honour. He was not a civic official, but he did operate on a public level both as a representative and, possibly, as a liturgist.

5.2.2. Gymnasiarchos of the Gerousia

The gymnasiarch, as the title of the office indicates, was an individual primarily responsible for matters relating to one or more gymnasia. This could include the general maintenance and upkeep of the buildings constituting the gymnasium or the supervision of the physical and intellectual education which was to take place in them. The gymnasiarch was also responsible for the provision of fuel for the heating of the baths and the management of the slaves who worked in the gymnasium.

Most importantly, though, the gymnasiarch was responsible for providing oil to the users of the gymnasium. This provision of oil, or the supplying of resources to purchase the oil and to meet the other expenses of the gymnasium, had become the primary responsibility of the gymnasiarch by the second century BC. The office was, therefore, a costly one. The expense of the office resulted in a relatively high position within the city and a certain amount of respect for the gymnasiarch. The gymnasiarch did not always meet the expenses of his office from his own resources, but could instead rely in some cases on previously established endowments which would provide the funds

---

61 Jones (1940): 221.
62 Paulys-Wisowa, RE 7:2:2, 1975, s.v. γυμνασιαρχός.
for, if not the entire cost of oil, at least a portion of it. As a liturgy, the gymnasiarchy was in the later empire a position which was seen as a burden and a duty to be avoided: personal expense was often expected, if not required. When there was an unwillingness to volunteer for the gymnasiarchy, wealthy citizens could be selected to fill the office. The potential difficulty of finding a gymnasiarch is apparent from a papyrus from Egypt that stipulates that the duties of a gymnasiarch who died while in office were to be passed on to the heir or heirs.

Seven men may be identified as gymnasiarchs of the Ephesian gerousia among the inscriptions collected in the catalogue. An eighth individual may be considered briefly: the gymnasiarch mentioned in the inscription of Marcus Aurelius Agathopus. This gymnasiarch, however, is identified simply as a gymnasiarch, not a gymnasiarch of the gerousia. The seven other possible gymnasiarchs of the gerousia appear in inscriptions unequally distributed through the Imperial period. Three come from the second quarter of the first century AD, one from the end of that century, and one from the late-second or early-third centuries; two are undated.

Tiberius Julius Heras, Lucius Cosinnius and Alexander the son of Alexander may be the earliest known officers of the gerousia, appearing in three letters of the proconsul Publius Petronius to the gerousia between AD 29 and 32. Heras and Cosinnius are each identified as “your gymnasiarch”, that is, the gerousia’s gymnasiarch. Neither individual appears elsewhere in the currently published inscriptions of Ephesus, although it is quite

---

64 Jones (1940): 222, n. 23; it is the choice between accepting public funds for expenses of the office or remitting those funds and using one’s own resources which distinguished liturgies and magistracies (Dmitriev [2005]: 109-119).
65 Lewis (1983): 91; it should be noted that Lewis was considering Egyptian, not Ephesian evidence.
67 Cat. no. 12-14, 24, 31, 38 & 52.
68 Cat. no. 23; above, Chapter Four, pp. 122-125.
69 Cat. nos. 12-14.
possible that they each belonged to socially prominent families: numerous Tiberii Julii are known from Ephesus, and several Lucii Cosinnii, one of whom, Gaianus, appears in several *kouretes* lists about a century after Petronius’ letters; a high standing and significant wealth is indicated by their service as ambassadors.\(^70\) Both men were very probably Roman citizens. It was noted in Chapter Four that the *tria nomina* alone are not enough to establish citizenship, but their names combined with their service as ambassadors to Publius Petronius seems to confirm this: individuals with Roman citizenship and other high connections were ideal ambassadors. It is not immediately evident whether the third gymnasiarch, Alexander the son of Alexander, was a Roman citizen or not; his service as ambassador might be an argument in favour of such status, though. His name neither confirms nor refutes citizenship, so it is best to leave the question open. It is obvious, however, that he must have enjoyed as prestigious a position in the city as Heras and Cosinnius: not only was he an ambassador to the proconsul, but he was also the gymnasiarch of all the gymnasia in the city. If Ephesus had funds set aside to pay for gymnasia-expenses, it would make little sense for a single individual to be gymnasiarch of the gymnasia unless he supplemented the civic funds to the benefit of all the gymnasia in the city. It is safe to conclude, therefore, that Alexander was a wealthy individual, as were Heras and Cosinnius. It becomes clear from Alexander’s service to all the gymnasia that one did not have to belong to the body which one served as gymnasiarch. Nonetheless, Alexander’s service as ambassador seems to be a strong indication of his membership in the *gerousia*.\(^71\) The role which these three

\(^{70}\) Tiberii Julii: *IEph* 968, 4118; 1933a, 5101-3, 5107, 5113-4; 684; 2070-1; 2273b; 241; 2277; 282; 810; 3440, 5101-6, 5108-5113; 736; 860; 2274b; 692, 692a, 1105, 1105a, 1105b, 1106a, 1130, 1604, 1605, 1611, 1621; 1384; Lucius Cosinnius Gaianus: *IEph* 1034-1037a, 1039.

\(^{71}\) See above, Chapter Four, pp. 110-113.
individuals played in representing the concerns of the *gerousia* may suggest that a fourth ambassador should also be identified as a gymnasiarch: a certain Theodorus appears in two letters confirming the privileges of the *gerousia*, though in each case the second half of his name is restored.\(^{72}\) The editors suggest that *ho gymnasiarchos t\(\epsilon\)es gerousias* could be restored in the former letter; for the purposes of this discussion, Theodorus is omitted: his office is entirely restored.\(^{73}\)

Two other individuals may be certainly identified both as members of and gymnasiarchs of the *gerousia*. Aphrodisius the son of Cleander, whose service as grammateus of the *gerousia* was discussed above, also identifies himself as a gymnasiarch of the *gerousia*.\(^{74}\) He is not known from other Ephesian inscriptions and little can be said of him other than that he served as gymnasiarch.\(^{75}\) It is clear, though, from the fact that the inscription appears on an architrave found in the agora that Aphrodisius was wealthy: it will have belonged to a building which Aphrodisius constructed, dedicated or repaired. It is probable, therefore, that he would also have supplemented any resources allocated to the gymnasiarchy with his own wealth.

Aurelius Niconianus Eucarpus appears in a partially preserved thanksgiving inscription datable to the later-second or early-third century AD after he had completed two terms as *essen*, the priest of Artemis.\(^{76}\) He also records his titles – voluntary *neopoios, chrysophoros* and gymnasiarch of the *gerousia* – and identifies himself as a *gerousiastes*. This title, given that he was gymnasiarch of that body, would seem

---

\(^{72}\) Cat. nos. 4 & 6.  
\(^{73}\) Cat. no. 4; *JOAI* 62 (1993): 119, no. 11a.  
\(^{74}\) Cat. no. 31; above, pp. 141-142.  
\(^{75}\) Aphrodisius appears without a patronymic, *praenomen* or *nomen* (*IEph* 1285, 1625β, 2205). Aurelius Moschion the son of Aphrodisius, Lucius Spedius Aphrodisius and Titus Flavius Aphrodisius are known (*IEph* 3484, 1034, 3279).  
\(^{76}\) Cat. no. 24.
superfluous were it not for the interpretation of Alexander's service as gymnasiarch of all the gymnasia: the gymnasiarch of the *gerousia* did not have to be a member of the *gerousia*. Eucarpus' use of the title *gerousiastes*, not his service as gymnasiarch of the *gerousia*, identifies him a member of that body. It is evident from his other services, once again, that Eucarpus was a wealthy citizen – most likely of both Ephesus and Rome.

There remain two individuals who may have been gymnasiarchs. At the end of the first century AD, Tiberius Puducaeus Canax, a priest of Rome and of Publius Servilius Isauricus, was honoured by the *boule* and *demos*. In addition to his priesthood, Canax provided distributions of oil for the citizens and of money for the *boule* and *gerousia*; he was also a gymnasiarch of the *presbeuteroi*. The use of both *gerousia* and *presbeuteros* in this inscription may be an indication that Canax was a gymnasiarch not of the Elders, the *gerousia*, but of the older boys. Whether he was a benefactor of a group of boys or the Elders, he was probably not a member of the *gerousia*: there is no other case of a member providing a cash distribution to the *gerousia*.

Finally, Gavius Menodorus is honoured in an undated, fragmentary inscription. Although the left half of the inscription is lost, it is clear that at least some of Gavius' benefactions were closely associated with the gymnasion. He served as *agonothetes* and panegyriarch, held the office of *prytanis*, feasted the citizens of Ephesus on apparently two occasions, provided games and gave a distribution of money for the purchase of oil. If the restorations printed in the catalogue are accurate, he also appears to have provided oil for all the gymnasia and to have served as gymnasiarch of the *presbeuteroi* in particular at his own expense. As in the case of Canax, this may be a reference to the

---

77 Cat. no. 38.
78 Cat. no. 52.
elder boys rather than the gerousia. The provision of oil may have been the primary duty of the gymnasiarch of the gerousia, whereas the gymnasiarch of the elder boys probably had duties including instruction and supervision in addition to the provision of oil. Consequently, providing oil for all the gymnasia and serving as gymnasiarch of the gerousia would seem to be stating the gymnasiarchy twice. One of the duties of the gymnasiarch was to supervise a public display consisting of competitions between members of his gymnasium – an element more likely to apply to a gymnasium of elder boys than of gerousiastai. The presence of the terms agonotheten (partially restored) and panegyriarchon give a competitive air to the initial portion of the inscription and may therefore bias the interpretation of presbeuteron in favour of the elder group of two divisions of boys or young men.

There are, then, five individuals who can be identified as gymnasiarchs of the gerousia, and an additional two who may have served in this capacity. No position within the gerousia appears as often in the inscriptions from Ephesus, but the relative rank of the gymnasiarch is not clear. In Mommsen’s view, shared by Oliver, the gymnasiarch was the highest officer, while Menadier argues that the gymnasiarch occupied the lowest position in the body. The phrasing of the inscriptions suggests that Menadier’s view is closer to the truth in the case of Ephesus. Of all the gymnasiarchs discussed here, not one is honoured for his service as gymnasiarch. The three ambassadors to Publius Petronius are identified as gymnasiarchs not by the Ephesians but by the proconsul. Tiberius Pdeucaeus Canax is identified as a gymnasiarch in the initial lines of his honorary inscription, but it is clear that it is not specifically this office for

---

79 Jones (1940): 223.
80 Mommsen (1921): 326, n. 1; Oliver (1941): 43; Menadier (1880): 51.
which the honours have been decreed: he is honoured for numerous services to the city. Aphrodisius the son of Cleander identified himself as a gymnasiarch in what is probably a dedication of a building. Gavius Menodorus was honoured for activities apparently related to the gymnasium, but more specifically, he was honoured for donations and benefactions which went beyond the normal expenses of the gymnasiarchy. Surely if the gymnasiarch were the chief officer of the gerousia, that position would be deserving of more than a passing mention, which is all it ever receives. It is more probable that this individual was not the highest or even second highest ranking officer in the gerousia, though, because the gymnasiarch was not always a member - he was a benefactor.

It is possible, though, to draw some conclusions about this individual's responsibilities within the gerousia. His duties were probably reduced over time. It is known that the original responsibilities, the supervision of the education of boys and the maintenance of a gymnasium, had narrowed during the Hellenistic period to the provision of oil, and it is possible that this reduction continued into the first century AD. The duties of a gymnasiarch in the Hellenistic period may also have included the military training of the paides and ephebes.\textsuperscript{81} In the case of the gerousia, the duties of the gymnasiarch probably did not extend beyond the provision of fuel and oil, and the maintenance of the gymnasium. The service of Tiberius Julius Heras, Lucius Cosinnius and Alexander the son of Alexander as ambassadors may have been undertaken in addition to the gymnasiarchy, but it is also possible that such services formed a part of the gymnasiarch's responsibilities at this time, so that the gymnasiarch was split into two separate offices: the gymnasiarch himself who provided oil, and a representative officer, such as the grammateus.

\textsuperscript{81} Chaniotis (2005): 50.
The source of the funds with which the gymnasiarchy was performed is nowhere specified, and depends in part on one's interpretation of the position: was the gymnasiarchy of the *gerousia* a regular position, or was it a service rendered at the discretion of the individual? If it was a regular position, it is probable that the *gerousia* had a fund to cover at least some of the expenses, which could then be supplemented by the gymnasiarch himself. If it was an irregular position, filled by a beneficent individual, the expenses would have been met entirely at that individual’s expense – oil may have been distributed to the members of the *gerousia* in the same way as gifts of money, as a one-time (or annual) benefaction. One might reasonably suppose that the position was a regular one, but that only those who supplemented the ‘gymnasium-fund’ fund with their own resources were given the title of gymnasiarch, that is, the gymnasiarchs supplemented the allotted funds with their own resources. It does seem to be clear that the *gerousia* enjoyed the financial support of some of its members and some non-members, at least with respect with to gymnasium-expenses. If the gymnasiarchy could be filled by non-members of the *gerousia* – and the service of Alexander and other Ephesians as gymnasiarchs of all the gymnasia strongly suggests this – it must be acknowledged that the gymnasiarchy was not always an official position within the *gerousia*.

5.2.3. *Pragmatikos of the gerousia*

Two *pragmatikoi* are known from the inscriptions of Ephesus. One appears in a Byzantine letter of Justinian to the bishop of Hypatios and is chronologically far outside the period under consideration. Keil suggests that the letter was written in response to a dispute concerning the precedence of the Churches of St. John and of Mary in the city;

---

82 *I Eph* 4133.
the pragmatikos appears in the final line of the letter but the nature of his position is unknown. Besides this individual, a single pragmatikos is known from the first three centuries AD in Ephesus. On a stone containing an undated funerary inscription of Artemon and his family, a certain Straton is identified as the caretaker of the altar and tomb and as the pragmatikos apo gerousias.\textsuperscript{83} What the duties of the pragmatikos entailed is not clear: was he responsible for the physical upkeep of the tomb? for the continuation of graveside rituals? for the prosecution of individuals who violated the tomb?\textsuperscript{84}

Because of the lack of Ephesian evidence, the pragmatikos can only be compared with individuals occupying the same position outside of Ephesus. A pragmatikos from the region of Phrygia served as the overseer of the construction of an aqueduct.\textsuperscript{85} A second pragmatikos appears in a decree of the sustema of the Elders in Magnesia regarding the provision of oil for the young and old men who used the city’s gymnasium.\textsuperscript{86} Publius Publicius Apollodorus, again in Magnesia, oversaw the erection of an honorary inscription and statue in which he is described as the pragmatikos of the demos.\textsuperscript{87}

Regardless of any similarities or dissimilarities between the gerousia of the Ephesus and the sustema of Elders in Magnesia or elsewhere, the duties of the pragmatikos appear in all cases to be primarily financial. Although the scale of expense in Straton’s case cannot be compared in the cases of the pragmatikos from Phrygia and Apollodorus of Magnesia, the pragmatikos is in all non-Ephesian cases given the duty,

\textsuperscript{83} Cat. no. 89.
\textsuperscript{84} Cf. below, Chapter Six, pp. 238-242.
\textsuperscript{85} MAMA 4.333.
\textsuperscript{86} IMag 108.
\textsuperscript{87} IMag 242.
and possibly the financial resources, to oversee some activity decreed by the body of which he is the *pragmatikos*.

This suggests that Straton, as the *pragmatikos apo gerousias*, may have been responsible for the maintenance of Artemon’s grave and tomb, probably with funds set aside for that purpose. The inscription accompanying Artemon’s tomb is remarkable in that it identifies a specific individual from the *gerousia* as the caretaker of the tomb, whereas it is common for the *gerousia* as a whole to be named as overseer.\(^{88}\) One may ask, therefore, if Straton was intended to perform this duty as a member of the *gerousia* or as a private citizen, that is, was this duty assigned to Straton the *pragmatikos*, or to Straton the citizen?

The *pragmatikos apo gerousias* may have been entrusted with this duty as a patron of Artemon. Given the nomenclature of the individuals involved – Artemon the son of Metrodorus, Myrilla the daughter of Demetrius, Hageson the son of Hageson, Phrynichus the son of Hageson, and Straton – there does not seem to be any reason aside from his supervision of the tomb to identify Straton as a patron, though.

It may be more probable that Straton and Artemon were peers – perhaps both were members of the *gerousia* – and that it was this peerage to which Artemon appealed for the upkeep of his tomb. If this is so, it follows that *pragmatikos apo gerousias* was not the title of an individual member who oversaw the upkeep of the tombs. Artemon’s inscription, then, would shed no light on the official position or duties of the *pragmatikos*. Any connection between Artemon and Straton, however, may be spurious: the two inscriptions were inscribed at different times. A relationship between the two individuals is not, however, impossible: in the absence of the name of the deceased

---

\(^{88}\) Cf. below, Chapter Six, pp. 238-242; cat. nos. 73, 74, 82, 85-88 & 91.
whose tomb Straton is to preserve, it is not unreasonable to suppose that Straton became responsible for the monument after it had originally been inscribed.

It may be noted that the scale of Straton’s responsibility for Artemon’s tomb cannot be compared to the construction of an aqueduct or service as gymnasiarch as performed by some other pragmatikoi from Asia; depending on the elaborateness of the tomb and statue, his service may not be comparable even to that of Apollodorus in Magnesia. At best, it may be supposed that the pragmatikos of the gerousia of Ephesus was similar to the pragmatikoi attested in other cities of Asia with the acknowledgement that this supposition is based solely on the similarity of titles. Içten and Engelmann suggest that Straton was the administrator of the gerousia. If this is the case, it may be surprising that he is the only individual so identified.

5.2.4. *Ekdikos and Logistes*

The *ekdikos* and *logistes* were not regular officers of the *gerousia*. An *ekdikos* was a legal representative, commonly of the city, appointed for a specific purpose or legal case. In the case of Ephesus, the *ekdikos* appears to have been a supervisor or an auditor rather than a strictly legal representative. Seven *ekdikoi* are known from Ephesus, only some of whom were clearly involved in legal cases.

An *ekdikos* of the *boule*, Marcus Flavius Domitianus, oversaw the erection of a statue for Aurelius Baranus. No other actions are recorded for Domitianus in the inscriptions from Ephesus. According to the inscription honouring Baranus, Domitianus set up the statue at his own expense. It is not unreasonable to suppose that he did so in

---

90 Paulys-Wisowa, *RE* 5:2:2, 2160, s.v., ἐκδίκος.
92 Cat. no. 48.
his capacity as *ekdikos*, if only because the inscription is identified as a decree of the *boule* and *demos*. The use of his own resources to dedicate a statue decreed by the city is not unusual since with a public position, as was noted above, it was possible to supplement official funds with one's own, essentially transforming an *arche* into a *leitourgeia*. It should be acknowledged, however, that Domitianus' erection of the statue and his service as *ekdikos* of the *boule* may be unrelated.

*Ekdikoi* could be on the other side of honorary inscriptions as well. Marcus Aurelius Menemachus was honoured by the *sunhedrion* of the *kouretes* and sacred heralds. He was the *ekdikos* of this *sunhedrion*, as the adjective *idion* indicates. What Menemachus was honoured for is not specified, but it is probably related to his being *ekdikos*. He may, for example, have successfully represented the *kouretes* and heralds in some dispute. Similarly, Ulpius Apollonius Plautus, a *grammateus*, *boularchos* and *ekdikos* of the *boule*, was honoured by the *boule* in the late second century, most likely for services provided as *ekdikos*. The reflexive pronoun *heautes* probably indicates that Plautus had represented the *boule* in a legal matter. Legal representation by the *ekdikos* appears most clearly in an early Byzantine fragment which records the result of a dispute between Smyrna and, probably, Ephesus: the *ekdikos* of the *polis* had represented the city. As legal representatives, it is probable that many *ekdikoi* did not belong to the bodies for which they spoke.

The nature of the duties of the *ekdikos* is not clear from those individuals bearing this title who have been surveyed so far. The clearest testimony for the activity of the

---

94 IEph 1075; FieI IX/1/1 d2.
95 IEph 740.
96 IEph 1343.
ekdikos in Ephesus appears in the inscription recording Nicomedes’ re-introduction of a festal celebration. Nicomedes is identified as the ekdikos of the sunhedrion and appears to have been responsible for reviewing the financial accounts of the gerousia. The passive heurethenton in line 6 indicates that Nicomedes redirected previously existing resources of the gerousia to a new purpose, rather than that he made an endowment, as has been noted above in Chapter Four.

Nicomedes was not a member of the gerousia at the time of his service as ekdikos: the stipulation at the end of the decree to “praise both Nicomedes and his sons, and proclaim them honorary members of the gerousia” would be redundant if they were already members. Although he appears to have been an auditor of the gerousia, Nicomedes should not be considered to have been a member before his honorary induction. He is described as tou katholikou ekdikou tou sunhedriou hemon. Sunhedrion, however, may not refer to the gerousia here: both the gerousia and the members of the sunhedrion are named as responsible for the observation of the details contained in the decree. This may be interpreted as an injunction lain upon the gerousia as a whole and upon its individual members, but, as was noted in Chapter Four, the regular formula for identifying members of the gerousia is simply ek gerousias or gerousiastes. Moreover, there is no other case of a distinction between the gerousia as a single body acting collectively and a portion of its members acting individually. The precise relationship between the gerousia and the sunhedrion is not important for the interpretation of Nicomedes’ service as ekdikos, though. As ekdikos of the sunhedrion, he provided, or

97 Cat. no. 56.
98 See above, Chapter Three, pp. 70-74, for the relationship between sunhedrion and gerousia.
more probably, redirected financial resources of the *gerousia* to meet the expense of the festival.

The case of Tiberius Claudius Moschas is similar. He appears in three inscriptions, in two of which he is identified as *ekdikos* of the *sunhedrion* and *ekdikos* of the *gerousia*, respectively. The involvement of the *gerousia* in these two cases, however, is uncertain. The first, honouring Vibius Seneca, identifies the *sunhedrion* of the *gerousia* as the honouring body, but the inscription is acephalous, so that the phrase *sunhedrion tes gerousias* is entirely restored. The second inscription identifies Moschas as *ekdikos* of the *gerousia*, but there is nothing in the remainder of the inscription to connect Claudia Caninia Severa, the recipient of the statue associated with this inscription, with the *gerousia*. Although the inscriptions are roughly contemporary and the product of the work of a single individual, Moschas, the preambles are restored differently. Given that they were both erected under the supervision of the same individual, one would expect that the two inscriptions and statues were awarded by the same bodies, so that the lacunae at the beginning of each text should be the same. Moschas is named as the *ekdikos* of the *gerousia* in Severa’s inscription so that one is tempted to suppose that the phrase to be restored in each case is that which appears in Seneca’s inscription, that is, [τὸ συνεδρίον τῆς φιλοσεβάστου γερουσίας], which is restored in Claudia’s inscription. The *gerousia*, however, does not appear to have been active as the author of honorary decrees beyond the mid-second century AD, so that [ἡ βουλή καὶ οἱ δῆμοι ἐκτίμησαν] should perhaps be preferred. Moreover, Moschas’

---

100 Cat. nos. 46 & 47; *IEph* 645.
101 As was noted above in Chapter Three, there is no certain instance of a *sunhedrion tes gerousias* in Ephesus (cf. pp. 70-74).
102 Cf. below, Chapter Six, pp. 237.
service as *ekdikos* is given among his other services so that the *gerousia* itself was not necessarily behind this dedication. *Sunhedrion* in Seneca's inscription, then, is probably either an alternate expression for the *boule* or a collective term for the *boule* and *demos*, but not for the *gerousia* alone. Moschas was not a member of the *gerousia*, though he is identified as *ekdikos* of the *gerousia* in the inscription honouring Claudia Caninia Severa. He, and the *ekdikos* in general, might have been similar to the *epi ton chrematon*, with the exception that he was appointed by an external body and was not limited to the financial affairs of the *gerousia*.\(^{103}\)

His activities were limited, though, by pre-existing decrees. Included in the *gerousia's* efforts to ensure that the arrangements made by Nicomedes remained unchanged was a statement to the effect that not even an *ekdikos* could divert the interest of the capital sum. Such an injunction also appears in the documents recording Salutaris' endowment: no magistrate, *ekdikos* or private citizen was to emend Salutaris' dispositions on pain of two twenty-five thousand denarii fines.\(^{104}\) The inclusion of both magistrate and *ekdikos* in this statement supports the theory that the *ekdikos* was not a regular official like an *archon*. His duties were not limited only to legal representation, but could also involve the supervision or auditing of finances even of bodies to which he did not belong.

The *logistes* is more commonly attested than the *ekdikos*, although the two positions are similar. Several individuals, all male, who had served as *logistes* were honoured by the Ephesians during the Imperial period. Four of these were also

---

\(^{103}\) Since *epi ton chrematon* and *ekdikos* occur at the beginning and end of the second century AD respectively, it is possible that these are different names for the same position.

\(^{104}\) Cat. no. 54, *ll. 315-325*: μηδεν[ν] δε ἡξεστω ἀρχοντι ἱ ἐκδικω ἱ ἰδώρη; it is argued in Chapter Six that there were in fact three fines for alterations to Salutaris' arrangements.
presbeuteis of Asia and three were Roman Senators: a propraetor and two consuls. 105 [Marcus Ulpius] Aristocrates, in addition to serving as agonothetes and high priest, was appointed (dothenta) logistes for the gerousia by the Emperor Hadrian. 106 Ulpius Eurycles was similarly ‘given’ as logistes to the gerousia. 107 The logistes was the equivalent of a curator civitatis. 108

The responsibilities of the logistes are more easily identified than those of the ekdikos, due to the fact that two extensive inscriptions record the activities of this official in Ephesus. Appropriately, these are two letters from the emperor. The first letter survives in two copies, neither of which is complete; it is in Oliver’s opinion Antonine in date. 109 In this case, though, the logistes is clearly responsible for conducting audits of certain individuals. 110 There is no indication of who these individuals are, but they are responsible through the logistes to the emperor. The letter is specific, requiring only those who had held office in the previous ten years to submit their accounts to the logistes, which suggests that the position of the logistes was not previously an annual position, but was occupied only irregularly. 111

The second inscription is a letter of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus sent to Ulpius Eurycles, the logistes of the gerousia, responding to the enquiries of Eurycles regarding, among other things, statues of busts of previous emperors in the assembly

---

105 IEph 25, 618, 3050, 4341; propraetor: IEph 696; consuls: IEph 612 & SEG 41, 976.
106 Cat. no. 41.
107 Cat. no. 17 (IEph 25); Dmitriev (2005): 196 suggests that the use of the participle dothenta may be an indication that the logistai could be appointed at the request of the cities.
109 IEph 15 (IEph 16 is a copy containing identical text); Oliver (1979): 556; Keil, JÖAI 27: 21-25.
chamber (*sunhedrion touton*). These busts are to be retained and re-erected under their original names rather than melted down and recast as representations of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. Next, the letter addresses the question of a public slave who inappropriately collected on debts owed to the *sunhedrion*. In this case, the emperors state the letter of the law, but do not pass judgment, referring Eurycles instead to the proconsul.

The *logistes*, as an imperially appointed official, was responsible for the rendering of accounts of officers and of public bodies, and may, in the case of the *gerousia*, have had some involvement in the preparation of imperial busts and statues. He was able to bring certain matters to the attention of the emperor but he was liable to the proconsul of the province, to whom his inquiries were in most cases supposed to be addressed. The existence of a *logistes* of the *gerousia* also implies an official recognition of the *gerousia* by imperial authorities. The *ekdikos*, on the other hand, was responsible only for certain legal and financial affairs of local Ephesian bodies and was specifically appointed, probably by the *boule*, for this purpose. It would be unusual, one would think, for the *logistes* and perhaps the *ekdikos* as well to have been members of the *gerousia*: impartiality would be desirable, but unlikely to have been achieved if a *gerousiastes* was appointed to correct the finances of his own institution.

Officers of the Ephesian *gerousia* are not attested as frequently as one might wish. Those positions which do appear in the epigraphic record suggest that several were not offices of the *gerousia per se* filled by *gerousiastai*, but rather were associated with it. Thus, anyone, given sufficient wealth, could serve as a gymnasiarch of the *gerousia*. As

---

112 Cat. no. 17 (*IEph* 25); it is tempting to see τούτου συνεκδριον as the place where the statues donated by Salutaris were kept when they were not being carried to the Artemision or to public meeting; cf. below, Chapter Six, p. 228-229, n. 53.
a representative, it is most likely that the *grammateus* of the *gerousia* was always a member; the *ekdikoi* and *logistai* were not members, but were instead overseers of the body responsible to the city and to the imperial administration respectively, indicating the subordinate position of the *gerousia*.

5.3. *Gerousiastai in the City*

The members of the Ephesian *boule* and *gerousia* appear to have been distinguished: no individual is known to have been a member of both bodies. This situation contrasts sharply with that in Sidyma, where half of the *gerousia* was drawn from or consisted entirely of the *boule*.113 The offices discussed in the first half of this chapter suggest that the officers of the *gerousia* were in general wealthy. There it was concluded that occupying an office of the *gerousia*, such as the gymnasiarchy, is not an infallible indication of membership; wealth, however, was a consistent feature of those who were both officers and members of the *gerousia*. The same is true when individual members are considered in light of the offices which they occupied in the city in general – that is, their positions independent of the daily operations of the *gerousia*. Neither the large-scale benefactors of the city nor their close relatives appear to have belonged to the *gerousia*: none of the Vedii Antoninii is identified as a member; Titus Flavius Damianus, who constructed a stoa along the Sacred Way did not belong; Gaius Vibius Salutaris was a Roman knight, but not a member of the *gerousia*.

This is not to say that individual *gerousiastai* were not benefactors of the city; clearly they were both publicly active and euergetic citizens, if only on a minor scale when compared to the best-known benefactors of Ephesus: Aphrodisius the son of

113 Cf. above, Chapter Four, pp. 79-82; TAM II, 175 & 176.
Cleander was able to put his name on the architrave of one building. *Gerousiastai* were *politeuomenoi*, that is, publicly active in the city. The civic offices in which the *gerousiastai* appear are often associated with the religious affairs of the city (Table 4). This association is consistent with what emerges from the Salutaris-dossier: the *gerousia*, Asiarchs and *neokoroi* are combined in the receipt of the distributions, suggesting a relationship, or at least a closeness between the three groups.114

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number of Appearances</th>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Kouretes</em></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23, 44, 59-63, 65, 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambassadors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1, 4, 6, 8-10, 12-14, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Neopoioi</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 44, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chrysophoroi</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21, 24, 26, 28, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Agonothetai</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Essenes</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Agoranomos</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Priest</td>
<td>1(?)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Leitourgos</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prytanis</td>
<td>1(?)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nyktophylax</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epi <em>thymiatrou</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63 (cf. 60-62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hymnodos</em>115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torch-race leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Leukophoros</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Offices and Positions Occupied by *Gerousiastai*.

Forty-five positions are known to have been occupied by members of the gerousia. Two-thirds of the attested offices and positions are clearly religious, namely the *kouretes*, the *neopoioi*, the *chrysophoroi*, the *essenes*, the *nuktophylax*, the *epi thymiatrou*, the *hymnodos*, the leader of the torch race and the *leukophoros*. To these may be added an Imperial priest and a *prytanis*, but it should be noted that it was argued in Chapter Four that there is reason to doubt whether the two individuals concerned were actually members of the *gerousia*. These forty-five offices and positions were occupied

114 Cat. no. 54, ll. 231-245.
115 On the *hymnodoi*, see above, pp. 136-137.
by thirty-seven individuals, though the names of the occupants have not survived in all cases.

5.3.1. Kouretes, Prytanis and the Epi thymiatrou

The origin of the kouretes was associated with the birth of Artemis and Apollo. According to myth, the kouretes took up a position on Mt. Solmissus to scare off Hera with their noise when Leto gave birth to the two gods at Ortygia. In the historical period, they performed sacrifices and held symposia at an annual festival; they may have acted out the myth as told by Strabo. The kouretes continued to play a cultic role, but they also took on political functions associated with the Temple of Artemis: the kouretes, at least in the early Hellenistic period, supported some citizenship decrees, which were displayed in the Artemision.

The kouretes of the Imperial period were organized into a college, a sunhedrion, which could have its own grammateus. They served under a prytanis, who may have had the right to choose his own kouretes, as the number of prytaneis related to their respective kouretes suggests. This personal choice could account for the fact that individuals did not normally serve as kouretes repeatedly: the position was, strictly speaking, assigned rather than undertaken. At the earliest period for which there is evidence, that is, the second half of the first century AD, the proportion of probable Roman citizens to non-Roman citizens in the college of kouretes is almost 1:1. This ratio steadily increases in favour of Roman citizens until it is almost 3:1 between 180 and

Although a large proportion of kouretes appear to have possessed Roman citizenship, relatively few can be certainly said to have been active in the Imperial service.

The kouretes are known primarily through the annual lists inscribed in the prytaneion (Fig. 2, no. 61; fig. 3). Knibbe, however, suggests that these lists may not record the kouretes of every year, but only of those years when resources allowed the inscriptions to be erected. These lists, as was noted in Chapter Four, are highly formulaic: the prytanis is named, followed by ‘hoide ekoureteusan’ or ‘kouretes eusebeis philosebastoi’, the names of the kouretes themselves and finally the cultic servants. Additional titles are not often given to the kouretes, but when they are, they follow immediately upon the name of the individual. Thus, a typical list would be:

έπι πρυτάνεως Γαίου Λικινίου Μενάνδρου τοῦ Σεργία Μαξίμου ἱουλιανοῦ· κοιρήτες εὐσεβεῖς φιλοσέβαστοι: Πάτρικος Λικίνιος Μάξιμος Μηνοδόρος ύδος Σεργία Βεβιανος βουλευτής: Μιαρκός Κασέλλιος Βάσσος βουλευτής: Διόδοτος Ἀσκληπίδου Ἐφέσιος ἐκ γερούσιας: Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος Νεικομήδης ἐκ γερούσιας: Πολύλος Κορνήλιος: Ἀρίστων βουλευτής ἱεροσκόπος[ei]: Μουδίκος βουλευτής ἱεροφάντης Ἀσκληπιόδωρος Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Ἐπικράτης ἱεροκήρυξ

Membership in the gerousia is indicated in these lists with the phrase ek gerousias: the only instance of a gerousiastes in a list of kouretes is not actually a kouretes list, but a thanksgiving dedication by Favonia Flaccilla. Membership in the boule appears to

---

123 Cat. no. 60.
124 Gerousiastes: Cat. no. 21; ek gerousias: 60-64, 66 & 67.
have been indicated simply with the term *bouleutes*: there is no corresponding phrase *ek boules*.

The Roman citizenship of the *gerousiastai-kouretes*, as is often the case, can only be determined on the basis of nomenclature. Six individuals can be said to be Roman citizens on the basis of their names. Five appear not to have possessed Roman citizenship; the name of one *gerousiastes-kouros* is unknown. The absence of citizenship, though, is an assumption based on the absence of the *tria nomina*, which, it was noted in Chapter Four, is not an infallible indicator of legal status. In some cases, it will have been possible for individuals to choose to use a Roman name or a Greek name in public life. Thus, Tiberius Julius Heras could be known as such, or as Tiberius Julius, or simply as Heras. The decision could reflect a desire to project a message: the use of a Greek name and patronymic could be an expression of 'greekness' in the face of increasing 'romanness'. Rogers has argued that a similar statement emphasizing the collective identity of the Ephesians was being made in the foundation of Gaius Vibius Salutaris at the beginning of the second century AD. The use of Greek names and patronymics was an affirmation of Greek heritage, just as during the Hellenistic period the use of ethnics as a part of one’s name was a reminder of one’s origins even if that city or region had been destroyed.

---

126 Cat. nos. 60 (Ti. Claudius Nicomedes, C. Licinius Euarestus), 61 (L. Caecilius Rufus), 62 (P. Aelius Isas Flavianus), 63 (...Venustus) and 67 (Julius Marcianus).
127 Cat. nos. 60 (Diodotus son of Asclepides, Assclepiodorus son of Apolloniuss son of Assclepiodorus) and 64 (Bacchius son of Zeuxius); cat. no. 66 (unknown).
129 Rogers (1991); the inscription which mentions Diodotus son of Asclepides and Assclepiodorus son of Apollonius is dated to AD 105.
130 Chaniotis (2005): 85-86.
Additional offices are only rarely attested in the kouretes lists, so that inferences cannot be made about the social standing of gerousiastai-kouretes on the basis of their other public positions. The kouretes do not, however, appear only in these lists. One Zoticus the son of Artemidorus appears in an honorary inscription as a gerousiastes and member of the ‘assembly of neopoioi, kouretes and chrysophoroi;’ he also served twice as essen. Each of these positions will be discussed below, and it will become clear that all three are indications of wealth and high social rank. Since the gerousiastai-kouretes appear together with bouleutai-kouretes in the kouretes lists, it may be said with certainty that these gerousiastai were wealthy, with high social connections. Such a conclusion seems particularly warranted given the name and patronymic used by Assclepiodorus son of Apollonius son of Assclepiodorus: this use is one means of drawing attention to his family and ancestors and, presumably, to their euergetism. The inclusion of his father’s name and that of his grandfather is an indication of the high standing of his family: both his father and his grandfather were known to the Ephesians, possibly through political or socio-religious activities.

Closely associated with the kouretes, the prytanis was the leader of the civic cult. The cult of Artemis, which the kouretes originally celebrated, may have been amalgamated with the civic cult in honour of Hestia at some point in time, combining the kouretes’ worship of Artemis with the prytanis’ worship of Hestia. The amalgamation of the two cults is apparent in the numerous kouretes lists, all of which are dated by the eponymous prytanis, as well as in the relations which existed in some cases between

---

131 Cat. no. 45.

132 Cat. no. 60; the inclusion of the patronymic is distinct from the choice between a Greek or Roman name: the patronymics emphasize one’s ancestry, while the personal name may emphasize one’s present standing and connections.
certain of the *kouretes* and *prytaneis*. Thus, Gaius Terentius Beratius was a *kouros* and a brother of the *prytanis* Gaius Terentius Flavianus; similarly, Aulus Larcius Julianus and Bacchius the son of Zeuxius are identified as kinsmen of the *prytanis* Publius Aelius Pontius Attalianus. The *prytanis* appears as the eponymous official in Ephesus. The high status thus rendered to the office is only enhanced by a trend in which Roman citizens appear to have occupied it more and more frequently until after the mid-century *prytaneis* were almost all Roman citizens.

A single *prytanis*, Gavius Menodorus, may have been a *gerousiastes*. Gavius’ membership in the *gerousia* is not certain, though. He served as gymnasiarch of the *presbuteroi*, although it is possible that the gymnasiarchy was that of the elder boys rather than of the *gerousia*. This is a less likely reading, but the fragmentary state of the inscription makes it inadvisable to rule it out absolutely. Gavius’ membership in the *gerousia*, therefore, rests on the assumptions that *presbuteron* refers to the *gerousia* and that service as gymnasiarch indicates membership in the *gerousia*, which it does not.

The *hieros epi thymiatrou* and *acrobates epi thymiatrou* were cultic servants; they are attested in the *kouretes*-lists, but they were not themselves *kouretes*. Whereas those individuals did not generally serve repeatedly, the position of *epi thymiatrou* was regularly occupied by the same individual over the course of several years. Moreover, it might, like other positions in the cultic-service, have been passed from father to son. While there is evidence of such dynastic possession of religious offices in the case of the Lysimachi Mundicii, who appear to have dominated the position of *hierophant* for a

---

century, familial succession is not as apparent in the case of *epi thymiatrou*: four men, Olympicus, Atticus, Tryhpo and Onesimus, all appear successively and repeatedly as *epi thymiatrou* over the course of the same century, but there is no reason to suppose that they were related to one another.\textsuperscript{137}

There is variation in this title, even when the name of the individual does not change. Thus, Trypho was simply *epi thymiatrou* in AD 104, thereafter *acrobates epi thymiatrou* for at least four years, and finally *geraios epi thymiatrou* in at least four additional years.\textsuperscript{138} Onesimus' titles show a similar pattern, though he appears to begin as *hieros epi thymiatrou* with three appearances as simply *epi thymiatrou* interspersed over a period of at least thirteen years; he was once *geraios epi thymiatrou*.\textsuperscript{139} Onesimus was a member of the *gerousia*, but this is not what *geraios epi thymiatrou* indicates.\textsuperscript{140} He is identified as *hieros epi thymiatrou ek gerousias* in a list of *kouretes* from the second half of the second century.\textsuperscript{141} *Geraios* should be seen as a description of *epi thymiatrou* like *hieros* and *acrobates*, rather than of Onesimus himself, as was argued above in Chapter Four.\textsuperscript{142}

The duties of the *epi thymiatrou* within the civic cult are not certainly known, but he must have been, as his title indicates, responsible for an incense offering. Knibbe suggests that the use of the word *acrobates* is a sign that a dance performance was part of


\textsuperscript{140} Cat. no. 64; cf. Knibbe (1981): 42, no. 44 and note 6. it may be noted that Onesimus appears in B44 as *epi thymiatrou geraios sun kai huoi Artemoni psephismati*: Onesimus and his son were not simultaneously members of the *gerousia* (they may have been, but this inscription does not demonstrate that); Onesimus was assisented in his serveice as 'revered servant in charge of tending the incense' by his son.

\textsuperscript{141} The phrasing is partially restored, but reasonably so; cf. above, Chapter Four, pp. 127.

\textsuperscript{142} Cf. above, Chapter Four, pp. 126-128.
the offering of incense and of the acting out of the birth of Artemis and Apollo by the
kouretes.\textsuperscript{143}

5.3.2. Ambassadors

Embassies were at all periods expensive undertakings. Cicero comments on the
excessive expense of embassies sent to Appius Claudius Pulcher and other previous
governors by several cities of Cilicia.\textsuperscript{144} Accordingly, he limited the amount which could
be spent on such deputations.\textsuperscript{145} Similarly, Vespasian, a little more than a century later,
limited the size of embassies which could be sent to the emperor, and Pliny the Younger
reports his efforts to reduce the expenses of embassies in Bithynia-Pontus.\textsuperscript{146} The
deputations limited by Cicero and Pliny were intended to carry expressions of thanks and
gratitude to their recipients. Others, which were less likely to be restricted, might carry
notice of awards decreed by a city to a benefactor; still others could conduct negotiations
or arguments between cities and seek favours from provincial officials.

Nine named gerousiastai are known to have undertaken embassies on behalf of
the gerousia;\textsuperscript{147} at least two more can be inferred from fragmentary inscriptions;\textsuperscript{148} eleven
individuals are also known to have represented the concerns of the gerousia to Octavian
in 29 BC, any or all of whom may have been members.\textsuperscript{149} The purpose of these
embassies was in all but the first and last cases to gain Imperial approval for the
continuation of benefits enjoyed by the gerousia.\textsuperscript{150} The first embassy was that led by
Euphronius to Prepelaus requesting exemption from the billeting of troops and taxation

\textsuperscript{143} Knibbe (1981): 85.
\textsuperscript{144} Cic., \textit{Ad Fam.}, 3.8.2.
\textsuperscript{145} Cic., \textit{Ad Fam.}, 3.8.3.
\textsuperscript{146} Dig., 50.7.5.6; Pl., \textit{Ep.}, 10.43; Jones (1940): 135.
\textsuperscript{147} Cat. nos. 1, 4, 8-10, 12-14, 16.
\textsuperscript{148} Cat. nos. 5, 11.
\textsuperscript{149} Cat. no. 6.
\textsuperscript{150} On the benefits and privileges of the gerousia, see below, Chapter Six, pp. 243-277.
on behalf of the Temple of Artemis early in the Hellenistic period. The final embassy which is known occurred early in Hadrian’s reign; this last delegation concerned the gerousia’s lending and collecting privileges. Hadrian’s letter, written in reply to this representative’s petition, provides the best indication of the potential expense of an embassy. He writes that a traveling expense should be paid to the ambassador, Cascellius Politicus, unless he had undertaken to represent the gerousia’s interests at his own expense. The mention of payment for traveling expenses implies that an embassy was at the behest of the boule, demos, gerousia or other groups: it was an official, not a personal, undertaking. The traveling expenses, however, are to be paid only after the return of Politicus, so that it is a reimbursement rather than a payment. The deputation led by Politicus can, however, be argued to have been excessive: Hadrian refers the matter back to the proconsul of Asia, Cornelius Priscus, with the implication that there was no need to send an embassy all the way to Hadrian in Rome. Advantage was taken of the occasional proximity of members of the Imperial family, though, as an embassy was sent to Germanicus in Nicaea in AD 18, an additional embassy which may also have visited Germanicus in the eastern regions of the Empire, but could have been sent to Gaius Caesar between AD 1 and 4 instead – the identification of the recipient is uncertain.

The contents of the letters written in response to the petitions of the late first century BC and early first century AD, requests for the renewal of the gerousia’s privileges, are a strong indication that the ambassadors were members of the gerousia. The fact that these individuals undertook embassies is a suggestion that they were

151 Cat. no. 16, ll. 14-15.
152 Cat. nos. 9 and 10.
153 Above, Chapter Four, pp. 110-113.
wealthy, though it also possible that they were traveling at the expense of a public body rather than at their own expense. Since the letters are addressed to the *gerousia*, it is safe to assume that, if they were not paying the costs of travel on their own, these men were traveling at the expense of the *gerousia*. The embassies then become a reflection of the combined wealth of the *gerousiastai* and of the *gerousia’s* corporate wealth. There were certain niceties to be observed in the despatch of Imperial embassies, which will be considered below in Chapter Six; for the moment, though, it is sufficient to note that members of the *gerousia* undertook delegations to represent the collective interests of their peers, and possibly those of their fellow citizens: the eleven individuals named in Octavian’s letter may be indicative of the *gerousia’s* involvement in issues confronting the city in general rather than the *gerousia* in particular.

5.3.3. Neopoioi

The *neopoioi* are commonly attested in the inscriptions of Ephesus, not exclusively in association with the *gerousia*. Originally, the *neopoioi* were, as their name suggests, a college of individuals responsible for the construction and maintenance of temples. As a college, the *neopoioi* were also responsible for the administration of certain festivals. Consequently, they generally appear in the plural rather than the singular; this is not, however, the universal case in Ephesus, where the appearance of a single *neopoios* is not irregular.

Service as a *neopoios* in Ephesus lasted for one year and was performed by members of various groups. Thus, there are both *bouleutai* and *gerousiastai* attested as

---

154 *P-W* 16:2, 2433-2439, s.v. *neopoioi*.
155 *P-W* 16:2, 2435.
156 *IEph* 622.
neopoioi. The neopoioi were in the Imperial period an official board – a sunhedrion – of possibly twelve elected individuals, who appear to have remained as an unofficial body after their terms of service: “those who have been neopoioi” erected a series of statues in the Augusteum (Fig. 3, no. 53); the duty of attending statues, though, was not limited to former neopoioi: two of these individuals were to attend the statues donated by Salutaris during his procession. It was possible to serve as neopoios more than once. The neopoioi themselves occupied a variety of offices and positions – prytanis, agoranomos, eirenarchos, grammateus, essen, kouretes and the general leitourgos are all attested. Such offices suggest that wealth may have been a prerequisite for service as neopoioi. This seems to be confirmed by the frequent appearance of the gymnasiarchy in the lists of positions occupied by the neopoioi.

Each neopoios was attached to a temple, either as an individual or as a member of a larger college. Publius Quintilius Valens Varius is identified as a neopoios of Artemis, in addition to being a grammateus, agoranomos, gymnasiarch and a benefactor who provided gifts of grain and money. Similarly, a statue group of Germanicus, Drusus and Tiberius was set up by a group of former neopoioi, as an inscription found in the temple of the Augusti indicates. This affiliation, however, was not restrictive. A neopoios and priest of Pluto and Kore oversaw a dedication by the demos of Aphrodisias in honour of Domitian in the Augusteum. The neopoioi were responsible for displaying at least some public decrees in their respective temples. This is particularly
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157 Boultuetai: IEph 622, 712B, 842; gerousiastai: Cat. no. 20, 22, 24, 26, 45 & 69.  
159 IEph 957, where the aorist participle νεοποιός combined with νεοποιός indicates at least two occasions on which the honourand served as a neopoios.  
160 IEph 661, 700, 712B, 1042 & 3014.  
161 IEph 712B.  
162 IEph 257.  
163 IEph 233.
clear in Ephesus in the case of citizenship decrees – both Hellenistic and Imperial – which frequently identify the neopoioi as the college responsible for erecting a copy of the decree in the Temple of Artemis “where they have set up the other citizenship decrees.”

It was common after service as neopoios to make a thanksgiving dedication to the god in whose temple such service had been completed. The only offerings which remain, however, are thanksgivings to Artemis; it is not clear whether these were offered exclusively by neopoioi of Artemis or if other neopoioi were accustomed to dedicate their thanksgivings to Artemis as well.

The precise duties of the Ephesian neopoioi are not known. Their appearance as overseers of dedications (epimeletai) suggests that they continued to be responsible for the upkeep of temples and particularly of the statues in the temples. Philip Mazaios dedicated the architrave of the Baccheion as neopoios. A letter of Antoninus Pius or Marcus Aurelius which appears to be concerned with the neopoioi as a college and a feast celebrated by them and which might be hoped to provide more information about the activities and duties of the neopoioi is, unfortunately, too fragmentary to provide detail.

Rogers suggests that “the neopoioi were deeply involved in the institutional and legal processes of conferring honours upon non-Ephesian citizens, including crowns, public-proclamations and even citizenship.” To be sure, they were involved in the
processes of honouring certain individuals, but not universally and not necessarily legally: being responsible for the records of citizenship grants in the temple is not indicative of involvement in the ‘legal processes’, but rather of the importance of citizen involvement in the civic cult of Artemis and of the goddess’ role as patron of the city.

Service as a *neopoios* in Ephesus carried with it membership in a college which was actively involved in the maintenance and upkeep of specific temples in the city. Like several of the other positions held by *neopoioi*, this service could entail significant expense, although there is evidence that at least some of this expense could be met by funds other than the private financial resources of the individual *neopoioi*.

Financially burdensome offices are not attested in the case of every *neopoios* known from Ephesus: only rarely are services attested in addition to those of a *neopoios*. Nonetheless, the preponderance of evidence suggests that the position of *neopoios* was in general a financially demanding one.

It can be said, then, that those *gerousiastai* who served as *neopoioi* were members of the wealthier classes of the city. Titus Flavius Asclepiodorus, in a thanksgiving offering to Artemis, declares that he served as *neopoios* voluntarily. The adverb *autairetos*, ‘voluntarily’, suggests that the office was one which could be – and was, in some cases – avoided: Asclepiodorus claims special status by declaring that he did not attempt to avoid service as a *neopoios*, contrasting his willingness to serve with the unwillingness of others. The reason for a refusal or failure to volunteer can only be the avoidance of financial outlay. Alternatively, the adverb may imply that the office could be forced upon someone if there were no volunteers or willing nominees. Asclepiodorus’
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169 IEph 622.
170 Cat. no. 22.
other offices (*essen, nyktophylax*) are not remarkable for their prestige, but it may be noted that he did serve as a night watchman *ek ton idion*, at his own expense.

The case of Aurelius Niconianus Eucarpus is similar: he also served as *neopoios* voluntarily.\(^{171}\) In addition, he served as gymnasiarch of the *gerousia* – an office expensive by its very nature – and as *essen philoteimos* – that is, on a generous scale. Eucarpus’ inscription, therefore, reveals the same prerequisite of wealth which is common in the inscriptions of the *neopoioi*.

Two fragmentary inscriptions honouring men whose names have been lost identify *neopoioi* who do not explicitly appear to support the requirement of wealth.\(^{172}\) Both inscriptions are thanksgivings to Artemis. The second inscription has been reasonably supplemented to read that this individual was a voluntary *neopoios*, but the first, for an unknown son of Asiaticus, provides no indication of the scale on which the dedicator served or of his other offices.

A dedication by a *neopoios* whose name may have been Eutyches or Charixenus identifies him simply as a *neopoios, chrysophoros* and *gerousiastes*.\(^{173}\) He is associated with his children, his wife, a freedman and a freedwoman. The presence of these last two individuals may be seen as an indication of the dedicator’s wealth: not only could he afford slaves, but he could afford to grant them their freedom.

Marcus Aurelius Artemidorus, whose inscription was discussed in Chapter Four, is identified as a *neopoios*, but not as an *authairetos neopoios*.\(^{174}\) Nonetheless, the phrase *leitourgos endoxos* in lines 6 and 7 indicates that Artemidorus did possess significant
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\(^{171}\) Cat. no. 24.

\(^{172}\) Cat. nos. 28 & 29.

\(^{173}\) Cat. no. 20.

\(^{174}\) Cat. nos. 26 & 27; cf. above, Chapter Four, pp. 113-118.
financial resources. Furthermore, Artemidorus' son, Attalus, appears with the title of patrobourlos, which is a clear indication of the family's wealth. Regardless of the nuances of the title – whether it indicated honorary membership, hereditary membership or membership based on one’s father – it is unlikely that Attalus could have borne it if his family and his familial resources were insignificant.

Zoticus the son of Artemidorus served in a variety of capacities – as chrysophoros, essen, kouros and temple-guard.\(^\text{175}\) In addition to these positions, Zoticus also provided a feast for ‘all the sunhedria’ and for two Roman officials staying in the city at the time (c. AD 231-239). His status as host of these two officials and the provision of a feast for the assemblies or colleges of the city are clear indicators of his wealth even if he is not identified as an authairetos neopoios.

Another gerosiastes who was also a neopoios is Julius Menecrates, who appears in a fragmentary list of voluntary neopoioi.\(^\text{176}\) Both Menecrates and his single surviving companion in this inscription were honoured by the boule and demos with crowns, suggesting that their service as neopoioi or as essenes was characterized by an abundance of generosity – that is, they performed their duties not only voluntarily but lavishly as well. Menecrates can, therefore, be considered to have been a wealthy citizen of the city like the other neopoioi considered in this section.

The neopoioi of Ephesus were wealthy citizens who cannot be assigned to a specific position in the social hierarchy of the city. Among their number are bouleutai, gerosiastai and citizens who do not appear to have been members of either body. It is clear, however, that the neopoioi, whether they acted singly or as part of a sunhedrion

\(^{175}\) Cat. no. 45.  
\(^{176}\) Cat no. 69.
neopoion, were wealthy. It follows from this that even those neopoioi who were not bouleutai were members of the upper classes of the city, including the gerousiastai.

5.3.4. Chrysophoroi

The chrysophoroi were a college of individuals seemingly limited in Ionia to Ephesus. Like the neopoioi, they appear both as a college and as individual citizens; they are also closely associated with the Temple of Artemis. The nature of this association, however, is not clear from the epigraphic evidence; the majority of the inscriptions in which a chrysophoros or the chrysophoroi appear simply identify the individual as a chrysophoros or a benefactor of the college honoured by the chrysophoroi.

A chrysophoros always appears with other titles. Five thanksgiving dedications offered by chrysophoroi appear to have been offered for the sake of other positions. Four of these record that the dedicator was, in addition to being a chrysophoros, also a neopoios;\(^{177}\) the third is an ekprogonon neopoios kai chrysophoros, that is, “a descendant of neopoioi and chrysophoroi”, and a bearer of these titles in his own respect.\(^{178}\) The ordering of the titles in each of these three inscription might suggest that neopoios was the more important title, and possibly that it was on account of the service in that capacity that the thanksgiving was offered.

Unlike a neopoios, a chrysophoros was a chrysophoros for life: the inscription of an unknown chrysophoros and voluntary neopoios records that his service as chrysophoros extended over sixty years.\(^{179}\) There is no indication that a neopoios served for an unlimited time. Chrysophoros could be a life-long title and could be borne simultaneously with other titles, such as neopoios and essen. Neopoios could be used as


\(^{178}\) IEph 958.

\(^{179}\) IEph 959.
a life-long title as well, but it is generally understood that the individual in question had been but was no longer a *neopoios*. A *chrysophoros* was always a *chrysophoros*. It is significant that the verb *neopoieo* appears as an aorist and perfect participle in certain cases; there is no corresponding *chrysophoresas*.

The *chrysophoroi* do not normally appear as such in inscriptions – the title *chrysophoros* or the college of *chrysophoroi* occur in conjunction with other positions. There is one instance, though, of the *chrysophoroi* by themselves. This is the case of the *sunhedrion* of the *chrysophoroi* erecting a statue in honour of Aurelia Metrodora.\(^1\) Unfortunately, the inscription is incomplete, preserving only the name of Aurelia, of her father and of several of her father's offices, including his service as *grammateus* of the *demos*; he is not identified as a *chrysophoros*. Consequently, the reason for the statue is unknown, though it may be related to a benefaction rendered to the *chrysophoroi*.

The *chrysophoroi* were a fully organized college, with a *grammateus* and occasionally an *agonothetes*.\(^2\) This *grammateus*, however, may not have belonged exclusively to the college of *chrysophoroi*. An unknown voluntary *neopoios* identifies himself in a thanksgiving offering to Artemis as *grammateus ton* [presbuteron | kai tes sun]odou [ton chrysophoron].\(^3\) It should be noted immediately that both *presbuteron* and *chrysophoron* are restorations. There is only one other case of an association of these two colleges in Ephesus, if *presbuteron* is taken to be a reference to the *gerousia*. The *boule, gerousia* and *chrysophoroi* are associated in an honorary inscription, but there is no direct connection between these three groups; rather, the inscription indicates the equivalence or near-equivalence of the three groups:

\(^1\) IEph 991.
\(^2\) Grammateus: IEph 940; agonothetes: IEph 889 & 1618.
\(^3\) Cat. no. 29; cf. above, pp. 146-7.
Individuals appear as chrysophoroi and gerousiastai at the same time, but there is no other instance of the two groups associated in this manner. The inscription simply grants to this individual an equal share in distributions for the three groups – that is, he is given the right of taking part in any distributions offered to any of these three groups.

A more common connection is that between the chrysophoroi and the neopoioi. In slightly less than half the inscriptions mentioning a chrysophoros, the individual being honoured is also a neopoios. Furthermore, Zoticus the son of Artemidorus is identified as a member of the assembly of the neopoioi, kouretes, and chrysophoroi. Consequently it may be preferable to restore neopoion in place of presbuteron: the chrysophoroi appear to have been more closely associated with the neopoioi than with the gerousia.

Such an association is supported by several other inscriptions. Although it is not always possible to identify the god to whom service was rendered solely on the evidence of the five thanksgiving offerings noted above, at least some of the chrysophoroi appear to have been closely linked to the Temple of Artemis. Thus, there is one instance of a chrysophoros of Artemis; there are also two occurrences of agonothetai of the chrysophoroi. The connection between the agonothetai and the Temple of Artemis is brought out by the service of one of these as agonothetes of the Artemisian and Pythian
games. Furthermore, both agonothetai were priests – one a high priest of Asia, the other a high priest of the temples in Ionia and the Hellespont. In addition, the priests who are to be allotted a share in Salutaris’ distributions are described as the chrysophoroi priests of Artemis.

Their service as priests suggests that at least some of the chrysophoroi were wealthy citizens. This is further supported by their use of the phrase authairetos neopoios and their provision of games. The high status of those citizens who were chrysophoroi is shown by the inscription of Zethus, who possessed both Ephesian and Roman citizenship, and by that of an unknown hymnode, who was granted an equal share in distributions with the bouleutai, the gerousiastai and the chrysophoroi. Although it is difficult to believe that the priests of Asia and of Ionia and the Hellespont were never members of the Ephesian boule, the chrysophoroi in general appear not to have been bouleutai. Nonetheless, their wealth cannot be doubted.

Five gerousiastai are known to have been chrysophoroi. Of these four have been discussed in connection with the neopoioi. The fifth individual is Aurelius Orpheus the son of Orpheus, who was honoured as gerousiastes, chrysophoros, and agonothetes. The sequence of the three titles may or may not be an indication of their perceived importance; however important the title of agonothetes was in comparison to gerousiastes and chrysophoros, its presence indicates that Aurelius was a wealthy citizen like other chrysophoroi.
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5.3.5. Agonothetai

The inscriptions of Ephesus contain over eighty references to *agonothetai*. It need not be argued that the *agonothesia* was an expensive liturgy in any city. It does not appear to have been the most expensive liturgy to which wealthy citizens could be subjected, though. An *agonothetes* could be responsible for either musical or athletic contests: there were not individual titles corresponding to different types of games.\(^{192}\)

The *agonothetes* was simply responsible for the defrayal of the expenses of the games and the awarding of prizes. Funds could be allocated to the *agonothetes* from the civic treasury, but this was not always the case.\(^{193}\)

The *agonothetai* of Ephesus could be responsible for various major games – the Dionysia, the Great Ephesia, the Great Artemisia, the Great Balbillia, the Great Hadriania, or the Great Epinikia are all attested.\(^{194}\) In addition to these six games, there were also the Great Pythian, Isthmian and Olympian games celebrated in the third century AD.\(^{195}\) These *agonothesiai*, however, account for only a portion of the *agonothetai* of Ephesus. Many individuals are identified simply as *agonothetai* with no indication of which festival or contest was administered. The named games were most likely celebrated quinquennially. This is certainly the case for the Hadriania\(^{196}\) and for the Pythian, Isthmian and Olympian games, which would have been modeled on their mainland-Greece namesakes. Those *agonothetai* identified simply as ‘*agonothetes*’ would have celebrated lesser games, in most cases. Otherwise, the absence of a reference

\(^{194}\) Dionysia: *IEp*, 1211 & 2031; Great Ephesia: *IEph* 627, 637, 1160, 2067 & 3072; Great Artemisia: *IEph* 24c, 930.2, 1162, 1104A, 1606 & 3056; Great Balbillia: *IEph* 686, 1122; Great Hadriania: 730, 1085a & 1087a; Great Epinikia: *IEph* 671 & 721
\(^{195}\) Great Pythia (time of Maximinus): *IEph* 1107-1108, Great Isthmia (time of Maximinus): *IEph* 2711; Great Olympia: *IEph* 114-1120, 4113.
\(^{196}\) *IEph* 618.
to which games were conducted would be remarkable, particularly in honorary inscriptions. This is not to say that such omissions could not occur, but it is unlikely that the majority of the twenty-two individuals identified simply as *agonothetai* failed to identify their *agonothesia* and lay claim to the credit for these greater *agonothesiai*. Some of these lesser games are, in fact, partially identified. Thus, there is an *agonotheses* of the Ephebes and possibly an *agonotheses* of the *chrysophoroi*.\(^{197}\) Moreover, one inscription, if supplemented correctly, records the victorious doctors in the Asclepieia.\(^{198}\)

The offices occupied by *agonothetai*, if the *agonothesia* by itself is not a sufficient indicator, leave no doubt about their standing in the social structure of the city. Although *agonothetai* were not drawn exclusively from the very highest of the citizens of Ephesus, they often were. Thus, there are Asiarchs and high-priests, *grammateis* (almost exclusively of the *demos*), *prytaneis*, gymnasiarchs, two Bithyniarchs and two Arabarchs.\(^{199}\) Marcus Aurelius Mindius Mattidianus Pollio had served as Prefect of Egypt,\(^{200}\) Tiberius Claudius Tuendiarnus was the son of a tribune;\(^{201}\) Publius Vedius Papianus Antoninus was a Roman senator;\(^{202}\) one *agonotheses* whose name has been lost could identify himself as the son of senators and a consul.\(^{203}\)

The wealth of the *agonothetai* of Ephesus is confirmed from the offices which they occupied in addition to their status as Roman citizens. Several *agonothetai* are known to have also been gymnasiarchs. The gymnasiarchy could require considerable
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\(^{197}\) Ephesos: *IEph* 1151; *chrysophoroi*: *IEph* 889 & 974.
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\(^{202}\) *IEph* 730; on the adlection of the Vedii Antonini to the Senate under Hadrian, see Kalinowski (2002); Bowie (1973).

\(^{203}\) *IEph* 810.
expense, since the gymnasiarch was responsible for the provision of oil for a gymnasium in addition to the heating expenses. The expense of this office would be multiplied in the cases of those gymnasiarchs who undertook to perform it for all the gymnasia in the city. One of the two gymnasiarchs who served as *agonothetes* was a gymnasiarch of all the gymnasia. Moreover, several *agonothetai* are identified as *dia biou*, 'for life', an indication that they set up permanent endowments which would generate enough income to offset the expenses of the games, whether quinquennially or annually, like the foundation of Gaius Julius Demosthenes in Oenoanda.

Although the majority of known *agonothetai* in Ephesus did not serve *dia biou*, the nature of the *agonothesia* and the other offices held by these individuals necessitates a degree of affluence beyond the ordinary, so that it must be concluded that those members of the *gerousia* who served as *agonothetai* were also wealthy. Little more can be concluded about the two *agonothetai* who were members of the *gerousia*.

One, Aurelius Orpheus the son of Orpheus, as was noted in the previous section, is identified simply as a *gerousiastes*, a *chrysophoros* and an *agonothetes*. If the actual sequence of the titles on Aurelius' statue base is significant, it may suggest that *gerousiastes* was seen as a more honourable appellation than *agonothetes*. There is no way to prove that this is the case, but it would be a further indication of the wealth and social standing of the members of the *gerousia*, if they could be ranked above some, even
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minor, *agonothetai*. This was surely not always the case, though: Aurelius was probably *agonothetes* of only a minor festival.

The fragmentary inscription of Gavius Menodorus, if supplemented correctly, identifies him as a gymnasarch of the *presbuteroi* and an *agonothetes*, though the name of the games of which Gavius had charge are perhaps irrecoverably lost.\(^{207}\) He was also a panegyriarch, again, of an unknown festival. It is clear from what remains of the inscription, though, that Gavius was wealthy. If the proposed supplement for line 10 of this inscription is correct, then Gavius would be a benefactor comparable to Aurelius Baranus as a feaster of the *boule* and a significant number of the citizens of Ephesus.\(^{208}\) His wealth is also indicated by line 13 of his inscription: he provided five days of games. It should be recalled, however, that it is not certain that Gavius was a member of the *gerousia*.

The *agonothesia* was a cost-intensive liturgy. The expenses of the position could be partially defrayed by endowments and foundations, but this was not always the case, as the occasional use of *ek ton idion* indicates.\(^{209}\) The consistency with which many of the *agonothetai* of Ephesus appear in such high-ranking offices as the asarchy or the high-priesthood of the province suggests that the *agonothetai* were drawn from at least one of the upper levels of Ephesian society. This, in turn, indicates that the *gerousiastai* who were also *agonothetai* were wealthy as well. Although only one *gerousiastes* is known certainly to have performed an *agonothesia*, that service can be seen as a sign of the affluence of the *gerousiastai* in general.
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5.3.6. *Essenes*

The *essenes* were priests of Artemis who, according to Pausanias, “neither wash nor spend their lives as do ordinary people, nor do they enter the home of a private man.” Pausanias gives this description in his discussion of Orchomenus, but it is unlikely to be entirely accurate when applied to Ephesus, even with his qualification that the Orchomenian *essenes* served only for a single year. The inscriptions of Ephesus give no indication that the *essenes* were markedly different from other priests in the city. They should not be confused or equated with the Jewish sect of the same name.

There is no reason to doubt Pausanias’ implication that the *essenes* of Artemis served for one year, though. The inscriptions from Ephesus, however, indicate that it was normal to serve as *essen* twice. Of nine known *essenes*, only one did not certainly serve as *essen* twice. Whether the two *esseneiai* were continuous is unclear, but it would seem to be unusual to divide two years of continuous service into two distinct periods rather than to report it as a single period of service: there was probably an interval between the two terms.

The *essenes* may be a remnant of a monarchy, comparable to the *archon basileus* of Athens or the *rex sacrorum* of Rome. The duties of an *essen*, so far as the evidence reveals, were simple. As a college, the *essenes* were responsible for the allotment of new citizens of Ephesus to a tribe and a chiliast. Consequently, they appear frequently in
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citizenship decrees. This aspect of the position did not change between the Hellenistic and Imperial periods. There are, however, more such decrees of Hellenistic date than of Imperial date. This is the most frequently attested role of the *essenes*.

As individuals, *essenes* appear most often in thanksgiving dedications to Artemis. These dedications were frequently made on the occasion of the individual’s service as *neopoios*, rather than that of his service as *essen*. The *esseneia* is, in the case of multiple positions and titles, given towards the end. It appears to be closely associated with service as *neopoios*, since the *esseneia* appears only in the inscriptions of individuals who had served or were serving as a *neopoios*. There is one instance in which only the *esseneia* is mentioned, but this is in a fragmentary inscription so that it is quite possible that the noun *neopoios* or the participle *neopoiesas* was originally inscribed on the stone.

The number of *essenes* to serve each year is not known, but the citizenship decrees indicate that there were at least two; there may, in fact, have been only two. Two thanksgiving dedications to Artemis identify former *essenes* who served as priests with their daughters or children and with another individual, a *sumenos*. The association of two individuals in the same thanksgiving offering strongly suggests that the *esseneia* was a priesthood occupied by two individuals at a time, though it is remarkable that two *essenes* would appear in the same inscription with only one clearly emphasized.
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Titus Flavius Asclepiodorus is clearly given precedence, both by the use of the first person *eucharisto* and by the prominent placement of his name immediately after that of Artemis. His *sumenos*, Aurelius Epagathus, on the other hand, is relegated to a subsidiary position in the tenth line of the inscription after Asclepiodorus’ daughter’s name. Such an arrangement would hardly be flattering to Epagathus, unless he erected a thanksgiving dedication of his own in which the positions of Asclepiodorus and himself were reversed. No such inscription survives.

The presence of an *essen’s* children may be explained as a parallel to the prophet and *hydrophoros* at Didyma, who were commonly father and daughter.\(^{220}\) This similarity between the *esseneia* at Ephesus and the priesthood at Didyma should not be stressed too strongly, though, since it is also common for a father and daughter to be associated during the father’s service as a *neopoios*.\(^{221}\)

Although the primary task of the *essenes* seems to have been to allot new citizens to tribes and chiliasts, as has been noted, they did undertake other activities. In one case, they were responsible for the publishing of honours accorded to an unknown individual who was given the right of addressing the *boule* and *demos* first after sacred matters.\(^{222}\) There is also one instance in which the *essenes* of the third century BC were involved in a
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contribution of money for the equipment of citizens of Priene garrisoning a fortress near the border of Ephesus' territory.\textsuperscript{223}

Since the majority of known essenes are also known to have been neopoioi, it is possible to conclude that the esseneia was a position which involved some outlay of financial resources and therefore required a certain degree of wealth. Again like the neopoioi, service as essen does not appear to have been limited to the boule or gerousia exclusively – both bouleutai and gerousiastai are known to have served in this capacity.\textsuperscript{224} Although the esseneia is not as frequently attested as the neopoieia, the basic requirements seem to have been similar, to judge from the other offices held by each type of official. There is no evidence of personal outlay by the essenes, but it appears that they were drawn from the wealthier classes of Ephesian citizens.

Titus Flavius Asclepiodorus, whose inscription is quoted above, served as essen twice with his daughter, but he was also a night-watchman (nyktophylax) at his own expense.\textsuperscript{225} The ek ton idion again can be taken as an indication of Asclepiodorus' wealth. Similarly, Aurelius Niconianus Eucarpus served as a voluntary neopoios and as a gymnasiarch of the gerousia, both signs of his wealth, in addition to performing the esseneia.\textsuperscript{226}

\textbf{5.3.7. Agoranomoi}

The agoranomoi are individuals who appear in the inscriptions of the Greek east between the fourth century BC and the third century AD, but primarily in the Imperial

\textsuperscript{223} IEph 2001.
\textsuperscript{225} Cat. no. 22.
\textsuperscript{226} Cat. no. 24.
period. In some cases, the term *agoranomos* is simply a translation of the Latin *aedilis*. Although in several cities they appear as a college, this does not seem to have been the case in Ephesus, where the *agoranomoi* appear always as individuals. As their name suggests, they were probably responsible for activities in the marketplace, and their duties ought to have included the assurance of quality and quantity and guarantors of weights and measures.

Few Ephesian inscriptions shed light on the actual duties and responsibilities of the city's *agoranomoi*. One *agoranomos* appears to have encouraged the import of grain, but there was a separate *seitopompos*, who must have been the individual regularly in charge of the actual importation of grain. A second *agoranomos*, Timon the son of Artemidorus, paved a portion of the agora. Otherwise, the *agoranomoi* appear as individuals receiving honours in the form of a statue, or similar to eponymous magistrates on a variety of inscriptions found in the tetragonus agora and elsewhere in Ephesus.

The offices held by *agoranomoi* once again reinforce the impression of a wealthy class of individuals. There is little consistency in the positions they occupied. There is, for example, an *agoranomos* who was also Asiarch and *grammateus* of the *demos*, and another who was *panegyriarchos* and gymnasiarch of the Great Artemisia.
The title *agoranomos* is most often used in a local sense, that is, the duties of the *agoranomos* were limited to Ephesus. Occasionally, however, the title should be understood as *aedilis*. Thus, Tiberius Julius Polemaenus Celsus, who was ‘appointed *agoranomos* by Vespasian’, should be understood as a Roman *aedilis* and senator.\(^{237}\) Similarly, Marcus Arruntianus Claudianus was adlected to the Senate *inter aedilicos*.\(^{238}\) It is not always clear, however, whether the term was used as a translation of *aedilis*, particularly in the case of high-status offices like Asiarchs or Tiberius Claudius Meliton, who set up a statue of Nike in honour of Caracalla and Julia Domna while *agoranomos*.\(^{239}\) The presence of other offices often helps to resolve this uncertainty since it is only occasionally that an *agoranomos* appears without an additional title closely associated with Ephesus. There are, for example, numerous *agoranomoi* who were also *strategoi, eirenarchoi, neopoioi* and *grammateis* of the *demos*.\(^{240}\) It is possible to conclude from these other offices that the position of *agoranomos*, like the other offices considered in this chapter, presupposes wealth and high-standing.

The only *gerousiastes* known to have been an *agoranomos* is Marcus Aurelius Artemidorus, *neopoios, agoranomos hagnos* and *leitourgos endoxos*.\(^{241}\) The final title supports what has been argued in the case of the *neopoioi* and the *agoranomoi*: *leitourgos endoxos* cannot be other than an explicit indication of Artemidorus’ wealth and prominence. It may also be recalled that Artemidorus’ son, Marcus Aurelius Attalus, was an honorary member of the *boule*.\(^{242}\)

\(^{237}\) *IEph* 5102.
\(^{238}\) *IEph* 620.
\(^{239}\) *IEph* 523.
\(^{240}\) For example, *IEph* 742, 847, 962, 1061, 3070, etc.
\(^{241}\) Cat. no. 26; the addition of *hagnos* is not unusual and it may be an indication of a late date.
\(^{242}\) See above, Chapter Four, pp. 113-118.
5.3.8. Imperial Priest, Leitourgos and Nyktophylax

The establishment of ruler cults in the Hellenistic period was originally an attempt to come to terms with a different type of power, the King. Obviously, monarchical rule was not a development of the Hellenistic period, but the manner by which kings established their authority was different from that granting authority to the Roman emperor. A Hellenistic king’s authority was based not upon a legal or hereditary right, but on the ability to command armies and to deal with political affairs. The Imperial cult should not be seen simply as a continuation of the preceding ruler cults; it was a dynamic institution which shifted and changed from the Hellenistic period to the Imperial period as Greek cities came to terms with the change in the nature of their overlords. Unlike during the Hellenistic period, overlordship in the Imperial period was a much more consistent matter: there was, for the most part, a definite and secure system by which authority was established and maintained which was not based on and continually shifting with military victories and defeats.

The Imperial priesthood was not an office held by members of the gerousia. There is, in fact, only one individual who may have been both a gerousiastes and a priest of the Imperial cult. In the early first century AD, the Elders honoured one Epaphras, priest for life of the divine Augustus. It is not certain that Epaphras was a member of the gerousia, though, since the priesthood is the only title given to him; the only indication that he was a member is that the honour was conferred by the Elders. It

---

244 Chaniotis (2005): 57; Suda, s.v. basileiai.
246 Cat. no. 33.
cannot be assumed that Epaphras was a member of the *gerousia* simply because that body honoured him, though – there is no certain case of the *gerousia* honouring one of its own.

*Leitourgos endoxos* is a general term whose precise meaning is unclear. It is commonly, though not exclusively, used of individuals who had been *grammateis* of the *demos*. The title itself suggests the wealth of the individuals so called, and this suggestion is strengthened by the other offices which *leitourgoi endoxoi* commonly held: Aurelius Artemidorus Thrason was a brother of an Asiarch and himself a *neopoios*; Marcus Arunceius Vedius Myro was a *panegyriarchos* and *ephebarchos*; Julius Artemas was an Asiarch and had ‘completed all the magistracies and liturgies’.\(^{247}\)

The single *gerousiastes* who is described as a *leitourgos endoxos* is Marcus Aurelius Artemidorus, a *neopoios* and *agoranomos*, who has been discussed frequently in previous sections.\(^{248}\) His high social standing cannot be doubted, not only because of the description as a *leitourgos endoxos* but also because of his son’s honorary membership in the *boule*.

*Nyktophylakes* appear to have been limited to Ephesus of the Ionian cities. As their title suggests, the *nyktophylakes* were associated with guard duties, presumably of the temple, during the night; this position may be similar to the *naophulakes* – the temple-guardian. Dmitriev, on the other hand, suggests that this official may have been similar to the *praefectus vigilum*.\(^{249}\) As in the case of the *esseneia*, it may have been common to serve as *nyktophylax* twice. This position, however, is mentioned only in two

---

\(^{247}\) Thrason: *IEph* 624; Myro: *IEph* 724; Artemas: *IEph* 1208.

\(^{248}\) Cat. no. 26.

\(^{249}\) Dmitriev (2005): 205.
Ephesian inscriptions, one of which is fragmentary, so two terms as nyktophylax cannot be determined with certainty.\textsuperscript{230}

Titus Flavius Asclepiodorus is the only known gerousiastes who was also a nyktophylax.\textsuperscript{251} His inscription complicates the picture of the position: he served twice as nyktophylax, ek ton idion. The addition of ek ton idion indicates that the nyktophylax was responsible for more than simple guard duties: there was expense involved in the position. What this expense supported and how great it was cannot be ascertained from the current state of the evidence.

5.4. Conclusions

The gerousia of Ephesus had several identifiable official positions, but fewer than is generally suggested. To be an officer of the gerousia, however, did not guarantee membership in the gerousia. Certain officers filled extra-ordinary positions which did not regularly occur and which were filled by appointment by an outside body or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammateus</td>
<td>Primarily representative; possibly involved in overseeing distributions involving the gerousia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epi ton chrematon</td>
<td>Probably a financial officer in charge of the monetary resources of the gerousia; it is possible that a group of members could serve in this capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatikos</td>
<td>Probably a second financial officer in charge of specific expenses, such as tomb maintenance. This officer may be the epi ton chrematon under a different name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekdikos</td>
<td>An external official who could intervene in the financial affairs of the gerousia, probably responsible to civic authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistes</td>
<td>An external official similar to the ekdikos, but responsible to the emperor or proconsul.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasiarch</td>
<td>An individual who was not always a member of the gerousia, but who undertook to provide oil for the use of that body.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Officers of the Gerousia and their Responsibilities

\textsuperscript{230} I Eph 957: νυκτοφυλακήσας | τάς δύο νυκτοφυλακάς; I Eph 969: ...νυκτοφυλακήσας.
\textsuperscript{251} I Eph 957=Cat. no. 22.
individual. The gymnasiarch of the *gerousia* cannot be proven not to have been a member, but the fact that several Ephesians served as gymnasiarchs of all the gymnasia demonstrates that there were years in which a *gerousiastes* did not serve as gymnasiarch, so that this should not be seen as a régular office of the body. The *grammateus* of the *gerousia*, on the other hand, was a member of the *gerousia*, though his duties appear to have been primarily representative. The *epi ton chrematon*, as an individual or as a board, was probably responsible for the normal administration and investment of the financial resources of the *gerousia*. An *ekdikos* could intervene in his activities, as could a *logistes*. The primary differences between the *ekdikos* and the *logistes* are that the *ekdikos* served also as a legal representative and that he was not imperially appointed; neither the *logistes* nor the *ekdikos*, however, were members of the *gerousia*. Whether or not there was always a *logistes* of the *gerousia* is unclear, but the appointment of Marcus Ulpius Aristocrates to this position ten times may indicate that it was not a rare position.\(^{252}\)

The possibility of many officers of the *gerousia* not being members of the *gerousia* suggests that it may be inappropriate to seek to impose a rigid hierarchical order upon the body. The best that may be done is to determine how the leading individuals might have been distinguished from their fellow-*gerousiastai*. To identify either the gymnasiarch or the *grammateus* as the 'leading officer' of the *gerousia* will reflect the commentator's interpretation of the *gerousia* as a social or a more political institute. Thus, to argue that the gymnasiarch was the chief official would give the *gerousia* a social character, whereas an identification of the *grammateus* would provide a political aspect. The gymnasiarch is more frequently attested among known offices of the

\(^{252}\) Cat. no. 41.
gerousia, which might support his identification as the leading officer. There are reasons to prefer the grammateus, however. First and most important, the gymnasiarch of the gerousia was not always a gerousiastes. Second, the role of representative of the interests of the gerousia in the city at large naturally places the grammateus of the gerousia in a prominent position so that he would be perceived as the leading official in effect, if he were not the “chief” gerousiastes in fact. It must be acknowledged, though, that the gerousiastai may have gone about their business without any strict ranking. It was surely not a disorganized and amorphous collection of citizens, though; in the absence of further evidence, the possibility that the gerousia was a loosely organized group of individuals unofficially directed by certain influential members cannot be dismissed out of hand. The grammateus is the most probable “leading officer’ in Ephesus, but he may have been little more than a figurehead.

The offices and religious positions, particularly those which were not associated with the gerousia, discussed in this chapter, although treated separately, should not be viewed in isolation. The repeated appearance of certain individuals in various positions is an indication of the interconnections which existed in the social classes from which the members of the gerousia were drawn. The overwhelming conclusion which must emerge from this discussion is that the gerousiastai were wealthy and prominent citizens of Ephesus and occasionally citizens of Rome as well.

Certain positions are conspicuous by their absence. No gerousiastes is known to have been a member of the boule. Nor are there any grammateis of the demos or of the boule to be found among the members of the gerousia. Roman Senators, such as the Vedii Antonini, Asiarchs like Claudius Aristion, and Roman knights, such as Salutaris,
are apparently also absent. Since the only appearance of an Imperial priest in the *gerousia* is questionable, it may be that this office too was generally outside the purview of *gerousiastai*; a similar argument may be appropriate in the case of the prytany.

The *gerousia*, then, was composed of Ephesian citizens who, while wealthy, were not of the upper crust of the Ephesian population. Their wealth is demonstrated again and again by the offices and positions which they occupied outside the *gerousia*. The inscription honouring Marcus Aurelius Artemidorus and his son Attalus may be seen as an indication that it was possible to pass from the classes which produced *gerousiastai* to those which produced *bouleutai*. There is no indication that the *gerousia* was made of citizens of Ephesus who had already completed their public careers.
6. THE ACTIVITIES AND PRIVILEGES OF THE Ephesian Gerousia

6.1. Introduction

Throughout its existence, the *gerousia* of Ephesus engaged in a wide range of activities, with which were associated various rights and privileges. The original doings of the *gerousia* cannot be known since, as it was noted in Chapter Two, its early existence predates the first epigraphic evidence attesting its presence in Ephesus. Consequently, the activities and the benefits of the pre-Hellenistic *gerousia* must remain, like its history during this period, in the realm of speculation.

Given the constitutional and locale changes which occurred in Ephesus during the last three decades of the fourth century and the first few years of the third century BC, it is reasonable to suppose that significant changes occurred in both the actions of the *gerousia* and its privileges. Upon capturing Ephesus after the battle of the Granicus, Alexander the Great restored its democratic constitution, depriving, it has been suggested, the *gerousia* of much of its political influence. Approximately a generation later, Lysimachus refounded and relocated the city. While it is unlikely that the *gerousia* was completely reformed by these changes, it is quite possible that the pre-Hellenistic *gerousia* was quite different in its nature from the Hellenistic body: it was suggested in Chapter Two that the *gerousia* was an oligarchic body directly involved in the administration of the city before Alexander's democratic restoration.

The absence of evidence prior to the Hellenistic period does cause difficulties in an investigation of the doings of and the concessions granted to the *gerousia*, but these are not debilitating. The Hellenistic period marks a new beginning for the *gerousia* of Ephesus, when some of its activities seem to be recent developments, as it will be argued,
while others were continued from its earlier existence. Which activities, which rights and
which characteristics of the Hellenistic period originated before the changes instituted by
Alexander and Lysimachus must, like the gerousia’s original undertakings, remain
matters of speculation, but some, it will be argued in this chapter, seem to be clear
continuations rather than new initiatives.

The changes apparent in the gerousia’s workings between the Hellenistic and
Imperial periods were not as marked as those of the beginning of the Hellenistic period.
This is probably due in part to the basic similarity between the structures of the
Hellenistic kingdoms and the Roman Empire: government by a single, autocratic ruler.
The slow process of change marking the transition from Greek rule, specifically that of
the Attalids, to Roman rule may have been rendered even more gradual by the lengthy
period which witnessed the establishment of Roman authority in Asia Minor, that is, the
century or so from the death of Attalus III until Octavian’s victory at Actium. Although
only three inscriptions survive documenting the doings of the gerousia during the
Hellenistic period, the similarity of some of its activities at the beginning and end of that
time period suggest a certain degree of continuity. The transition of Ephesus to Roman
rule resulted in the development rather than the alteration of the gerousia’s practices and
privileges.

The gerousia continued to evolve under Roman rule, retaining, gaining and, on
occasion, losing privileges. These changes to its rights naturally had an effect on its
activities. For the present purpose, the Imperial period can be divided into three sections:
the late-first century BC and the early-first century AD, the second century AD, and the
late-second and early-third centuries AD. The first period is marked by the confirmation
and acquisition of rights. Although the quantity of evidence increases in the second century AD, this period begins to show a decline in indulgence towards the gerousia. The third and final phase of the gerousia for which there is evidence is characterized by a gerousia which, through a continuation of the decline of the second century, shows significant changes from its early Hellenistic manifestation.

6.2. Activities

6.2.1. The Hellenistic Period

The activities of the gerousia during the Hellenistic period must be inferred from two inscriptions naming that body and a third which may refer to it with the term ta sustemata. The first inscription is a decree granting citizenship to Euphronius the son of Hegemon and has been discussed earlier in connection with the embassy which that individual conducted to the general Prepelaus. The inscription offers several insights into the gerousia. First, and perhaps most important, the fact that Euphronius was sent on his embassy by the gerousia to raise the issue of the taxation of lands owned by the temple and the question of billeting soldiers must be taken as indicative of the influence of the gerousia over the temple and its resources, specifically properties in the possession of the temple; this influence appears to have been well established by the beginning of the third century BC, which may suggest that it was longstanding.

The temple’s resources at this period must have been somewhat limited. Strabo reports the argument of Artemidorus that the treasures possessed by the temple before 356 BC were destroyed when Herostratus burnt down the structure in that year. Moreover, Alexander’s offer to pay the costs already incurred in the reconstruction and
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1 Cat. nos. 1, 2 and 3.
any additional expenses implies a shortage of immediately available funds.\textsuperscript{2} Such a shortage, though, could not have persisted long beyond Alexander's capture of the city: he redirected the taxes formerly paid by Ephesus to the Persians to the temple itself.\textsuperscript{3} In addition, the temple may at this time have received income from two lakes north of the city on the Cayster, one of which was called Selinusia; Strabo leaves the second unnamed, but he does report that the lakes were a source of significant income for the temple, presumably from fishing and harbour tolls, until these profits were withdrawn by an unspecified king.\textsuperscript{4} For Alexander to have redirected the city's tribute to the temple and then to have deprived the temple of a significant revenue source would have been contradictory. It is far more probable that one of his successors was responsible for the seizure.\textsuperscript{5} By the first century BC, though, the revenue of the lakes had been returned to the temple, thanks to an embassy led by one Artemidorus.\textsuperscript{6} At the beginning of the Hellenistic period, therefore, the temple was perhaps not as wealthy as one might expect, but it was growing richer through the consistent income from the two lakes and tribute paid by the city. It should be noted, however, that Artemidorus exaggerated the situation, at least as he is quoted by Strabo. The temple at this time did have landed property, the revenue from which would not have been significantly impaired by the destruction of the temple itself. That said, it did not have the same wealth it had enjoyed in the first half of the fourth century BC.

\textsuperscript{2} Str. 14.1.23.  
\textsuperscript{3} Arr., Anab., 1.17.10.  
\textsuperscript{5} It is equally unlikely that Lysimachus deprived the temple of the profits from the two lakes, since this would be inconsistent with the concessions granted through Prepelaos.  
The extent to which the *gerousia* managed these temple resources cannot be known from the current evidence, but Euphronius' embassy does suggest a certain degree of control. The inscription may also indicate that the *gerousia* had some control over temple-spending. There is no mention of how Euphronius' embassy was paid for, only that it was sent by the *gerousia* (*apostaleises presbeias*). It is probable that, since the embassy is not emphasized among his other benefactions, Euphronius did not undertake this service at his own expense and that his traveling expenses were met by the *gerousia* through temple resources.

The inscription also suggests that the *gerousia* may have been a body representative of the temple’s interests to the city as a whole. Although Euphronius was an active benefactor of the city and the Temple of Artemis in general, it is clearly his services to the temple which earned the gratitude of the *gerousia* — and his citizenship. The embassy which he led to Prepelaus is given pride of place in line four of the inscription, emphasized and given immediacy by the adverb *nun* in contrast to his earlier unspecified actions:

![Image](https://example.com/image.png)

Since Euphronius, the son of Hegemon, the Acarnian, has formerly shown himself well disposed and enthusiastic toward the *demos* of the Ephesians and now, since when an embassy was sent to Prepelaus by the *gerousia* and the *epikletoi*...?

Moreover, the specific purpose and results of the embassy are detailed, highlighting the service which it represented for the temple. The *boule* and *demos* were technically not beneficiaries of Euphronius’ more recent euergetic activities, the concessions granted to

---

7 Cat. no. 1.
the temple, but simply the bodies which conferred citizenship upon him. Rather, it is the *gerousia* which enjoyed the benefits which Euphronius won for the temple and which, therefore, set in motion the process to reward Euphronius. The inscription records a decree of the *boule* and *demos*, but it is a decree based upon a *psephisma* of the *gerousia* and the *epikletoi*.\(^8\) That the decree of the *boule* and *demos* was passed in response to a *psephisma* of the *gerousia* indicates that the movement to grant Euphronius citizenship began with the *gerousia* and that it was that body which brought his recent euergetism to the attention of the *boule* and *demos*.

The decree honouring Euphronius makes it clear that the *gerousia* served as a representative of the temple’s interest to the city as a whole, but the mission which he led also suggests that it served as a representative of the temple to the king and his officials. It is probable that this was not an innovative role: the simple reference to the embassy rather than a more detailed summary may suggest that the *gerousia*, if not in the habit of dispatching embassies, had at least some experience in the sending of such petitions.

Finally, the inscription indicates that the *gerousia* was at this time subordinate to the *boule* and *demos*. The preamble of the decree records that it was originally a *psephisma* of the *gerousia* put before the *boule* and *demos*. This may be – and has been – seen as a sign that the *gerousia* had certain probouleutic functions. This is clearly not the case, though, as the *psephisma* was not introduced by the *gerousia* itself but through the *neopoioi* and the *kouretes* as intermediaries, both of which groups have religious affiliations. The *gerousia*, therefore, did not have direct access to the *boule* and *demos*, but had to proceed through certain channels.

---

\(^8\) On the *epikletoi*, see above, Chapter Two pp. 54-57.
This subordinate position of the gerousia is also apparent in the decree for the son of Ismenodorus, the flute player.\(^9\) Once again, the gerousia prepared a psephisma which was presented to the boule by the neopoioi, whereupon it became an official decree of the boule and demos. Although they appear without the kouretes in this inscription, it is clear that the neopoioi acted as intermediaries between the gerousia and the boule in this case. The activity of the neopoioi and the kouretes as go-betweens perhaps casts doubt on the possibility that the gerousia was able to direct the policy of the boule and demos through the influence of its individual members, even if the intermediary role of the neopoioi and kouretes was limited to matters of citizenship.\(^10\)

The decree for the flute player also supports the view that the gerousia was a representative of the temple’s affairs to the city. The son of Ismenodorus should be seen as a participant in a small festival or contest honouring Artemis. Consequently, the inscription may indicate that the gerousia undertook to increase the splendour of festivals celebrated by the temple officials.\(^11\) If this is the case, though, it might seem unusual that no mention is made of the festival itself.\(^12\) It may be, therefore, that the flute player was a participant not in a large festival such as the Artemisia, but in a smaller celebration supported and funded by the gerousia itself.

The decree awards the flute player a golden crown and public proclamation, honours which might not require the approval of the boule and demos if they were awarded for a victory in a festival or sacred games. The honours must have been granted

---

\(^9\) Cat. no. 2; Rogers (1994) argues that this flute player, possibly named Gorgion, was one of several well-known Boiotian auletai.


\(^11\) Oliver (1941): 37.

\(^12\) Such information is unlikely to have been provided in the lost lines of the text: before breaking off, the text begins to list the rewards granted - the crown and public proclamation; the reasons for such awards are usually given before the naming of the rewards themselves.
to the son of Ismenodorus for services rendered directly to the gerousia, as in the case of Euphronius. The failure to specify the precise nature of his performance is somewhat surprising. It must be concluded that the flute player’s services were of a private nature. His performance must have taken place at an event which was closely associated with both the temple and the gerousia – it is highly unlikely that he could be so honoured for performance at a gathering which was simply social. The celebration of such a feast is known at the time of this inscription, the beginning of the third century BC.

A decree from the time of Commodus records the re-institution of a feast and sacrifice to Artemis through the work of Nicomedes.\textsuperscript{13} The decree records that these events were initially established by Lysimachus after his re-foundation of the city. The feast and sacrifices are to be celebrated by the members of the sunhedrion and paid for by the common treasury of the gerousia. It is clear that the gerousia resumed responsibility for the funding of this festival during the reign of Commodus.\textsuperscript{14} A flute player is not mentioned in this decree, but this does not mean that one could not have been involved in its original manifestation: there is no reason to assume that the renewed festival had precisely the same form as the original, nor is there any guarantee that the festival under Commodus was the same as the proposed feast at which this flute player performed. Nonetheless, the absence of reference to a flute player is not proof that he did not exist, but the presence of a festival does provide the opportunity for him to have performed.

The early-Hellenistic evidence for the activities of the gerousia demonstrates that that body was closely associated with the Temple of Artemis, in religious affairs and probably also in financial matters. The gerousia was able to undertake certain public

\textsuperscript{13} Cat. no. 56.
\textsuperscript{14} See below, pp. 237-238.
business closely associated with the temple on its own authority, but in matters pertaining to the city – such as citizenship – it was subordinate to the boule and demos. Whether the approval apparently required by the gerousia of the boule and demos was legally required or only formally required is not clear from these two inscriptions, but the former is more likely. It seems, though, that the gerousia did not direct affairs by virtue of the influence of its members at this time, as Strabo’s comment might suggest.\(^\text{15}\)

Numerous citizenship decrees are known from Ephesus, more than seventeen from the Hellenistic period. These decrees suggest that the one granting Euphronius citizenship is remarkable not only for the presence of the gerousia, but also for the service in return for which the citizenship was granted. The majority of the citizenship decrees are not specific in the description of the services rendered. The basic formula is “since he was well disposed and enthusiastic towards the demos of the Ephesians;”\(^\text{16}\) variations include having made oneself useful to the demos and the temple, and having served in the magistracies of the city. Details are occasionally provided, but in no other case is service rendered to the temple cited as the primary reason for the grant of citizenship, as it is in the case of Euphronius. Service to the temple may be included, but the new citizen’s goodwill or generosity to the city itself is always mentioned. Although the phrase “he was well-disposed and enthusiastic” may be little more than a formula, included in all such decrees and applied equally to greater and lesser benefactors, it does, nonetheless, draw attention to generosity to the city as a whole. While the decree honouring Euphronius does include this formulac expression, it has been argued above that the decree clearly emphasizes his embassy on behalf of the gerousia and the temple.

\(^{15}\) Str. 14.1.21.

\(^{16}\) IEph 1427: ἐπειδὴ εὐνοοῦσ᾽ ὑμῖν καὶ πρόθυμος [πρὸς τὸν δῆμον τῶν Ἐφέσων διατελεῖ; cf. IEph 1412, 1413 & 1443.
as the primary reason for the grant of citizenship. The decree is remarkable, therefore, in that it records the awarding of citizenship not for a civic service but for what could be seen as an almost religious service. For whatever reason, Euphronius' generosity to the city did not win him the recognition of the *boule* and *demos*. His euergetism did not benefit – or did not significantly benefit – the city itself, so that it was left to the *gerousia* to honour him. The approval of the *psephisma* of the *gerousia* by the *boule* and *demos*, therefore, becomes anything but a formality. The same may be said of the flute player: in order to enjoy his golden crown and the public proclamation, the *psephisma* of the *gerousia* had to be approved by the *boule* and *demos*.17

Evidence for the *gerousia* disappears after the two decrees in honour of Euphronius and the son of Ismenodorus. This does not mean that the institution faded into insignificance during the Hellenistic period, though. The two decrees may be extraordinary appearances of the *gerousia* so that its apparent absence thereafter cannot be taken as indicative of a disappearance. It is evident that service to the temple was only rarely a primary reason for an award of citizenship, so that the *gerousia*, as a representative body of the temple, would not normally have a reason to support candidates. The son of Ismenodorus may have earned his honours not simply for his performance but for his skill, so that again there is no reason for a regular appearance of the *gerousia* in support of all such performers: he and Euphronius were unusual in being honoured by the *gerousia*. The absence of evidence is as indicative of regular operations as of a decline to insignificance.

It is probable that the *gerousia* appears in a decree recording the declaration of war against Mithridates VI by the Ephesians in 88 BC: Menadier believed that the

17 The son of Ismenodorus does not appear to have been granted citizenship.
sustemata which appear in this inscription should be understood as the gerousia.\textsuperscript{18}  Although it was argued in Chapter Three that sustema should not be taken in all its appearances to be a reference to the gerousia, Menadier’s suggestion deserves attention, attention which it does not seem to have received.\textsuperscript{19}  The declaration of war followed several defeats suffered by Mithridates’ general, Archelous, in mainland Greece and the execution of the citizens of Chios by another of his generals, Zenobius, while Mithridates himself was in Pergamum.\textsuperscript{20}  Initially, Mithridates had enjoyed popular support because he presented himself as a liberator of the Greeks from the Romans and the Roman tax collectors.  His rule came to be resented, however, resulting in the return of the Ephesians to the Roman fold.  The support initially enjoyed by Mithridates and the previous deprivations of the Roman tax collectors may have necessitated special measures to win over the populace to the declaration of war.\textsuperscript{21}  Consequently, the declaration includes several clauses regarding debtors: sacred and secular debts are to be annulled; moneys owed on rented lands are to be cancelled; legal proceedings concerning sacred and secular matters are to be dropped.  A limitation is placed on the dissolution of sacred debts, though. Those which were lent by the sustemata or by individuals appointed by them were exempted from the terms of the decree:

\begin{verbatim}
35 δσα δέ ιερά δεδάνεισται, πάντας τούς

οφείλοντας και χειρίζοντας ἀπολελύσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν οφειλημάτων, πλη[ν]

τῶν ὑπὸ τῶν συστεμάτων ή τῶν ἀποδεδειγμένων ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ἐκδανεισ-

[τ]ῶν ἐπὶ υποθήκας δεδανεισμένων
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{18}Cat. no. 3; Menadier (1880): 57.
\textsuperscript{19}See above, Chapter Three, pp. 70, 20 App., Mith., 46-48.
\textsuperscript{20}Above, Chapter Two, pp. 31-32.
and whatever sacred monies are owed, everything which is owed and due will be dismissed, except those which have been lent upon security by the sustemata or by lenders appointed by them...\textsuperscript{22}

It can be concluded, therefore, that the sustemata were closely involved in the financial aspect of the city’s religious affairs. The stipulation that only sacred debts not supervised by the sustemata be absolved, however, indicates that the sustemata were not involved in all aspects of religious finances. There were clearly some loans of sacred resources which were not administered by the sustemata and therefore were not subject to exemption. The decree also includes a clause that the conditions upon which lands owned by the Temple of Artemis were rented were to remain unchanged. This is treated separately from the remission of loans and the exemption of the sustemata, suggesting that the sustemata did not have direct control over lands owned by the temple. The fact that both the loans of the sustemata and the rental agreements are to remain unchanged may suggest, however, that there was some involvement of the sustemata in the administration of temple lands since both aspects of the temple’s resources are given special status.

The gerousia in the early-Hellenistic period clearly had some dealings with temple lands. Euphronius’ request for exemption from the billeting of soldiers indicates as much. The extent of the gerousia’s interest in temple lands cannot be determined from a single inscription, but the additional accomplishment of Euphronius’ embassy – that the goddess enjoy tax-free status (ateleia) – may be an indication that this interest was more than cursory. It would have been the lands of the temple and the income derived from them which would be exempted from taxes, so that both accomplishments of the embassy were directly related to both the gerousia and land owned by the temple.

\textsuperscript{22} Cat. no. 3.
The *sustemata* of the Mithridates-decree and the *gerousia* of the early-Hellenistic period, therefore, are similar. Both were involved in the finances of the Temple of Artemis to some extent and each group appears to have had an interest in the lands owned by the temple. If it is accepted that the similarities between the two groups warrant Menadier's identification of them as one and the same body, it is evident that the *gerousia* began to be active in lending in addition to the administration of temple lands during the Hellenistic period. Since the *gerousia* also had interests in the land owned by the temple at the beginning of the third century BC, it is probable that this activity extended throughout the period despite the absence of evidence and that it may have originated before the Hellenistic period. The differentiation of debts in the Mithridates-decree suggests a limitation of the *gerousia's* influence over the course of the third and second centuries BC.

The activities conducted by the *gerousia* during the Hellenistic period appear to be continuous with some of its activities prior to the beginning of the third century BC. The decree honouring Euphronius suggests a familiarity with both the finances of the temple and the representation of its interests to the city and the king. There can be little doubt that the evidence available provides only a partial picture, though, and that the *gerousia* no longer carried out the same duties it had before Alexander's restoration of the democratic constitution. The *gerousia* served as a board representative of the Temple of Artemis both to the city and to the current king. It was also involved in the administration of the temple's resources, both liquid and propertied. It is probable that this involvement developed at some point into the active, though limited, lending role in which it appears at the beginning of the first century BC.
6.2.2. The Late First Century BC and First Century AD

The publication in 1993 of eleven Imperial letters and fragments of letters from the agora confirmed the existence of the *gerousia* in Ephesus during the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius.\(^{23}\) These letters record the affirmation of rights and privileges (*teimia kai philanthropa*) at the request of an embassy on behalf of the *gerousia*. The letters themselves do not make clear what these rights and privileges were; that question will be considered in greater detail later in this chapter. D. Knibbe, the *editor princeps*, suggests that lending privileges are implied, citing in his commentary a similar letter of Hadrian written to the *gerousia*,\(^{24}\) which will be discussed in greater detail in the next section. It may also be recalled that during the Hellenistic period the *gerousia* seems to have been involved in lending, so that it is not necessary to look forward to provide support for the hypothesis that the *gerousia* was involved in financial activities at the turn of the first century BC. There is, however, no indication in the letters whether the *gerousia* was at this time supervising temple loans: none of the letters makes any mention of the temple or of its financial resources. Nonetheless, the association which the *gerousia* had with the temple’s financial resources at the beginning of the Hellenistic period and the connection which it may have had at the beginning of the first century BC are strong reasons to suppose that the *gerousia* was still responsible for some aspects of the temple’s finances. Augustus is known to have modified the amount of temple land which could offer asylum, so he clearly did involve himself in the affairs of the Temple.

---

\(^{23}\) The inscriptions are dated to the late-first or early-second century AD and are copies of letters originally sent from as early as 49 BC. The latest letter is dated to the third proconsulship of Publius Petronius in AD 31/32; cf. Knibbe (1993): 113-119, nos. 1-10; Lewis (2000): 99-100.

\(^{24}\) Cat. nos. 4-14; *JOAI* 62 (1993): 113-120, nos. 1-11.
of Artemis.\textsuperscript{25} It is not unreasonable, therefore, that he should also have taken an interest in the finances of the temple as represented by the \textit{gerousia}, even if that interest was actively sought out by the body itself.

At this time the \textit{gerousia} was also actively representing its interests, certainly to the Roman authorities and probably also to local authorities. If the above interpretation of these letters is correct, the \textit{gerousia} will also have been representing the temple at this time as it had done at the beginning of the Hellenistic period. Each letter represents an embassy. That the letters are addressed not to the \textit{boule} and \textit{demos} but to the \textit{gerousia} (with one exception) suggests that the embassies were undertaken by the \textit{gerousia} itself, but this cannot be regarded as certain in all cases: several of the embassies were led by multiple individuals so that it is possible that they presented the interests of more than a single body, each of which may have received a separate answer. It is clear that these delegations served to bring the interests of the \textit{gerousia} to the attention of Roman officials, representing its own concerns and probably those of the temple as well.

The \textit{gerousia} was also active, on a more local level, in granting honours to euergetic citizens. A fragmentary inscription records honours voted by the \textit{boule} and at least one other body, most likely the \textit{demos}, for Glaucon the son of Mandrylus in the late first century BC.\textsuperscript{26} There appears to be additional space in the first line of the inscription for a third body; the editors propose either \textit{he gerousia} or \textit{hoi neoi}.\textsuperscript{27} Both restorations

\textsuperscript{25} Alexander, Mithridates and Marcus Antonius all expanded the temple’s asylum area to the extent that it included a portion of the city, with the result that certain criminal activities increased. Augustus cancelled Antonius’ expansion of the asylum area, reducing it to that established by Mithridates (Strabo, 14.1.23); cf. \textit{SEG} 41, 971.

\textsuperscript{26} Cat. no. 32.

\textsuperscript{27} Büyükkolancı & Engelmann (1998): 71.
have their merits, but *he gerousia* is perhaps more likely since the *neoi* are otherwise not associated with the *boule* and *demos* in such honorary inscriptions.\(^{28}\)

The reasons for the honours voted to Glaucon are unknown. Although the inscription records that he was *prytanis* and has been restored to attribute an agonothesie to him in addition, these offices do not form the basis for his honours. Rather, they are simply a part of his civic career, adding to his reputation, but not warranting in themselves an honorary decree. An explanation giving the services for which the honours were decreed would have fallen in the damaged and unrestored portions of the inscription. He appears to have shown his goodwill toward his fellow citizens by acting on their behalf, and he made a generous donation. That donation may have been the immediate reason for the honorary decree. It must have been a significant display of generosity to warrant the combination of the *boule*, *demos* and *gerousia* (or *neoi*). If the restoration of *he gerousia* is correct, this combination indicates an apparent increase in the importance of the *gerousia*: Euphronius and the Boeotian flute player were honoured by the *gerousia*, but through the *boule* and *demos*. In this case, the *gerousia* would be a partner rather than a subordinate body in granting the honours.

Although the *gerousia*'s role in honouring Glaucon is speculative and dependent on a restoration, there is additional evidence that it took an active role in the granting of public honours during the first century: the *gerousia* joined the *boule* and *demos* in honouring Octavia Capetololina in an inscription dated to the first century on the basis of

\(^{28}\) Engelmann and Büyükkolancı (1998) note both ἡ γερουσία and ὁ νεός as possible restorations for line 1. Both have their merits. The Ταῦρος in line 4 and σφακικυστίριον in line 7 suggest that Glaucon's benefaction was directed towards athletic aspects, in which case νέος is preferable since the *neoi* are more often associated with gymnastic activities than the *gerousia* is. Alternatively, the association of the *neoi* with the *boule* and *demos* is very rare in Ephesus, while the *gerousia* does appear with both bodies in honorary decrees (cf., cat. no. 36, *AE* 2000: 1408; cat. no. 37, *IEph* 657A), so that ἡ γερουσία may be preferable.
its script. Like the inscription of Glaucon, this inscription is found on a damaged stone, but not such that the phrasing is irretrievable. Octavia Capitolina is honoured for her prudence and generosity (*sophrosunes kai philandrias*). Once again, the *gerousia* shares the authorship of the honorary inscription and is in no way presented as less than the *boule* or the *demos*.

The *gerousia* could also offer honorary dedications independently of the *boule* and *demos*. A first-century inscription, again fragmentary, records honours for a certain Epaphras by the Elders (*presbeuteroi*). Since the remaining text does not mention anything to indicate that *presbeuteroi* could refer to an older group of boys in an athletic contest, this is in all probability a reference to the *gerousia*. The honorary decree was passed in response to Epaphras’ donation of ten thousand denarii for lending purposes (*ekdanismon*), not his service as priest of the divine Augustus. Such an inscription should be considered to be part of a monument rather than an official decree of the city. As in the case of Glaucon and Octavia Capitolina, however, it is not clear why the *gerousia* should have published this honorary text: at best, it may be supposed that it had benefited from the financial donation. If this is the case, the inescapable conclusion, given the presence of the word *ekdanismon*, is that the *gerousia* was involved in lending at this time either temple loans or secular loans funded by its own resources derived from such benefactions.

Finally, an undated inscription records honours for Marcus Com[...]. This is a dedication of the *boule*, *gerousia* and *demos*. Such an ordering of the three bodies is

---

29 Cat. no. 36.
30 Cat. no. 33.
31 Cf. above, Chapter Three, pp. 74-76.
32 Cat. no. 37.
unusual, but the restoration of he gerousia must be correct. The editors suggest that a third body originally stood between the he boule and ho demos, and, as noted above, it is highly unlikely that hoi neoi stood between the two bodies, leaving little choice beyond he gerousia. The unusual ordering can be accounted for by hypothesizing an error on the part of the stone mason, but the placement of the gerousia between the boule and demos may also be explained by the supposition of a particularly generous benefaction to the gerousia. If the restoration is correct, it may be possible to date the inscription to the first century since the gerousia does not appear in the company of the boule and demos as the author of such honours beyond that period.

The question of how these honours were earned cannot be answered simply by postulating an unknown benefaction to the groups involved, since the gerousia was not active in honouring all of its benefactors. Vipsania Olympia and Vipsania Polla, for instance, were honoured by the boule and demos probably before AD 88, when inclusion of the gerousia among the honouring bodies would not have been unusual.³³ Both women were priestesses of Artemis, led the sacrifices, adorned the temple and repaired a colonnade. They also offered distributions for the boule and the gerousia. The value of the distributions is not known, but it is evident that it was not sufficient to warrant an active role of thanks by the gerousia: the distributions were probably a one-time occurrence rather than an annual event supported by a large capital endowment. It may also be noted that the gerousia’s ties to the Temple of Artemis, if not to its financial resources, appear to have been loosened, since the service of the two Vipsanias to the temple also did not warrant the gerousia’s participation in the honorary decrees. These

³³ Cat. no. 35.
inscriptions may, therefore, show the beginnings of a diminishing role of the *gerousia* in public activities towards the end of the first century AD.

As is the case for the Hellenistic period, the evidence for the activities of the *gerousia* at the end of the first century BC is not sufficiently detailed to provide a complete picture. Nonetheless, it is probable that the *gerousia* continued to play a role in the administration of the financial resources of the Temple of Artemis, involving itself in lending, and to represent the interests of the temple to the city at large and Imperial officials on the provincial scale. The *gerousia* was occasionally involved in ascribing honours to its benefactors, but the precise criteria on which its involvement was determined are not known. It can only be hypothesized that the *gerousia* joined the *boule* and *demos* in honouring very large-scale benefactors of the city.

6.2.3. The Second Century AD

Epigraphic evidence for all aspects of Ephesian society increases during the second century. This also applies to the *gerousia*. During this century, the body appears in various types of inscriptions: Imperial letters, local decrees and honorific dedications.

An inscription which C.P. Jones has dated to the end of first century AD on the basis of the letter forms contains the final portion of a decree establishing heroic honours for a certain Peplus; this text may also suggest that the *gerousia* was increasing in the scope of its activities.34 The remnants of the inscription begin with a clause establishing the penalty for any violation of the terms of the decree: the decree passed in contravention of Peplus’ arrangements is to be declared invalid, and the one who proposed the decree is to pay ten thousand denarii “for the further adornment of the goddess Artemis and of the Augusti” and an additional ten thousand denarii to the Elders

---

34 Cat. no. 53; *JRS* 73 (1983): 116-125.
to fund a distribution (*presbeuteroi*). Although the decree also includes a provision allowing anyone to prosecute the violator or violators, the establishment of a fine payable to the *gerousia* places that body in the unofficial role of overseer of the terms of the decree, especially if the body maintained its interest in the temple’s financial resources: the *gerousia* would benefit privately through the distribution for its members, and publicly through the increase of temple funds.\(^{35}\)

The documents recording the donation of Gaius Vibius Salutaris contain a letter from Afranius Flavianus, the propraetor of the province of Asia in AD 104/105, granting approval to Salutaris’ arrangements.\(^{36}\) This letter is confirmation of approval granted in a previous letter by the proconsul of the same year, Aquillius Proculus, who specified the penalty to be paid by anyone who violated the arrangements made by Salutaris. The penalty specified is a fine of fifty thousand denarii, to be split equally between the Temple of Artemis and the *fiscus* of the emperor; there may also have been an additional twenty-five thousand denarii payable to the *gerousia*.\(^{37}\) There is no mention of an individual or group responsible for bringing a charge in the case of violations. If the *gerousia* was a recipient of a fine, though, it would have had an obvious interest in prosecuting violations, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that the task of overseeing Salutaris’ arrangements was overseen, in part, by that body. If this is the case, then the *gerousia* can be seen as a supervisor of the entire endowment, responsible, even if unofficially, for ensuring the proper investment and distribution of the capital sum. Even without a fine payable to itself, the *gerousia* may have been placed in the role of a

\(^{35}\) Cf. Oliver (1941): 85, where he notes that fines payable to the Artemision and the *fiscus* in the case of violation of Salutaris’ arrangements served to name the individuals in charge of those treasuries as guarantors of Salutaris’ provisions.

\(^{36}\) Cat. no. 15.

\(^{37}\) See below, pp. 264-270.
guarantor of the Salutaris’ arrangements through its interest in the fine payable to the temple.

The hypothesized fine may have been payable to the *gerousia* to be used at that body’s discretion, and it is probable that other, similar fines existed. If this is the case, the question arises of what the *gerousia* used its money for. It should be noted that such fines cannot have constituted a regular income: only if the terms of the benefactions were violated would the fines be levied. There are several possible uses. First, the *gerousia* may have used what financial resources it possessed to fund distributions or feasts for its members. No inscription commemorating such a distribution or feast survives in the evidence of the early second century AD, but this is not surprising. In the Hellenistic period, the *gerousia* was a semi-private organization involved in the administration of temple resources, so there is no reason why it should set up an inscription commemorating its own generosity to its members. The frequent appearance of the body in the inscriptions of the second century AD suggests that by the end of the first century the nature of the *gerousia* had changed from its original Hellenistic manifestation. It is, nonetheless, unlikely that a distribution or feast funded by the *gerousia* would be commemorated in an inscription. Such records were erected when there was *philoteimia* to be gained from the proclamation, but no one individual could claim responsibility, and therefore honour, for the distribution of corporate wealth.

---

38 The possibility of a violation of Salutaris’ terms cannot be considered to have been nonexistent. The redirection of endowment funds could be proposed by individuals eager to demonstrate their own generosity or to win popularity, as in the case of cash distributions at Delphi (below, p. 223, n. 40), but it could also be proposed and carried out for the benefit of the city as a whole: the closure of the gymnasium in the Macedonian city of Beroia in the second century resulted in the diversion of resources intended to fund previous endowments to meet the operating expenses of the gymnasium, on the instruction of the proconsul, Lucius Memmius Rufus (Kokkinia [2004]: 39-42). A similar diversion of funds may be apparent in the decree reinstituting a festival (Cat. no. 56): Nicomedes is said to have *found* money rather than to have *donated* it.
It is also possible that the *gerousia* received the income from such fines into a common treasury to be used for loans. It is known that twenty years after the establishment of Salutaris’ benefaction the *gerousia* was engaged in money-lending. A letter of Hadrian to the *gerousia* contains that emperor’s response to a complaint brought by the body.\(^{39}\) It appealed to the emperor in a conflict with the creditors or heirs of certain deceased persons. Its representative argued that the individuals in possession of the deceased individuals’ assets were heirs who had wrongly laid claim to the estates in question. Hadrian does not provide an unqualified answer: if things are as reported, the proconsul will appoint a judge to settle the matter. Aside from the question of primacy among collectors, the letter is a clear indication that the *gerousia* was actively lending at this time. It does not make clear whether the money that the *gerousia* lent out was from its own funds or from sacred resources which it may have been overseeing at this time. It does seem surprising that if the money in question belonged to the temple, there would be no mention of Artemis or the temple when one considers a letter sent by Hadrian to Delphi.\(^{40}\) Upon learning that some resources of the temple of Apollo at Delphi had been redirected to fund cash distributions, Hadrian ordered the god’s money to be restored and the distributions to cease. This suggests that Hadrian took an interest in sacred finances – at least in the larger sanctuaries – so that it is important that there is no mention of the Temple of Artemis in the letter to the Ephesian *gerousia*; one cannot, however, ignore the

\(^{39}\) Cat. no. 16.

possibility that there may have been no need to mention the Temple explicitly if the
*gerousia* was quite closely associated with it.

In light of his apparent attention to such matters, the tone of Hadrian's response is
also significant. Hadrian refers the matter to the proconsul without an expression of
direct support for the *gerousia*, which can be seen as an indication that the emperor was
unaware that the body was in this case concerned about a sacred loan. It is unlikely that
the *gerousia* would have failed to mention this fact as it could only have made its case
stronger. It must be concluded, therefore, that it was lending its own money, conducting
at least some business independently of the Temple of Artemis; this does not mean that it
was no longer involved in temple finances, but only that it was conducting a separate
business from its own treasury, possibly in addition to sacred loans. The incidental
income from the fines levied against violations of endowments should be seen as
potential additions to these private resources, with the *gerousia* serving as the primary
overseer of the arrangements of some benefactions. Those resources which were
available to the *gerousia* may therefore have been used either to fund distributions and
feasts for its members, or to increase its capital base. It is also possible that some of its
cash resources were used to fund feasts and sacrifices for other members of the Ephesian
citizenry.\(^{41}\)

Hadrian's letter suggests a differentiation of the resources of the temple and those
of the *gerousia*. If Menadier is correct in identifying the *sustemata* of the Mithridates-
decree with the *gerousia*, as argued above, the influence which the *gerousia* enjoyed over
the temple had already been limited by the first century BC: of all the sacred loans, only
some were overseen by the *sustemata*. The process of limitation continued, despite the

\(^{41}\text{Cf. cat. no. 56 and above, pp. 103-106 & below, pp. 237-238.}\)
support received under Augustus and Tiberius, until by the end of the first century the financial resources of the *gerousia* and the temple appear to have been largely separate. Nonetheless, there was still a close connection between the two. The close association between the *gerousia* and the *neopoioi* in Salutaris’ arrangements for the annual distributions and the identification of both the temple and the *gerousia* as recipients of the fine for violation support such a connection. Consequently, the separation of the two treasuries may not have been entirely complete at this time, or it may have been a recent development. Certainly, however, the separation was underway if not complete by the date of Hadrian’s letter in AD 120/121.

Although there are no inscriptions preserving a transaction or a contract of the *gerousia*, its financial activities are sufficiently attested by occasional references of the type discussed earlier. The possibility that a *logistes* could be appointed must also be seen as confirmation that the *gerousia* used its income to engage in business practices.\(^{42}\)

The direct role taken by the *gerousia* in the honouring of some of its benefactors remarked upon in the previous section continued into the second century; after the first century, though, the *gerousia* appears to have honoured its benefactors or other individuals independently of the *boule* and *demos*. As in the first century, though, the *gerousia* did not honour all of its benefactors: the failure of the *gerousia* to honour Vipsania Polla and Vipsania Olympia has parallels in the second century. Although the body was the recipient of a portion of Salutaris’ endowment, no evidence is currently known to indicate that it honoured him for this benefaction. Similarly, Titus Peducaeus Canax provided distributions of money for the *boule* and *gerousia*, but it is only the *boule* and *demos* which are named as the authors of the decree in his honour, as in the case of

\(^{42}\) Cat. nos. 17 & 41.
the two Vipsanias. Titus Flavius Montanus provided a midday meal for the citizens of the city and “did everything which was fair for the boule and gerousia.” Again, though, the gerousia is not named as one of the authors of the decree.

The gerousia did, however, honour Tiberius Claudius Secundus in a brief bilingual inscription, datable to the early second century AD. The reason for the honours is not known, nor is there any indication in the inscription of how Secundus was connected to the gerousia. He is, however, honoured in two other inscriptions from Ephesus by his freedman, Tiberius Claudius Hermias, of which one is given below:

The other inscription provides a partial Latin translation of the first half of the above inscription. These two inscriptions were erected by Hermias rather than the by gerousia, but they nevertheless provide an idea of the sort of activities which Secundus undertook to merit the honorary inscription offered by the gerousia. He was a friend to the city (philephesion) and “adorned the city of the Ephesians with other noteworthy works and constructed the house and the stoa leading away from the house.” Which building ton oikon refers to is unknown but Secundus was clearly a benefactor of the city

---

43 Cat. no. 35.
44 Cat. no. 39.
45 Cat. no. 43.
46 IEph 1545.
47 IEph 646.
on a relatively large scale. It is possible that the gerousia was concerned with honouring
the benefactors of the city as a whole rather than its own benefactors: the gerousia was
not a direct beneficiary of Secundus.

Marcus Ulpius Aristocrates was the recipient of an honorary statue a little after
AD 140. Aristocrates was high-priest and agonothetes of the Hadrianeia; he also made
donations in the tens of thousands of denarii for unknown projects as a form of summa
honoraria. Perhaps more importantly, though, he had been appointed by Antoninus Pius
to be the logistes of the gerousia. Strictly speaking, the summa honoraria would not
warrant the spontaneous dedication of a statue, so that it is the service as logistes which
more probably prompted the action. As was argued above in Chapter Five, the logistes
was an external official and, as the appointee of the emperor, it would not be surprising
for the gerousia to honour him: one could not simply ignore such an individual.

At some point during the first two centuries AD, the gerousia may have
developed a connection with the Imperial cult. Oliver argues that this was a result of the
extension of the cult of Artemis to include the emperors and that there was no direct
connection between the gerousia and the Imperial cult. Imperial high-priests are
conspicuous among the members of the gerousia by their absence. Any suggestion that
the gerousia was directly involved in the operations of the Imperial cult therefore cannot
be indisputably proven, and Oliver’s position is not unreasonable. Even in the case of an
incidental connection between the gerousia and the Imperial cult the absence of cult
officials from the ranks of the gerousiastai would be remarkable given the prominence of

---

48 Cat. no. 41.
49 Above, Chapter Five, pp 164-165.
51 Above, Chapters Four and Five.
its members in other religious aspects of the city’s daily life, as discussed in the previous chapter.

The connection may have been even less than incidental, though. A letter of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus to the logistes of the gerousia, which seems to offer a connection between the two institutions, concerns, among other things, the restoration of Imperial statues.\(^{52}\) The logistes appears to have written to the emperors asking if it was appropriate to alter pre-existing statues or busts (eikones) into representations of the current emperors. Aurelius and Verus refuse this expedient, requiring instead that the existing statues be re-erected together with their original name plates and, by implication, that new statues be made for themselves. The statues at the time of the inquiry were kept in a sunhedrion, clearly, in this case, a reference to a chamber rather than a body of individuals:

\[
\text{τάς οὖν εἰκόνας τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων, ὡς ἀποκείσθαι λέγεις ἐν τῷ συνε-} \\
[δρί]ῷ τούτῳ, παλαιάς, ἐνι μὲν λόγῳ πάσας δοκιμάζομεν φυλαχθήναι τοῖς \\
[νόμασιν, ἐφ’ ο-} \\
[τέ]ς] γέγονεν αὐτῶν ἐκάστη, εἰς δὲ ἡμετέρους χαρακτήρας μηδὲν τι τῆς ὥλης \\
[ἐκείνης} \\
[μεταφέρεινˈ} \\
...all the ancient busts of the emperors, which you say are stored in this assembly chamber (συνεδρίων), should be preserved under the names upon which each of them originally was,\(^{53}\) and that none of them should be changed into our representations....\(^{54}\)

\(^{52}\) Cat. no. 17.

\(^{53}\) One is to imagine the imperial representations as standing on inscribed bases. It is the emperors’ decision that the bases and representations should be retained as is. The sunhedrion in which these representations were stored is clearly a building, one which would seem to have been associated with the gerousia. The nature of this association is not at all clear. It is unlikely to have been a meeting house of the gerousia, though. The verb ἀποκείμαι can be understood as “to store something for a common purpose or for safety”, but this sense appears primarily in classical authors. The verb in later authors, as in this case, implies indefinite storage or neglect: the statues were placed in the sunhedrion in order to do something with them. The sunhedrion should therefore be understood in this case as a storage area, a type of attic, which was used by the gerousia, rather than as a meeting chamber.

\(^{54}\) Cat. no. 17.
Since it is the logistes of the gerousia who asks about these statues, it seems clear that the gerousia had supervision of them and, consequently, that the sunhedrion was used by the gerousia.\textsuperscript{55} That the inquiry is not raised by an Imperial cult member should be seen as an indication that these statues were not associated with the cult per se. They should be viewed as possessions of or dedications by the gerousia. The statues can therefore be seen as expressions of corporate rather than of provincial loyalty of the gerousia.

Such expressions outside of the Imperial cult are not uncommon. The epithet philosebastos appears occasionally in the inscriptions of Asia Minor, though nowhere so often as in Ephesus. The term is not particularly common outside of Ephesus, but it is applied to individuals, such as grammateis and high-priests, groups of individuals, such as kouretes and strategoi, and to bodies, such as the boule and demos. In some cities, the adjective appears to be used very specifically, as in Miletus, where the boule alone is described as philosebastos, or in Stratonicea and its sanctuary sites at Lagina and Panamara, where only individuals acquire the epithet.\textsuperscript{56} Elsewhere, it is used with less discrimination, as in Tralles, Magnesia and Ephesus itself.\textsuperscript{57}

Some of the earliest uses of the term are in dedications to Caligula and Drusilla in Didyma and Magnesia, respectively.\textsuperscript{58} It was not a common epithet in the first century, however, and appeared only sporadically after these initial attestations.\textsuperscript{59} During the reign of Trajan, philosebastos begins to appear with much greater frequency, known from

\textsuperscript{55} This is one of two mentions of a building which might have been used as a meeting place by the gerousia, but cf., p. 228-229, n. 53. A geronteion is mentioned in a second inscription (cat. no. 72), but little can be said about this building except that it existed.

\textsuperscript{56} Milet I 2 17, I 7 226, 228, 232, 238; I 9 344; IStrat 151, 184, 186, 187, 189, 210, 230a, 230b, 665, 665a, 1025, 1026.

\textsuperscript{57} ITralles 69, 77, 93, 112, 141, 145; IMag 122, 169, 170, 171, 173, 179, 218.

\textsuperscript{58} I Did 148; IMag 197.

\textsuperscript{59} AD 7 (1921-1922): 286, no. 5 (AD 84-85), RhM 22 (1867): 314-315, no. 1 (AD 41-100; both in Samos); ISmyrna (AD 80-83); I I asos (AD 79-81).
Chios, Didyma, Miletus and Magnesia. Thereafter, the epithet appears with relative frequency throughout the second century and into the third.

With one exception, *philosebastos* is applied to individuals in every non-Ephesian instance dated to the first century; the exception is an inscription from Tralles, dated by B. Laum, in which the *gerousia* and the *neoi* are both described as *philosebastoi*. It is only in the second century that the epithet begins to be applied regularly to bodies of citizens. In particular, the appearances of a *philosebastos boule*, *gerousia* or *demos* occur most frequently between the reign of Trajan and that of Antoninus Pius. These bodies do bear the epithet into the Severan period and the third century, but by this time it is primarily individuals once again who are termed *philosebastos*.

Ephesus is the source of the greatest number of instances of *philosebastos*, and the usage of the term in that city conforms to the outline of the word’s use elsewhere as given above. Its earliest appearances seem to be in three inscriptions datable to the reign of Claudius, namely one dedication to the emperor, an honorary inscription for the proconsul and an honorary inscription for a legate. Although it does appear in inscriptions from the reign of Nero, applied almost always to individuals, it is with latter half of the reign of Domitian that the term becomes common in Ephesus.

Individuals remain the most common recipients of the epithet throughout the second century and up to the mid-third century. As is the case elsewhere in Asia Minor, *philosebastos* is applied regularly to groups of citizens or public bodies in the second
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60 Eg., CIG 2216b (Chios); IDid 312; Milet 12 17, I 17 226, 228; IMag 169, 170.
61 ItTralles 145.
62 IDid 156 (AD 250), Milet 19 344 (AD 242-4); ItTralles 69 (mid-3rd century), 112 (3rd century).
63 I Eph 261, 716 & 829.
64 I Eph 1008; JOAI 59 (1989): 163-164, no. 1 (reign of Nero); I Eph 449, 1927.3, 263c & 319 (reign of Domitian at the earliest).
century, beginning in the reign of Domitian. The latest application of *philosebastos* to a public body appears in a pair of inscriptions honouring Vibius Seneca and Claudia Caninia Severa, dated to AD 244-246.\(^{65}\) With this exception, the epithet appears to have been no longer applied to bodies and groups of citizens at all beyond the joint reign of Severus and Caracalla, but the reign of Commodus marks the end of its regular use in this way in Ephesus.

The term should not be seen as indicative of any special service to the emperor or to Rome, but rather simply as a parallel to *philopatris* or *philephesios*, that is, as an expression of *eunoia* and, through that *eunoia*, loyalty to the emperor and Rome.\(^{66}\) The initial appearances of the epithet are cases of dedications to the emperor or his family, and so are more representative of a desire to emphasize loyalty. Its frequent use throughout the second century in the case of individuals probably removed most nuances of specific loyalty to the emperor, until it became a standard title, which could be attached to the names of some Asiarchs or individuals offering a dedication.\(^{67}\)

When applied to bodies such as the *boule* or *gerousia*, the use of the term probably followed the same pattern: expressing actual loyalty or goodwill toward the emperor at first, but becoming less expressive of such feelings during the course of the second century. That *philosebastos* does not persist with any degree of regularity beyond the reign of Commodus indicates that its use as an epithet may not have become firmly established, and therefore that the degradation in its meaning may not have been as dramatic as in the case of individuals. The appearance of a *philosebastos* *boule* or *gerousia* in the third century outside of Ephesus is more frequent, strengthening the
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\(^{65}\) Cat. nos. 46 & 47.


\(^{67}\) Eg., *IEph* 616, 619B, 621A, 632, 655, 679, 716, 739, 3030, 3063, 3088 & 3091.
suggestion that the term did not become a standard epithet of little significant meaning in Ephesus. It was used sparingly in the case of public bodies, revealing that some degree of importance was probably retained.

The philosebastos gerousia should, therefore, be seen as an attempt by the gerousia to present itself as a body which was loyal to the emperor. Why such expressions should have become persistently common in the second century is unclear, but there are possible explanations. The consistent appearances of philosebastos may begin as early as the reign of Domitian. Ephesus received its first or second neocorate under the Flavians, and Domitian is known to have undertaken significant building projects in the city.\textsuperscript{68} Philosebastos may, therefore, have been a title adopted in gratitude for the emperor's attention to the city. The boule and demos appear to have assumed the title first in Ephesus and so may be explained in this way.

The philosebastos gerousia, though, does not appear until the Salutaris-dossier in AD 104. It is possible, therefore, that a Trajanic rather than a Domitianic explanation should be sought for the gerousia's use of the title.\textsuperscript{69} Trajan's concerns about the assembly of private citizens are well known from his letter to Pliny forbidding the creation of a fire-brigade in Nicomedia.\textsuperscript{70} When Pliny inquired about benefit societies in Amisus, however, Trajan did not overrule the right of certain cities to form assemblies of citizens if that right had been granted by a treaty.\textsuperscript{71} Trajan's concern, though, is the same as in the case of Nicomedia: Pliny is to ensure that the contributions paid by the members of the new society are not used for "riotous and unlawful assemblies".

\textsuperscript{69} Cat. nos. 54 & 55; IEph 27A & G.
\textsuperscript{70} PL, Ep., 10.33-34.
\textsuperscript{71} PL, Ep., 10.92-93.
While the benefit society of Amisus and the *gerousia* of Ephesus are not precisely comparable, the situations are similar. The danger as feared by Roman officials was that any group of citizens – be it fire-brigade, benefit society or *gerousia* – could become a political gang. The *gerousia* of Ephesus had existed continuously from the Hellenistic period, so that the perceived danger could not be dealt with in the same way as that posed by a proposed fire-brigade, that is, by forbidding its creation; instead, the *gerousia* was permitted to continue, as, possibly, in Amisus. Trajan’s concern cannot have been limited to Bithynia-Pontus alone, and so was probably known to the Ephesians. The application of *philosebastos* to the *gerousia* – and to other groups of citizens – can therefore be seen as an effort to assure the emperor and the provincial officials that the *gerousia* was not a political gang or any threat to civic peace, but simply an orderly and law-abiding group of citizens with no grand, ulterior political motives.

The use of the adjective in public inscriptions, however, was probably only one of several ways in which the *gerousia* – and other bodies – attempted to present this appearance. The statues about which the *logistes* of the *gerousia* writes to Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus can be seen in the same light. The statues were dedicated and maintained – or simply stored as the letter indicates – and so can be seen as expressions of loyalty. Not only did the *gerousia* not meet for subversive or perceivably subversive purposes, but it observed the metaphorical presence of the emperors. Any connection to the Imperial cult can therefore only have been through the temple and the *gerousia*’s financial activities associated with it.

The second century provides the most evidence for the *gerousia* in Ephesus. Despite this, the evidence does not provide as complete a picture of that body’s activities
as one might wish. The gerousia continued to act as a lending body, but there was a distinction between the financial resources of the Temple of Artemis and those of the gerousia itself. These resources were augmented occasionally by income from fines levied against violators of certain decrees whom the gerousia, because of the fines payable, had a vested interest in prosecuting. The gerousia continued, at least in the early years of the second century, to take a role in honouring certain benefactors of the city as it had occasionally done in special circumstances during the first century, but independently of the boule and demos. It undertook to demonstrate its loyalty to the emperor, but there was no direct connection between the Imperial cult and the gerousia.

The financial activities which were evident in the first century continued into the second, and may have lasted the duration of that century, although the only evidence from the middle portion of the century seems be the existence of two logistai of the gerousia. Given the lack of evidence beyond the mid-second century, it is possible that the gerousia’s involvement in loans diminished over the course of this century. Although evidence is more abundant during the second century, the presence of the gerousia is passive rather than active, that is, it is most often mentioned as a recipient or the body to which a citizen belonged rather than as the author of a decree or the dispatcher of an embassy.

6.2.4. The Late Second and Early Third Centuries AD

The gerousia of the late second and early third centuries is known primarily through funerary inscriptions. The latest Imperial letter addressed to the gerousia is that of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, which was discussed in the previous section, and there are few decrees concerning the body’s activities. A single honorary inscription was
erected in honour of a member of the *gerousia*; it does not reveal much about the activities of the body as a whole. The funerary inscriptions, on the other hand, do provide some evidence for its activities.

Although funerary inscriptions form the bulk of the evidence for the *gerousia* in the late second and early third centuries, a dedication to (possibly) Dionysus, Artemis and the *Tyche* of the *gerousia* suggests that the body continued its lending activities beyond the second century. Marcus Aurelius Agathopus erected a monument together with his family “because [he] preserved the trust of the *gerousia*”. It has been argued above that this “trust” (*ten pisten*) is not an office within the *gerousia* but property entrusted to Agathopus as security. This would suggest that the *gerousia* was at this point not lending money, but borrowing against something which was temporarily entrusted to Agathopus. Such a proposition is not inconsistent with what is known of Agathopus. He appears in a second dedication in which he identifies himself as a *prytanis*, a position occupied by men of rank and therefore wealth, and only very rarely if at all by a *gerousiastes*. It is possible that the *gerousia*’s financial resources had significantly declined by this date. Alternatively, the body may have been temporarily short of liquid resources or outlaying an unusually large amount of money. Agathopus’ inscription could only have been erected after the return of the *pistis* to the *gerousia*, so one of the latter explanations should be preferred to a significant and permanent decline: it was able to redeem whatever property had been held by Agathopus.
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72 Cat. no. 23.
73 Above, Chapter Four, pp. 122-125.
74 IEph 1069; cf., above, Chapter Five, pp. 172: only one *prytanis* is known who may have belonged to the *gerousia*, but there his membership is not at all certain (cat. no. 52).
Activities beyond those pertaining to lending and borrowing must be gleaned from honorary and funeral inscriptions. These show that the active role taken by the gerousia in honouring certain individuals in earlier periods had either ceased entirely or was so infrequent as to be invisible in the epigraphic record. A third century member of the gerousia, Aurelius Antoninus Julianus, erected a statue in honour of a Marcus Aurelius whose cognomen has been lost. Marcus is identified as a gymnasiarch, grammateus, agonothetes and Asiarch, but in no way is he a benefactor specifically of the gerousia. It seems unlikely, therefore, that the gerousia itself was behind the dedication of the statue: Marcus’ offices are to be regarded as conferring honour and status, but he was not a benefactor on a large scale like those individuals honoured by the gerousia in the first century were. Given the titles attributed to him, it is highly unlikely that he was a member of the gerousia, so this cannot be a case of one member erecting a statue in honour of another. Aurelius Julianus was most likely a private beneficiary of his, perhaps a client, who erected a statue in honour of his patron and included geroustaies simply as a list of his own positions and honours within the city.

Tiberius Claudius Moschas served as ekdikos of the gerousia and possibly of the boule between AD 244 and 246. He appears in several Ephesian inscriptions, two of which are relevant to the gerousia; both appear on statue bases which Moschas erected. The first inscription honours Vibius Seneca, a tribune of the Praetorians and a sailor in the fleets of Messene and Ravenna. No reason is given for the dedication. The first few lines of the inscription have been lost and supplemented Die Inschriften von Ephesos to read “the sunhedrion of the Emperor-loving gerousia (has honoured)” Vibius Seneca. It
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75 Cat. no. 49.
76 Cat. nos. 46 & 47.
was suggested in the previous chapter, though, that a more probable restoration might be "the boule and demos have honoured Vibius Seneca", which may also appear in the second inscription erected by Moschas, that of Claudia Caninia Severa.\footnote{\textit{Cat. no. 47}; above, Chapter Five, pp. 162-163.}

The \textit{gerousia} was involved in the performance of a sacrifice in honour of Artemis at the beginning of the Hellenistic period, and this activity continued for some time. It was, however, discontinued due to a lack of funds, though the date of its discontinuation is not known. This activity was revived, however, during the reign of Commodus.\footnote{\textit{Cat. no. 56}.} The degree of the \textit{gerousia}'s involvement is not clear, beyond its role of funding the sacrifices and the accompanying feast. It has been argued above that the \textit{gerousia} and the \textit{sunhedrion} in the Nicomedes-decree are not identical.\footnote{\textit{Cat. no. 56}; above, Chapter Three, pp. 72-73, Chapter Four, pp. 103-106 & Chapter Five, pp. 161-162.} Each member of the \textit{sunhedrion} was to receive an unknown sum of money from the treasury of the \textit{gerousia} and the injunctions laid separately on the \textit{gerousia} and the \textit{sunhedrion} suggest two bodies rather than one. It is possible, therefore, that the \textit{gerousia}, as a unified body, played no role in the feast and sacrifice as they were re-established under Commodus other than to provide the funding.

If the \textit{gerousia} and \textit{sunhedrion} are to be identified with one another in this decree, it appears that the members of the \textit{gerousia} began to be separated into different groups, namely those who would participate in the feast and those who did not. As a body which had been throughout its documented history closely associated with the Temple of Artemis, the \textit{gerousia} could be expected to take part in such a celebration. In the case of the endowment of Salutaris, arrangements were made with the intention that the entire \textit{gerousia} would participate. Measures were taken to encourage the presence of the entire
body, even if only a portion were actual beneficiaries of Salutaris’ distributions. There is no distinction between the members in Salutaris’ benefaction: each member of the gerousia is a potential recipient since the distribution is to be conducted according to a lottery.\textsuperscript{80} If the sunhedrion is identified as a council within the gerousia, there is a clear demarcation of recipients and supporting members in the decree reinstating the sacrifices and feast, a demarcation which is not supported by any of the other evidence for the gerousia. It is preferable, therefore, to identify the sunhedroi mentioned in the Nicomedes-decrees either as those members of the gerousia who took part in the re-instituted festival, or as members of a different group.

During the late second and early third centuries, the gerousia continued to play a role in ensuring the observance of certain decrees. There is, however, no case in which the gerousia played a role comparable to that which it has been suggested for it in the case of Salutaris’ endowment, or even in the endowment establishing heroic honours for a certain Peplus.\textsuperscript{81} Instead, the gerousia is given charge of ensuring adherence to funerary injunctions during this later period, both directly and indirectly, rather than of overseeing endowment-related activities.\textsuperscript{82}

Julia Domnula erected a tomb for herself, her husband and her sons.\textsuperscript{83} According to the inscription, the gerousia, boule and the Augustales (Kaisarianoi) are to take care of the tomb (kedetai). The reason for the association of these three groups is unclear. The presence of the Augustales gives support to the proposition that Julia Domnula was a

\textsuperscript{80} Cat. no. 54.
\textsuperscript{81} Cat. nos. 53-55; above, pp. 220-222 & below, pp. 264-270.
\textsuperscript{82} This is true of Ephesus and of other cities. Thus, a funerary inscription from Magnesia ad Sipylum also specifies a penalty payable to the fiscus and to the gerousia in the event of violation of its terms (TAM V,II 1382), while three additional texts also identify the gerousia as the recipient of such a fine (TAM V,II 1383, 1386, \textit{Magnesia am Sipylum} 23); cf. TAM III,1 590 (Termessus); \textit{Ilaodikeia} 110, 122 & 123; on the violation of tombs and attempts to protect them, see Strubbe (1997).
\textsuperscript{83} Cat. no. 74.
freedwoman of Julia Domna. If so, it would not be unreasonable for her to take an interest in the affairs of the boule as a prominent member of the Ephesian populace and vice versa. The reason for the presence of the gerousia must remain even more hypothetical. It is possible that Gaius Julius Phoebus, Domnula’s husband, was a member of the gerousia and this membership was used to garner further support to ensure adherence to the terms of the funerary inscription. Although it is possible that Phoebus was also a freedman of Julia Domna, there is no incongruity in identifying a former as a member of the gerousia: a certain Zoticus identifies himself as an Imperial freedman and as a member of the gerousia in an inscription approximately contemporary with that of Julia Domnula. There is, however, no clear evidence that the gerousia maintained the tombs of its members.

The exact reason for the involvement of the three groups in the guardianship of the tomb must remain uncertain, as it must in the case of Hellenia Meroe, who built a tomb for herself, her husband and their children. Two suppositions, though improbable, are possible. Meroe, like Domnula, may have had a connection to the gerousia through her husband. Alternatively, Sextus Hellenius, her former owner, may have been a member and used his membership to ensure adherence. Again, though, it may be noted that no inscription explicitly associates the gerousia with the tomb of one of its members.

The term kedetai in these inscriptions must mean that the caretaker ensured adherence to the terms specified in the funerary inscriptions and not that the individual or group named physically maintained the tombs. In the case of Julia Domnula’s tomb and

\[\text{kedetai}\] in these inscriptions must mean that the caretaker ensured adherence to the terms specified in the funerary inscriptions and not that the individual or group named physically maintained the tombs. In the case of Julia Domnula’s tomb and
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84 Cat. no. 75; freedmen as a rule do not appear to have been members of the gerousia, but Imperial freedmen must be considered separately from former slaves of regular citizens.
85 Cat. no. 82.
86 Cf. Cat. nos. 73, 85-88, in all of which the gerousia is charged with care (kedetai) for the tomb.
two others, multiple groups are assigned to “take care” of them.\textsuperscript{87} It would be excessive to charge several groups with simple maintenance, and it would seem to be beneath the dignity of the \textit{boule} to be specifically charged with the maintenance of particular tombs. It should be noted, though, that a \textit{kedomenos} could be a patron. Therefore, the appearance of the \textit{gerousia} (and the \textit{boule}) in association with this verb may be indicative of patronal activities.\textsuperscript{88}

Several of the inscriptions identifying the \textit{gerousia} as caretaker also specify a penalty for any violation of the terms of the inscription. To open Julia Domnula’s tomb after her death, for example, carried a fine of ten thousand denarii, payable to the \textit{gerousia}. Publia Julia Beryla stipulated that the sale of her tomb entailed a penalty of five thousand denarii, also payable to the \textit{gerousia}.\textsuperscript{89} Interment of bones in the tomb of Claudia Magna required two payments of two hundred and fifty denarii to the \textit{gerousia} and the treasury of the city respectively.\textsuperscript{90} A certain Paulina left very specific terms: to buy the tomb, to inter anyone other than those specified, to remove any remains, or to alter or remove any of the terms of the inscription carried fines of twelve thousand five hundred denarii each to the \textit{gerousia} and the \textit{boule}.\textsuperscript{91} Julia Domnula’s inscription is the only one to include both a charge of guardianship with \textit{kedetai} and the specification of a fine, but, as it was argued earlier in this chapter, the existence of a fine gave certain groups a vested interest in preserving the terms of the inscription.\textsuperscript{92} Consequently, it can

\textsuperscript{87} Cat. nos. 73, 87 & 88.
\textsuperscript{88} Cf. Nollé (1999): 107, n. 52.
\textsuperscript{89} Cat. no. 81.
\textsuperscript{90} Cat. no. 83.
\textsuperscript{91} Cat. no. 84.
\textsuperscript{92} Above, pp. 220-222.
be said with relative certainty that an important role of the gerousia during the late second and early third centuries was the enforcement of the terms of certain burials.

Why the gerousia was given this task in only a few circumstances cannot be adequately explained. As was suggested, there may have been direct connections between the deceased and the gerousia, or an element of patronage may have been involved. Although this cannot be shown to have been the case in inscriptions naming the gerousia as the caretaker, it is almost certain in other cases. The husband of Aurelia Cyrilla, for instance, was a member of the gerousia, but the college of linuphoi is identified as the recipient of a fine for violation of the burial terms.\textsuperscript{93} The presence of the linuphoi can be explained only by the assumption that the deceased belonged to the college or that he was a patron of the college.

Another possibility must also be recognized: those inscriptions which name the boule as the caretaker can be seen as transferring the honours of that body to the individual – that is, the deceased enhances his own status by associating himself (or herself) with the boule. From all the evidence, it appears that the members of the gerousia enjoyed a social status which, while below that of the bouleutai, was above the average.\textsuperscript{94} Associating oneself with that body, therefore, would also enhance one’s own status. It cannot be imagined that such an association could have been accomplished unilaterally in a funerary inscription; the reason for the gerousia’s appearance in these inscriptions and its relationship to the deceased must remain unexplained.

The gerousia’s diminishing role in the lending activities of the temple during the second century appears to have continued into the third to the point that it may have been

\textsuperscript{93} Cat. no. 79.
\textsuperscript{94} Cf. Chapter Five.
required to take out loans. Although apparently reduced, the gerousia’s finances were healthy enough at the end of the second century to support a sacrifice and feast in honour of Artemis and Commodus. The reduced authorship of honorary decrees which emerged during the second century was complete by the late second or early third century: the gerousia is no longer seen to honour its beneficiaries or those of the city with decrees or monuments. This general decline was accompanied by an increase in one aspect of the gerousia, though. By the third century, the gerousia was not infrequently identified as the recipient of fines levied against tomb violations and may therefore have continued to be an unofficial supervisor of certain decrees.

6.3. Rights and Privileges

6.3.1. The Hellenistic Period

It was argued above in Chapter Two that the gerousia was an established institution by the beginning of the Hellenistic period. As such, its basic rights and privileges will have been established long before the period for which there is evidence. The process of the limitation of the authority which the gerousia exercised in the affairs of the city during the early Hellenistic period was most likely accompanied by a simultaneous diminishment of its rights and privileges.

At the beginning of the Hellenistic period, the gerousia possessed the right of recommending individuals for grants of citizenship. Whether this was strictly speaking a privilege is uncertain. It is clear that the gerousia recommended Euphronius to the boule and demos for a grant of citizenship, but no other citizenship decrees preserve such a recommendation by the gerousia or by any other group or individual.\footnote{Cat. no. 1.}
above that the activity of the *gerousia* in securing honours for Euphronius was unusual and it is possible that the award of citizenship was not an honour which the *gerousia* could normally influence. It is clear, though, that the *gerousia* was able to influence the decision in his case, and it is equally clear that this right, if right it was, was used very sparingly. Thus, the inscription mentioning the flute-player from Boeotia appears to be simply an honorary decree, praising, crowning and publicly proclaiming him. The decree breaks off, but it does not seem to have included citizenship for the Boeotian.\(^{96}\)

Given the absence of similar decrees later in the Hellenistic period, it may be argued that this privilege was lost early in the *gerousia*’s Hellenistic existence. Honorary inscriptions in the first century AD, however, present a similar pattern: the *gerousia* only rarely appears as one of the authors of the dedication.\(^{97}\) The exceedingly rare appearance of the *gerousia* as an honouring body in the Hellenistic period is entirely consistent with its failure to appear regularly with the *boule* and *demos* in honorary inscriptions beyond the first century AD. That the *gerousia* did not support more of its benefactors and the benefactors of the Temple of Artemis for citizenship – or other honours – should not be taken as proof that it could not do so, only that it did so very rarely. The apparent right of recommending individuals may be similar to rights of first consultation of the *boule* granted to certain benefactors.\(^{98}\)

The decree granting Euphronius citizenship also demonstrates that the *gerousia* possessed the right of sending embassies in its own name. Embassies were frequent in Hellenistic Asia Minor, both between cities and between cities and kings. They are known from honorary inscriptions, decrees of the cities and responding letters of kings or

\(^{96}\) Cat. no. 2.
officials. Ambassadors were sent from city to city most often as bearers of decrees of isopoliteia, but there are also cases of ambassadors carrying decrees of thanks to cities which had arbitrated a dispute.

Embassies sent to kings and officials were frequently intended to inform the recipient of an honorary decree, or to bring forward a complaint against another city. Thus, a pair of letters from Iasos records the oaths of two officials, Aristobulus and Asclepiodorus, to uphold the freedom and autonomy of Iasos at the beginning of the third century BC.99 It appears that embassies such as that of Euphronius were relatively rare. Responses to petitions appear only occasionally, which suggests that petitions themselves were presented or granted only infrequently.

Although it is not stated in every case, most ambassadors were sent out by the boule and demos of their respective cities; in those inscriptions which do not record the authorizing body, it is logical to assume that it was the polis. There is no evidence of an embassy dispatched by a body such as the chrysophoroi or the neoi. Euphronius' embassy was unusual, therefore, since it was dispatched not by the boule and demos, but by the gerousia. Since there is no other case of an embassy sent by a body other than the boule and demos, the polis or a patris, the gerousia's dispatch of Euphronius must be seen as a privilege of the gerousia, whether or not it was repeated.100 This would seem to place the gerousia on a level with cities which also dispatched embassies, as opposed to individual citizens whose regular method of appeal was through a letter or a patron.

Recommending a foreigner for citizenship and sending an embassy in the manner of a polis were rights which the gerousia possessed before the beginning of the

---

99 Ilasos 3; cf. Welles, 9, a petition regarding asylum and tax-free status addressed by Nysa to Seleucus I and Antiochus.
Hellenistic period. The right to dispatch an embassy may be a remnant of the oligarchic control which it has been suggested the *gerousia* exercised during the fourth-century Persian ascendancy.\textsuperscript{101} Euphronius’ embassy to Prepelaus did not gain privileges for the *gerousia per se*, but it did gain financial concessions for the Temple of Artemis, namely tax-free status and exemption from billeting soldiers. Individually, the members of the *gerousia* did not benefit from this success; they appear to have been personally exempt neither from taxes nor from billeting. Corporately, however, the body did benefit. The simple act of dispatching the embassy makes it clear that the *gerousia* did have an interest in the financial affairs of the temple at this time. This interest may have been limited to a supervision of the temple’s possessions with no involvement in lending, but it is equally possible that the *gerousia* was already active in overseeing loans by the temple. In either case, the temple’s exemptions became indirectly the *gerousia’s* exemptions. If the representative role which it was argued the *gerousia* played in the early Hellenistic period was the limit of its involvement with the temple, the concessions gained by Prepelaus would still be of benefit to it: as a representative body, the interests of the temple would become its interests.

Whether or not the *gerousia’s* supervision of loans of temple resources formed a part of its activities from the beginning of the Hellenistic period, lending was certainly an important part of the *gerousia’s* operations by the end of the Hellenistic period. Reasons have been given above to support Menadier’s identification of the unspecified *sustenata* of the Mithridates-decree as the *gerousia*.\textsuperscript{102} If such an interpretation is correct, it is clear that the *gerousia’s* supervision of temple loans began at some point before the first

\textsuperscript{101} Above, Chapter Two, pp. 27-28.
\textsuperscript{102} Above, pp. 211-213; cat. no. 3.
century BC, and may have characterized the *gerousia* throughout the Hellenistic period. It is equally clear from the decree that the *gerousia* did not enjoy supreme supervision of the temple’s resources. There is an unequivocal differentiation of sacred loans into those lent by the *sustemata* or individuals appointed by the *sustemata*, and other sacred loans.

At some point, therefore, the *sustemata* must have gained a privileged position among the supervisors of the temple’s possessions; it is possible that this decree marks the beginning of such special status. When the *gerousia* reappears under its own name in the second half of the first century BC, it is in possession of certain unspecified rights and privileges (*teimia kai philanthropa*). It will become clear that these rights and privileges existed before the first letter to the *gerousia*, which is dated forty to sixty years after the decree declaring war on Mithridates. The emergence of special status for a supervisory board of the temple’s finances shortly after the Mithridatic war would not be surprising. During the brief period of his supremacy in Ephesus, Mithridates, like Alexander before him, had extended the area of asylum covered by the Temple of Artemis, and it is reasonable to suppose that with this extension of physical area came an extension of the influence of the temple authorities. It is, however, more probable that the special status of the *gerousia* among creditors was a concession of the city used to limit the comprehensiveness of the remission of debts which the decree calls for.

Certainly the emergence of such a privileged status under Sulla seems unlikely, since his main activity related to financial concerns in this area of Asia Minor seems to have been the imposition of a war indemnity after the defeat of Mithridates. Marc Antony appears to have been similarly interested in the exaction of tribute rather than the

---

103 Cf. cat. nos. 4-7; below, pp. 249-253.
104 Str. 14.1.23.
105 Above, Chapter Two, p. 31-42.
reorganization of the temple’s administrative structure; he did, however, double the area of asylum to include a part of the city.\textsuperscript{106} The uncertainty of Caesar’s role in Ephesus makes it dangerous to draw any conclusions about a possible role in granting privileges to the \textit{gerousia}.\textsuperscript{107}

What may be the earliest letter written to the \textit{gerousia}, however, may have been sent by Caesar, in which case it is unlikely that he granted rather than simply confirmed the \textit{gerousia}'s privileges.\textsuperscript{108} Alternatively, it may have been sent by Augustus. It would be noteworthy, if that were the case, that Augustus makes no mention of Caesar; one might have expected, for example, “the rights and privileges granted by my father.” The absence of such a phrase, however, does not prove that Caesar was not responsible for the initiation of the privileges mentioned in the letter, if the letter itself is Augustan: a letter of Tiberius records the “rights and privileges which my grandfather and father confirmed for you.”\textsuperscript{109} That the rights are “confirmed” suggests that Caesar may not have granted new rights to the \textit{gerousia}, but only upheld pre-existing ones. Given that the rights and privileges mentioned in this series of letters appear to be related to financial matters and that financial privileges appear to have been in place in 86 BC, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the rights and privileges confirmed in the letters are those which appear in the decree against Mithridates, that is, a special status among creditors. Such a correlation, however, depends on the \textit{sustemata} of the Mithridates-decree being the \textit{gerousia}. This cannot be proven beyond doubt, but the existence of financial privileges for both bodies is suggestive, as is the presence of the “\textit{sustema} of the Elders” in a letter

\textsuperscript{106} Str. 14.1.23.  
\textsuperscript{107} Above, Chapter Two, pp. 31-42.  
\textsuperscript{108} Cat. no. 5; see below.  
\textsuperscript{109} Cat. no. 8.
possibly sent by a proconsul of the early first century.\textsuperscript{110} It is probable that the lending activities which were mentioned in the previous section of this chapter had become established practices of the gerousia before the first century BC. Although these activities did not encompass all of the temple finances by 86 BC, the gerousia may have begun to occupy a privileged position in the temple administration by that date.

At the beginning of the Hellenistic period, the gerousia possessed the privilege of bringing certain individuals to the attention of the boule and demos in order to reward their services. This was related to its representative role, but appears to have been very rarely exercised. Equally infrequently, the gerousia exercised its ability to send representatives to the ruling king or his officials. Some of its privileges were, therefore, based on the authority of the king, and others on the authority of the city. The gerousia's privileged status among the groups which supervised temple loans may originally have been granted by the city, but it was certainly supported by the city and Imperial officials. At what date the gerousia gained this concession is unknown, but it is clear that by 86 BC a stratification of the supervisors of temple loans did exist.

\textbf{6.3.2. The Late First Century BC and Early First Century AD}

The privileges of the gerousia immediately after the consolidation of the empire by Augustus do not appear to have changed significantly. It has been noted above that one of the gerousia's activities during this period was the supervision of temple finances and loans, which was probably a continuation from the Hellenistic period. This continued activity was accompanied by a prolongation of the special status which, it has been argued, the gerousia possessed in 86 BC.

\textsuperscript{110} Cat. no. 11.
The series of Imperial letters published in 1993 confirms both the lending of and the special considerations granted to the *gerousia*. Each letter contains a recognition of an embassy sent by the *gerousia* and a promise to uphold if not to extend the honours and privileges (*teimia kai philanthropa*) of the *gerousia*:

The first letter does contain a clause concerning debts owed to the *gerousia* (*opheilomenoi chreoi*). Matters are to be conducted in this case “according to your own laws and practices”. This would seem to be a reduplication of the confirmation of the rights and honours which immediately precedes this clause: the *teimia kai philanthropa* are confirmed, and debts are subject to local law and the *gerousia*’s traditional guidelines.

111 Cat. nos. 4-13.
112 Cat. no. 8.
113 Cat. no. 5.
Since the two grants appear in the same fragment, it is probable that they are closely related. It is true that there is no guarantee that the two subjects are related: the letter sent by Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus in the second century, for example, deals with disparate issues. In that case, though, there is a clear indication that the logistes took the opportunity of an inquiry concerning Imperial statues to raise other unrelated issues. The lack of any such differentiation between relevant and extraneous inquiries may be an indication that the teimia kai philanthropa and the opheilomenoi chreoi are indeed both related to the same topic.

D. Knibbe, the editor princeps of the letters, suggested that the teimia kai philanthropa are the gerousia’s privileges over those of other lenders, though he does not comment on the opheilomenoi chreoi. The teimia kai philanthropa may be a reference to the gerousia’s privileged status among creditors, and the opheilomenoi chreoi to the methods of repayment or collection: it is clear that the gerousia had its own methods of administering and collecting debts by the first century AD.

The exact nature of the gerousia’s lending privileges cannot be known from the evidence of currently published inscriptions. It is possible to make some suggestions, though. Given the evidence of the Mithridates-decree and the possibility that it refers to the gerousia, it may be that loans administered by the gerousia were viewed more
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114 Cat. no. 17.
115 The letter of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus to the logistes Ulpius Eurycles indicates that the collection of debts by a public slave is extraneous to the main topic of Eurylces’ inquiry, the modification or preservation of current Imperial busts (cat. no. 17). This can be seen as an indication that the second query was a matter which might have been better addressed on a provincial level. This does not imply that a similar inquiry under Caesar or Augustus would have been equally inappropriate to make of the Emperor. Precedent existed by the mid-second century for directing inquiries regarding the gerousia’s finances to the provincial proconsul (cat. no. 16), whereas the relative newness Caesar’s or Augustus’ position would have made an inquiry to the highest levels of Roman authority not unexpected.
strictly, with less possibility of leniency. The gerousia’s advantages may have consisted of a higher rate of interest or greater freedom in the case of defaulting debtors.

At the beginning of the second century, Salutaris made arrangements to ensure that his foundation would continue even if he died before he had completed all the arrangements:

\[\text{εάν δὲ πρὸ <ά>πο-}
\]
\[\text{δοῦναι τὰ δισμύρια δη(νάρια) ἢ διατάξεσθαι ἀπὸ προσόδου}
\]
\[\text{χωρίων διδοσθαι τὸν τόκον αὐτῶν ἢ} \]
\[\text{τελευτήσει}
\]
\[\text{Σαλουτάριος, ὑποκεισθῶσαι οἱ κληρονόμοι αὐτοῦ τῇ εὐ-
\]
\[\text{λυτησεῖ τῶν καθερωμένων δη(νάριων) δισμυρίων καὶ τοῖς ἐπα-
\]
\[\text{κολουθήσασα τόκοις μέχρι τῆς εὐλυτήσεως, ὑποκει-
\]
\[\text{μένων αὐτῶν τῇ πράξει κατὰ τὰ ἵερα τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τὰ πα-
\]
\[\text{ρά τοῖς προσβυτέροις ἐκδανιστικὰ ἐγγραφά.}
\]

But if Salutaris dies before he pays the twenty thousand denarii or before he arranges for the interest to be paid from the income of his estates, his heirs will be liable for the payment of the donated twenty thousand denarii and they will be liable for the interest until the conclusion of the payment, with them being liable for payment according to the sacred loan-regulations of the goddess and of the Elders.\textsuperscript{117}

In the event of his death, Salutaris’ heirs are to be responsible for the payment of the capital fund and for any interest which might accrue. They are to be liable “according to the sacred loan-regulations of the goddess and of the Elders” (ekdanistika egrapha). The mention of the loan-regulations of the Elders may suggest that a loan from the gerousia was not contracted at the regular interest rate; it certainly indicates special concessions. The “loan-regulations of the Elders”, which appear to be conceived of as distinct from those regulations for the loans of the goddess, should be understood as the evolution of the teimia kai philanthropa of the gerousia.\textsuperscript{118}

\textsuperscript{117} Cat. no. 54.

\textsuperscript{118} The failure of Salutaris to specify a third party to ensure the payment by his heirs is unlikely to have been an issue. The support given by the proconsul Aquilius Proculus to Salutaris’ endowment must have rendered default an improbable occurrence. In the event that the heirs did fail or were delayed in paying any outstanding capital, though, enforcement of this clause, like that specifying the fines in the event of changing the terms of the endowment, could have been undertaken by any interested party.
Although the *ekdanistika egrapha* of the Salutaris-dossier are separated from the first appearance of the *teimia kai philanthropa* of the *gerousia* by over a century and from the exemption of the *sustemata* from the general cancellation of debts by nearly two centuries, the chronological distance is not as great as it appears. The treatment of the *gerousia* in the Salutaris-dossier implies an organized body of such an age and prominence as to be familiar to the Ephesians, and it has been argued above that the *gerousia* existed continuously throughout the first century AD. Continuous existence implies a continuity or, given the prominence which the *gerousia* assumes during the second century, an accretion of activities and privileges. Furthermore, the pairing of the lending practices of Artemis and of the *gerousia*, with no specification of those practices, implies that these regulations were commonly associated and were easily discovered by any who were interested. In short, the *ekdanistika egrapha*, which could be translated as the “lending customs”, were in existence for some time before the beginning of the second century, and probably grew out of the *teimia kai philanthropa* confirmed by Caesar or Augustus, Agrippa, Tiberius and Gaius Caesar or Germanicus, which themselves may have emerged from the exemptions granted to the *sustemata*. Financial privileges were included in the *teimia kai philanthropa*, but it should not be concluded that other benefits were not also included in this phrase.

The right of sending ambassadors, in the manner of the *boule* and *demos*, which the *gerousia* possessed during the Hellenistic period appears to have been maintained into the first century AD. Although there appear to be fewer cases of ambassadors during the Imperial period, the reasons for sending an embassy appear to have been similar: the delivery of a decree to the emperor, appeals to the emperor regarding privileges, and the
reporting of honours; there are also instances in which all that is known is that a mission was sent to Rome.\textsuperscript{119} As in the Hellenistic period, representatives were sent by the \textit{boule} and \textit{demos} of any given city or by the collective body of citizens; with the exception of those recorded in the series of letters regarding the privileges of the \textit{gerousia}, no embassy appears to have been sent other than by the \textit{boule} and \textit{demos} or the citizens as a whole.\textsuperscript{120}

In the case of smaller settlements and villages, petitions, even those to the proconsul, were presented through a powerful patron or the city to which the village was subordinated.\textsuperscript{121} The appeals which the \textit{gerousia} must have addressed to the emperor are not unusual in themselves; they can be seen as similar to the appeals and legal questions which every Roman citizen had the right to address to the emperor. What is unusual is that the responses came in the form of letters addressed directly to the \textit{gerousia} and that those letters were then publicly inscribed. Such a public display suggests that the \textit{gerousia} had a special standing within the city, and that the \textit{gerousia} was concerned to make it clear that it enjoyed the personal support of the emperor – or to convince the Ephesians that it did. The addressing of the letters to the \textit{gerousia} itself is an indication of the direct involvement of the central Roman authorities in local affairs. This involvement, though, was invited: the letters are replies. It should be noted that these letters represent genuine embassies and indicate that the \textit{gerousia} was not obliged to go through a patron or an overseeing-city.\textsuperscript{122}

\textsuperscript{119} Delivery of a decree: Sardis 7.I.8, \textit{IKnidos} 34, \textit{TAM} II.905; appeals: \textit{Aphrodisias & Rome} 15, \textit{IPriene} 111; honours: \textit{IEph} 22; \textit{TAM} II.147; unspecified: eg., \textit{ISrat} 631, 678, 689, 690; \textit{TAM} II.284

\textsuperscript{120} In the case of embassies whose purposes remained unspecified, it is possible that the embassy originated with a body other than the \textit{boule} and \textit{demos}, but since it is primarily honorary decrees in which these appear, it is most likely that they were in fact sent by the \textit{boule} and \textit{demos}; cf. Mitchell (1999): 30-31.

\textsuperscript{121} Mitchell (1999) notes that a direct approach by a village or its leaders to the proconsul was not necessarily "legally or procedurally out of order"; cf. Nollé (1999): 106-109.

Three letters in Knibbe’s series do not come from the emperor, but from the proconsul Publius Petronius, who governed Asia from AD 29/30 to 34/35; each letter refers to envoys sent to the proconsul. Since it was characteristic of Tiberius to leave provincial governors in place for extended periods of time, it is entirely reasonable that during the latter part of his reign requests which did not have direct claims on the emperor’s attention should have been redirected to the appropriate provincial official. Moreover, leaving requests to the proconsul is in keeping with Tiberius’ efforts to encourage the Senate to act on its own. Nonetheless, Petronius’ letters may form the nucleus of a diminishment in the gerousia’s access to the emperor which seems to emerge in the second century.

There is, however, an additional important difference to be noted in the three letters from Petronius: the phrase teimia kai philanthropa no longer appears. Instead, this general reference to the rights and privileges of the gerousia is replaced by the even more vague ta dikaia. It is, however, not certain that the two phrases refer to the same benefits. Although one letter subsequently employs ta philanthropa, each correspondence identifies the dikaia, with minor variations, as those ‘which the Augusti have granted to you and which the proconsuls before me have uniformly preserved.’ The statement that previous proconsuls had confirmed the dikaia suggests that the gerousia may have sought confirmation for ta teimia kai philanthropa from the emperors or members of their family and for ta dikaia from provincial authorities. Furthermore, Petronius specifies the dikaia concerned in the first letter, and promises to uphold specific privileges in the second two:

\[\text{[tά τῶν πρεσβυτέρων δίκαια, ἄνευ ὧν μὲν ἴση παντὸς ἐξαριστηκτο

[οί δὲ πρὸ ἐμὸν ὧν ἱεράπατοι πάντες συνετήρησαν ἀπολύσαντες ὑμᾶς}^\text{10}\]

123 Cat. nos. 12-14; for the date of Petronius’ proconsulship, cf. Corsten (1999).
124 Tac., Ann., 6.38; Suet., Tib., 31, 41.
the rights of the elders, which the Augusti have granted to you and which all the proconsuls before me uniformly preserved absolving you of the securities for the assize district and of donations and of billeting. So I have written to you to say that I also am willing to preserve these privileges....

*Ta dikai* are clearly spelled out: exemption from the payment of fees assessed for the assize district, exemption from donations, and exemption from billeting; Petronius’ second letter includes the important addition of release from liturgies. The privilege of being free from the onus of billeting is reminiscent of Euphronius’ embassy to Prepelaus. It may be noted, however, that by this time it is unlikely that this would involve billeting soldiers, since Asia was an unarmed province. Instead, it would involve the housing and feeding of Imperial visitors. The benefits to the *gerousia* from these dispensations were financial and were probably a part of or developments of the *teimia kai philanthropa*. They were concessions which one would expect a provincial governor to grant: it is probable that *ta dikai* confirmed by Petronius are a combination of the *teimia kai philanthropa* confirmed by the emperors and the exemptions specified in Petronius’ letter. The concessions confirmed by the proconsul for the *gerousia* seem to be directed to the benefit of individuals rather than to the *gerousia* as a body, particularly the exemption from liturgies. The *gerousia* did enjoy corporate benefits, though, as the *gerousia* of Chios appears to have been subject to the assize fees from which the *gerousia* of Ephesus was exempted.
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125 Cat. no. 12.  
126 Cat. no. 13.  
127 Cf. Cat. no. 45.  
128 IEph 13.II.
Gymnasiarchs of the gerousia appear for the first time in AD 29. Only three such individuals are known from the first century, all of whom served as ambassadors of the gerousia to Publius Petronius.\textsuperscript{129} All three men, by virtue of their service on the embassy, appear to have been members of the body. Consequently, it cannot be said that the institution enjoyed a public gymnasiarch. It is certainly possible that a wealthy Ephesian who was not a member of the gerousia could undertake to supply it with oil, but this duty could and did fall to the individual members of the gerousia itself. The gerousia was the recipient of such benefactions, but only inconsistently. The services of a gymnasiarch do not prove that one the city’s gymnasium was dedicated to the exclusive use of the gerousia.

The final benefit known to have been enjoyed by the gerousia during the first century of the empire which deserves comment is its receipt of distributions provided by wealthy citizens seeking public honours or acclaim. This type of information is found primarily in inscriptions honouring the benefactors, most often with the simple statement that the honoured individual provided a distribution but with little detail to explain the procedure involved in the actual handing out of the gifts of food or money. The recipients of these small gifts were not the poor, but rather the members of the upper classes of cities throughout the province: for example, members of the boule and gerousia, some of the citizens or tribes, and occasionally the wives or children of these individuals. The gerousia does not appear as a recipient of every distribution, but when it does, it is listed immediately after the members of the boule. Such distributions are most often attested, like so much else, during the second century, but they do occasionally appear earlier. Thus, Gaius Stertinius Orpex and his daughter Marina, and Vipsania

\textsuperscript{129} Cat. nos. 12-14.
Olympia and Vipsania Polla all provided distributions for the boule and the gerousia during the first century. The gerousia’s place among the recipients of these gifts is not so much a right as a general tradition or benefit, but it came to be expected in a certain respect and so can be seen as a privilege enjoyed by its members. Dianomai (small gifts of money) were given to members of the boule on thirty-eight attested occasions throughout Asia Minor during the first three centuries AD, and to members of the gerousia on nine occasions. In the case of Ephesus, though, the combination of the boule and gerousia as recipients of dianomai appears to have been a common practice. It may be said, therefore, that the gerousia enjoyed the attentions and favours of generous and ambitious citizens at the same general level as did the boule.

Continuity can be seen in the rights and privileges enjoyed by the gerousia from the Hellenistic period into the first century of the empire. These privileges were primarily financial, involving the gerousia’s lending practices and its payment of provincial exactions. The ability to bring its concerns to the attention of Hellenistic monarchs adapted with the establishment of Roman hegemony so that the gerousia could send embassies and letters to emperors or the provincial officials in the same way as a city could – and reasonably expect an answer. Finally, the gerousia began to be associated with the boule as a beneficiary of local euergetism. The absence of evidence makes it impossible at the moment to determine whether this was an innovation or if the gerousia had been the recipient of distributions during the Hellenistic period as well.

130 Cat. nos. 34, 35 & 72.
132 The boule and gerousia appear together three times (IEph 27, 1151, 2113 & 4123); the boule appears without the gerousia twice (IEph 2111 & 3803b); the gerousia appears without the boule once (IEph 47; cf. I Eph 3214 [Cat. no. 53] which specifies a fine to provide dianomai for the gerousia without the boule.
6.3.3. The Second Century AD

The rights of the gerousia in the second century appear to continue directly from those of the first century. Corresponding to the diminishing role played by the body in lending suggested above, the lending concessions of the first century were probably gradually worn away. Nonetheless, the financial privileges enjoyed in the first century extended into the early second century and were supported by the emperors and imperial officials for a time. The receipt of gifts of money and food also continued beyond the first century.

Imperial letters once again provide important information about the rights and privileges of the gerousia. Two Imperial letters are known which shed light on its rights during the first half of the second century.\(^{133}\) In addition, a letter of the propraetor Afranius Flavianus which forms a part of the Salutaris-dossier and a fragment of a letter from the third quarter of the second century are also informative.

Hadrian's letter in AD 120/121 regarding the collection of debts, discussed briefly above, can be seen as a continuation of the confirmation of financial privileges by the early emperors.\(^ {134}\) The letter records two appeals by the gerousia, one to the proconsul in the previous year, Mettius Modestus, and a second to the emperor himself. The nature of the initial dispute is not known, but it is clear that Modestus upheld the rights (ta dikaia) of the gerousia; although very general, ta dikaia does recall Petronius' letters. The mention of Modestus suggests that it may have been a dispute similar to that which Hadrian addresses next, if not the same, involving the gerousia's resources or its lending procedures and rights, ta dikaia. The inclusion of the former proconsul may also serve as

\(^{133}\) Cat. nos. 16 & 17.

\(^{134}\) Cat. no. 16; Knibbe (1993): 120; cf., above, p. 223.
a reminder to the gerousia both that its appeals had previously been successful at a provincial level and that the proconsul had the authority to deal with financial disputes, including that which provoked this letter.

The reason for the appeal to the emperor is clear. The opponents of the gerousia claimed that they were also creditors of the deceased and not simply heirs. Since under Roman law an heir became liable for the debts of the deceased, the gerousia was arguing that those in possession of the property of the deceased debtors legally became debtors of the gerousia.\textsuperscript{135} Hadrian, however, referred the entire matter back to the new proconsul of Asia, Cornelius Priscus, agreeing that the gerousia was entitled to the property if the current holders were in fact heirs:

\textit{...but since you have shown that many men are usurping your money as they are seizing the property of your debtors claiming that they are not the heirs but that they themselves are also creditors, I have sent a copy of your decree to Cornelius Priscus, vir egregius, the proconsul, so that if such a thing should be the case, he may appoint someone who will both judge the disputed matters and exact all that is owed to the gerousia.}\textsuperscript{136}

The support for the gerousia is much less clear in this case than in the instances from the first century: Hadrian does not explicitly grant a privileged position among the creditors to the gerousia. The letter can be seen as supporting such a position for the body, though, depending on the interpretation of \textit{ei ti toiouton eie} in line 11. The phrase translates “if

\textsuperscript{135} Borkowski (1997), 234 (8.5.2); since the appeal is addressed to the emperor, it is clear that Roman law is intended to apply to the case.

\textsuperscript{136} Cat. no. 16.
such a thing should be the case”. It is unclear whether this means “if the argument is as you say” or “if they are heirs and not creditors”. The distinction is important for the relative clause of the apodosis of the condition. In the first case, the implication is that the proconsul’s appointee will determine whether the gerousia’s opponents are heirs or creditors and what is owed to the gerousia. This suggests that something is owed to the gerousia regardless of the status of its opponents, and may, therefore, indicate a ranking of the creditors. In the second case, the proconsul’s appointee is essentially a formality: “if they are heirs, as you say, the appointee will judge the matter and you will be paid.” In this situation, there is no ranking of creditors apparent in the letter.

Hadrian does, however, provide some explicit support to the gerousia. The reminder that Modestus upheld the rights of the gerousia and the sending of the entire case to the new proconsul may both have served to bolster the gerousia’s confidence. Furthermore, the fact that the case was referred to Priscus directly by the emperor may have ensured a faster resolution than might otherwise have occurred, and Hadrian’s apparent approval of previous support for the gerousia may well have biased Priscus in that direction.

Hadrian’s ambiguous backing was not unusual. Direct support for the gerousia of the type which is evident in the first century did not return during the course of the second century. The letter of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus referring to Imperial statues, discussed above, also deals with a possible misappropriation of funds.\textsuperscript{137} The logistes Ulpius Eurycles informed the emperors that a public slave, Saturninus, had

\textsuperscript{137} Cat. no. 17.
collected debts in the name of the sunhedrion. The emperors’ decision is clear: if Saturninus rendered his collections to the gerousia, no harm has been done. If he has kept any for himself, it should be recollected. Any money which he collected over and above the debts owed to the gerousia was to be returned to its owners following an official trial. This is simply a matter of misappropriation, not a question of the rights of the gerousia. The final seventeen lines of the letter deal with a third matter. The inscription, however, becomes fragmentary at this point, with most of the right half lost. Consequently, the inquiry and the solution are alike unknown. From what is preserved, though, it appears that Eurycles raised the issue of the delayed payment of certain debts. The emperors provide a detailed response, with the inclusion of certain unknown conditions, as in the case of Saturninus and Hadrian’s response to the gerousia. The final lines of the inscription seem to have contained an admonition that such an inquiry could have been addressed to the proconsul, which would correspond to a statement near the beginning of the letter that Eurycles used the necessary inquiry about the statues to raise additional, extraneous, matters. Again, support for the gerousia is indirect, but Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, to judge from the earlier inquiries in the letters, did, unlike Hadrian, actually pronounce a judgment, quite possibly, as in the matter of Saturninus, in favour of the gerousia.

The letters of Hadrian and of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, therefore, suggest that the gerousia no longer enjoyed the ease of access to the emperor which it had in the first century. Hadrian refers the question of debts back to the proconsul, while Aurelius and Verus explicitly say that Eurycles inappropriately addressed certain matters

---

138 The inscription later states that Saturninus had collected the debts for the gerousia, so that sunhedrion in this instance appears to stand for gerousia; it should be noted that this is a case of the emperors calling the gerousia a sunhedrion, though, not of the Ephesians or the gerousiastai themselves calling it a sunhedrion.
to them, without any direct support for the gerousia’s rights. The letters do not indicate whether the gerousia continued to occupy a privileged position among creditors. It is possible to see such support in Hadrian’s letter, but even in the most generous interpretation his support is not nearly as explicit as that of the early Julio-Claudians. It should be noted that, in AD 120, at least, the gerousia did still have direct access to the Emperor: one of its members personally brought the matter to Hadrian’s attention. The gerousia was not yet compelled to appeal to the emperor through a patron.\textsuperscript{139}

A third letter, identified as one sent to the gerousia by an unknown proconsul, appears to address a disagreement between the gerousia and an Asiarch.\textsuperscript{140} It has been suggested above that this may have been a dispute originating in the decision of the Asiarch, Aelius Martiales, to demonstrate his generosity through an act which benefited the gerousia indirectly, as a public building, instead of directly, as a gift of money, for example, would have.\textsuperscript{141} The letter appears to be supportive of Martiales rather than of the gerousia. This does not necessarily indicate a further diminishment of imperial support for the gerousia, though, since it would be remarkable for the proconsul to have found fault with an Asiarch and supported a local body unless a serious offence had been committed. Moreover, it is highly unlikely that a proconsul or emperor would have preferred distributions to public works and so ruled against Martiales.\textsuperscript{142} The apparent admonishment of the gerousia does place it in a lesser position, though. If the

\textsuperscript{139} Cf. Nollé (1999): 106-109. It is significant that the letter concerning the gerousia’s Imperial statuary, Saturninus’ collections and the third, unknown issue was not a response to an embassy of the gerousia, but to an inquiry by the logistes.

\textsuperscript{140} Cat. no. 18.

\textsuperscript{141} Above, Chapter Four, pp. 120-122. An appeal to Imperial authorities in this case is understandable, since pledges made in the hopes of attaining a civic post could be legally enforced after the reign of Trajan (Dmitriev [2005]: 152). Martiales, however, probably did not fail to deliver on his promise – it is difficult to see why he would have been supported by the proconsul if that were the case – but rather made a donation for a specific purpose instead of general distributions.

\textsuperscript{142} Pl., Ep. X.116 & 117; Eph 1491-3; Eck (1999): 11.
identification of a proconsul as the author of the letter is correct, the letter would further support the argument that the emperor became less and less accessible to the gerousia. In addition, the letter does not appear to have been written in response to an embassy sent by the gerousia. Nonetheless, the letter may have been sent after a complaint from the gerousia, possibly conveyed in a now lost letter: Antoninus Pius’ letter rebuking the Ephesians for failing to honour Publius Vedius Antoninus III contains the phrase, “I have learned of the generosity which Vedius Antoninus has shown towards you not so much from your letters as from his own letters.”

Since no such phrase seems to appear in the letter concerning Martiales, it is reasonable to suppose that the gerousia appealed to the proconsul in the hopes of compelling Martiales to fulfill not the promises which he made, but the promises which the gerousia – and possibly other citizens – believed were deserved and appropriate.

This loss of ease of access to the emperor clearly did not happen all at once. It was a process which was already underway during the reign of Hadrian and had progressed to the point where the gerousia appears to have had only indirect access to the emperor through its logistes. Hadrian’s subtle admonishment that the proconsul would have been the appropriate authority to deal with the gerousia’s complaint about its debtors suggests that the transferral of the gerousia’s petitions from the emperor to the proconsul may have been a relatively recent development.

The origins of the increasing prominence of the proconsul in the gerousia’s affairs may be apparent as early as the beginning of the second century AD, if not earlier. The

---

144 The letters of Petronius (Cat. nos. 12-14) may mark the origins of this decline, providing a precedent for referring matters to the proconsul.
proconsul Aquillius Proculus is identified twice in the Salutaris-dossier in connection with the fine owed by any who altered Salutaris’ directions.\(^{145}\) It is not remarkable that the decree establishing Salutaris’ endowment should have been sent to the proconsul for imperial approval, but it is striking that the proconsul would have set the penalty for violation rather than that the \textit{boule} or Salutaris himself would have done so.\(^{146}\) Also noteworthy is that the \textit{gerousia} may have been involved in the second portion of the fine, that which was payable to the \textit{fiscus} of the emperor. The final portion of Flavianus’ letter mentioning the fines has been almost entirely reconstructed on the basis of Salutaris’ letter. Unfortunately, the two lines describing the \textit{gerousia}’s involvement, which does not appear in Salutaris’ letter, have been almost entirely lost and have, consequently, not been restored.\(^{147}\)

\begin{quote}
\text{μοῖν κυρωθησομένων, τούτων ἄνυπερθέτως βούλομαι}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{εἰ[...]ς μὲν τὸ τῆς μεγίστης θεᾶς Ἀρτέμιδος ιερὸν καταθέσαι προστείμου δη(νάρια) β’ μ(ύρια) πεντακις(χίλια), εἰς δὲ τὸν τὸύ [κυρίου Κάλεσαρος φίσκον] \ldots [χίλια, γερφασία] \ldots ἀλλὰ δη(νάρια) διαμύρια πεντακις(χίλια, καθὼς Ἀκουίλλιος Πρόκλος, ὁ λομπρότατος ἄνθρωπος, καὶ πρόστερον δὲ ἢς ἀνεγραφεὶν πρὸς ομάς ἔπιστολῆς ἐπεκόμισας καὶ ὄριον τὸ πρόστειμον. ἔ]ρωσθε. ...I wish that he pay immediately to the temple of the greatest goddess, Artemis, a penalty of twenty-five thousand denarii and to the fiscus of lord Caesar...to the \textit{gerousia}...another twenty-five thousand denarii, just as Aquillius Proculus, the most illustrious proconsul, approved and specified the penalty in the letter with which he formerly responded to you. Farewell.\(^{148}\)}

The remains of the inscription indicate that two fines of twenty-five thousand denarii were originally certainly mentioned. Mention of the \textit{gerousia} between the recipient of

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Cat. nos. 15 & 54.}
\footnote{Cf. Oliver (1954): 167, who argues that cities sought approval from Imperial authorities in order to strengthen their decrees and penalties.}
\footnote{Cat. nos. 15 & 54.}
\footnote{IEph 27D; Oliver, \textit{SG} 3; \textit{FiE} II, no. 27; cf. cat. no. 15; \textit{GIBM} 481, II. 279-282: \ldots θαὶ προστείμου δη(νάρια) β’ μ(ύρια) πεντακις(χίλια, εἰς δὲ τὸν τὸύ | Σεβαστοῦ φίσκον ἄλλα δη(νάρια) β’ μ(ύρια) πεντακις(χίλια, καὶ τῇ[| γερφασίας τῇ Ἐφεσίων ἄλλα δη(νάρια) β’ μ(ύρια) πεντακις(χίλια [καθ...}
\end{footnotes}
the second fine, the *fiscus* of the emperor, and the amount of the fine interrupts and complicates the meaning of this part of the inscription. Salutaris’ letter is clearer on this point:

\[
\text{ἀποτεισάτω εἰς } \text{προσκόπημα τῆς μεγαλῆς θεᾶς Ἀρτέμιδος δηνάριαι δισμύρια πεντακλίσει καὶ εἰς τὸν Σεβαστὸν φίλον ἄλλα δηνάρια }
\]
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\[
\beta' μ'ύριοι) \text{, .} \\
\text{[η δὲ προαγαγμένη διάταξις ἔστω κυρία εἰς τὸν ἄπαντα χρό-} \\
\text{[νυν . . . . , καθάπερ Ἀκουίλλιος Πρόκλιος, ὁ ἐ Ἰ[ε]ρ[γ]έτης} \\
\text{[καὶ άνθυψατο]ς καὶ Ἀφράνιος Φλαουεανός, ὁ κράτιςτος πρεσβευτὴς} \\
\text{καὶ [ο] ἀντιστράτηγος, διὰ ἐπιστολῶν περί ταύτης τῆς διατάξε-} \\
\text{ως ἐπεκύρωσαν καὶ ὄρισαν τὸ προαγαγμένον προστασιμον. }
\]
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...and let the one who attempts to do anything in contradiction to these arrangements or to those aspects of these arrangements which have been approved and ratified by the *boule* and *demos* pay for the additional adornment of the greatest goddess, Artemis, twenty-five thousand denarii and to the fiscus of the Emperor another twenty-five thousand denarii.

Let the aforementioned arrangements be in legal effect for all time..., just as Aquillius Proculus, the beneficent proconsul, and Afranius Flavianus, *vir egregius*, the legate and propraetor, in their letters concerning these arrangements have approved and established the aforementioned fine. Gaius Vibius Salutaris, the son of Gaius, of the tribe Oufentina has brought forth the aforementioned endowment and gifts.\(^{149}\)

The violator of Salutaris’ instructions is to pay two fines of twenty-five thousand, one to the goddess and the other to the *fiscus* of the emperor, with no mention of the *gerousia*.

It should be noted before proceeding that the two letters need not have been identical. Since Salutaris’ sought approval from the proconsul, it is entirely possible that the proconsul took it upon himself to add certain elements. In this case, it seems that Proclus altered the details of the fines to the benefit of the *gerousia*. If the restoration of *γερουσία* in the dative is correct, the *gerousia* must have been intended as the beneficiary of at least a portion of the fine payable to the *fiscus*: the fine went to the *fiscus* for the *gerousia*. The length of the lines, however, indicates that more

\(^{149}\text{Cat. no. 54; cf. cat. no. 54, ll. 110-116 where the double-fine is also mentioned.}
information was provided on the way in which the gerousia was to profit from the penalty.

A roughly contemporary inscription, already discussed above, establishing heroic honours, also associates the goddess, the emperors and the gerousia in the clauses specifying the penalty for alteration of its terms.\textsuperscript{150} The guilty party is to pay ten thousand denarii “for the further adornment of the goddess Artemis and of the Augusti and another ten thousand denarii for a cash distribution for the Elders.” Although the fine in this case is “for the further adornment” of the emperors rather than for the fiscus of the emperors, the remainder parallels the penalty clause in Proculus’ letter: both Artemis and the emperors are beneficiaries of the fine, and the gerousia appears in the dative, here as presbeuterois. This is the only other published instance of an association of these three in connection with such a fine, so it stands to reason that they should be similar.

Given that the two inscriptions are nearly contemporary and generally similar – whatever other purposes Salutaris’ endowment served, it was in many respects a public memorial of Salutaris, functioning in the same way as heroic honours for Peplus – the earlier inscription may provide a model for explaining the presence of gerousia in the penalty clause of Afranius’ letter. With the acknowledgment that the remains of the stone have not been viewed by autopsy, the presence of gerousia can be explained by the supposition of three fines of twenty-five thousand denarii: one payable to Artemis, one to the fiscus of the emperor, and one to the gerousia to fund a cash distribution to its members. The inscription might then read:

\[
\text{Θαὶ προστείμου δὴ(νάρια) β' μ(ύρια) πεντακισ[χί]λια, εἰς δὲ τὸν τοῦ [Σεβαστοῦ φίσκου δὴ(νάρια) β' μ(ύρια) πεντακισχίλια, εἰς δὲ τὴν τῇ]}
\]

\textsuperscript{150} Cat. no. 53; Jones (1983), in his edition of this inscription, notes similarities between it and Salutaris’ inscriptions.
In addition to explaining the presence of *gerousia*, such a restoration also preserves the approximate length of the lines, when the abbreviations are taken into account, and brings the text into closer parallel with that of Peplus:

```
καὶ ἀποτεισάτω [ὅ τοῦ] ἀρχηγεῖν ἔτι εἰς

προσκόσσ[ῆμα θεᾶς ?]
[Ὑπ' Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ τῶν Σεβαστῶν δημούργ] αὶ [ἡμίρια καὶ ἀλ] λα ἐῖς
dιὰ[νο] μὴν τῶι πρεσβ[υτέροις]
[δημόρι] αἱ μύρια
```

The restoration, however, raises the question of why the proconsul would add a fine to the benefit of the *gerousia*. There are several possible reasons. First, the *gerousia*’s presence as a recipient of a portion of the fine would give it, as argued above, a strong interest in ensuring that Salutaris’ arrangements remained in force. Second, the decree instituting heroic rites suggests the possibility that it was becoming part of the *gerousia*’s regular activities even at this early date to serve as official or unofficial guarantor of the terms of memorial endowments. Third, and most importantly from the perspective of the *gerousia*’s interactions with the emperor, the addition of a third fine indicates that Imperial officials continued to take an interest in the affairs of the *gerousia*, but with the proconsul taking a more and more active role. Closely related to this, it may be noted

---

151 Cat. no. 15.
152 Cat. no. 53.
153 Oliver (1941): 85, while denying a fine payable to the *gerousia*, states that “the two most irresistible executors at Ephesus, namely, the imperial procurator and the management of the Artemisium, were associated to guarantee the inviolability of the arrangements.”
155 Publius Petronius’ role in confirming the *gerousia*’s freedom from contributions, assize district fees and billeting should not be viewed in the same light as Proculus’ proposed action. The exemptions which Petronius granted can be seen to be purely provincial in nature and therefore at his discretion without necessary reference to the emperor. The introduction of third fine is not, admittedly, related to the emperor either, but, unlike Petronius’ confirmations, Proculus’ third fine, if this restoration is acceptable, indicates a closer involvement in the activities of the *gerousia*, particularly since it would have been done without a request from the body: Petronius’ actions, on the other hand, were a direct result of an embassy from the
that the addition of such a fine may have won Afranius and the proconsul Proculus support from the members of the *gerousia*. A governor who took unpopular decisions risked the retaliation of his subjects after his departure, so that winning local supporters and allies may have formed an important part of the governor's activities.\(^{156}\) Earning the favour of the members of the *gerousia* through the institution of a fine would have been a politically astute move on the part of Afranius or Proculus, or both, and one which cost nothing. As was argued in Chapter Five, the *gerousiastai* may not have formed the provincial elite, but they were of such social standing as to be worth winning over.

At any rate, the presence of the *gerousia* in Afranius’ letter cannot be entirely disregarded.\(^{157}\) Since Proculus or Afranius appear to have been responsible for the addition of the *gerousia* at this point, it seems beyond dispute that one of them took an active interest in the *gerousia*’s affairs, whether or not he made them the beneficiaries of a third twenty-five thousand denarii fine.\(^{158}\) It must also be stressed once again that the three clauses specifying the penalties for violators of the terms of Salutaris’ donation do not agree. Heberdey suggests that this is a result of a misconception which influenced the

---

\(^{156}\) Kokkinia (2004): 56-58; the significance of the opinion of the governor held by provincial citizens continued well beyond the second century (Slootjes [2004]: 70-75).

\(^{157}\) Oliver (1941): 85: “we do not know how or even whether the Gerusia was mentioned by [Afranius Flavianus].” All editions – including Oliver – print γερουσιαττὸς at the beginning of 410.

\(^{158}\) This interest may also be apparent in the existence of *logistai* of the *gerousia*, who, as was noted in Chapter Five, were appointed – whether at the request of the body in question or not – by Imperial officials.
composition of Afranius’ letter: he modelled his letter on others in which the gerousia did appear. It is true that it is difficult to reconcile the fact that Salutaris mentions only two fines while Afranius appears to mention three, particularly when Salutaris’ two fines are accompanied by the phrase, “just as Aquillius Proculus, the proconsul, and Afranius Flavianus, the legate and propraetor, in their letters established the aforementioned fine.” Virtually the same phrase, however, appears in Afranius’ letter. Whether an error or not, the fact that a fine payable to the gerousia appears in a proconsular letter would, one can argue, override its absence in a civic decree. Consequently, while Salutaris and the boule may not originally have envisioned a third fine, Proculus’ actions – or Afranius’ error in his letter – created one.

Although the gerousia’s rights diminished in its loss of access to the emperor, the second century did not bring with it a lessening of the gerousia’s privileges in every way. These privileges continue to reflect the relatively high social position which the gerousia occupied in the city. Thus, the gerousia continues to appear among the recipients of distributions of food and money, as is evident not only from the two inscriptions just discussed, but also from three additional inscriptions. A fragmentary inscription from the first half of the second century AD preserves the middle portion of an honorary decree. As such, the name of the individual being honoured is unknown, though the participles indicate that it was a woman. Among her services, the text of the inscription records that she provided distributions of sacrificial meat to the boule and gerousia. It can be concluded that the woman involved was a priestess of Artemis, since the phrasing of this clause, using the verbal dianeimo rather than the nominal dianome, finds Ephesian

---

159 Heberdey, *FiE* II, p. 146.
160 Cat. no. 42.
parallels only in the decrees honouring Vipsania Polla and Vipsania Olympia; in addition, the sacred servant and the victors in the Artemisia are included among the recipients of the distributions.\textsuperscript{161} As was the case during the first century, the \textit{gerousia} is given a prominence in these benefactions second only to that of the \textit{boule}.

A hymnode and \textit{grammateus} of the Hadrianeia during the agoonothesie of Tiberius Julius Reginus in AD 170 was honoured in an inscription which, like that of the priestess just discussed, preserves neither his name nor those of the authors of the decree.\textsuperscript{162} The recipient of a crown, he is also awarded the privilege of participating in distributions offered to the \textit{boule}, \textit{gerousia} and the \textit{chrysophoroi}. Although distributions to the \textit{chrysophoroi} are virtually unknown, the inscription indicates not only that the \textit{gerousia} continued to be among the common recipients of distributions but also that the distributions were becoming more exclusive and perhaps less common. As such, the retention of the \textit{gerousia} among the beneficiaries of these small gifts is a mark of the esteem in which it was held by the benefactors and the citizens of Ephesus in general.

Finally, the \textit{gerousia} appears as the recipient of a \textit{dianome} in a long list of donors and \textit{kouretes} from the reign of Commodus.\textsuperscript{163} As is often the case, no details are given about the \textit{dianome}. The extent of the evidence for the distribution in this inscription is that the \textit{gerousia} was the sole recipient and that it was provided by the \textit{prytanis} Marcus Aurelius Menemachus. Obviously, the \textit{gerousia} is given prominence and a degree of social importance by its appearance as the only beneficiary. An additional privilege, similar to its inclusion in distributions, hints at the \textit{gerousia}'s perceived high social

\textsuperscript{161} Cat. no. 35.
\textsuperscript{162} Cat. no. 44.
\textsuperscript{163} Cat. no. 65.
standing and honour: a section of seating in the theatre appears to have been reserved for the *gerousiastai*.

The rights and privileges of the *gerousia* during the second century can be summarized briefly. At the beginning of the century, it most likely retained a portion of the freedom of access to the emperor which it enjoyed in the first century of the empire. This access was gradually limited over the course of the century until it was expected that the *gerousia* and its representatives would bring queries and complaints to the attention of the proconsul rather than the emperor; in exceptional situations, such as those involving the *maiestas* of the emperor, direct contact was still permissible, though an intermediary may have been introduced in the person of a *logistes*. Whether the replacement of the emperor by the proconsul as the patron and supporter of the *gerousia* was a result of an imperial decision cannot be known, but it is unlikely. The process was most likely begun through minor interventions and displays of support by a proconsul who took an interest in the *gerousia* and whose involvement created an Ephesian precedent upon which subsequent proconsuls gradually built until the proconsul became by tradition the regular authority to whom to appeal. With this development may have come a lessening of the *gerousia*’s financial privileges with respect to sacred loans. It continued to appear as a beneficiary of distributions as it had during the first century, though again this is, strictly speaking, a general tradition rather than a genuine right.

---

164 Two fragmentary inscriptions, *FiE* II, p. 185, no. 83, and *FiE* II, p. 186, no. 86 (*IEph* 2086b), form the basis for this suggestion.

165 Cf., on a governor’s interference in civic affairs, Kokkinia (2004): 39-42; Burton (2001); this is not to say, however, that such interference was the norm.
6.3.4. The Late Second and Early Third Century AD

Most attestations of the *gerousia* later than the mid to late second century appear in funerary inscriptions. Consequently, evidence for its rights and privileges, as was the case for its activities, is not as abundant as for earlier periods. It is possible, though, to draw some conclusions about the benefits enjoyed by the *gerousia* during this period.

Several inscriptions indicate the existence, as during the first century, of a gymnasiarch of the *gerousia* during the late second and early third centuries. Hicks and Oliver identified Marcus Aurelius Agathopus as one such individual, but reasons have been given above in Chapter Four to suggest that he was not in fact a gymnasiarch of the *gerousia*, but rather a gymnasiarch of an unspecified gymnasium.\(^{166}\) Niconianus Eucarpus, on the other hand, is clearly identified as a gymnasiarch of the *gerousia*.\(^{167}\) Similarly, Aphrodisius the son of Cleander served as gymnasiarch of the *gerousia*, as evidenced in an inscription which probably dates to this period.\(^{168}\) A summary of the gymnasiarch's activities and responsibilities has been given above in Chapter Five and need not be repeated here. It is sufficient to note that the existence of a gymnasiarch indicates that the *gerousia* had access to a gymnasium. It also demonstrates that the members of the *gerousia* were provided with oil for their use, through the generosity of fellow-citizens and, in some cases, fellow-*gerousiastai*. Again, however, a gymnasiarch of the *gerousia* does not prove that the *gerousia* had exclusive access to a gymnasium of its own.

Although *sunhedrion* cannot indiscriminately be assumed to be a reference to the *gerousia*, it is possible that the *gerousia* came to be considered one of several *sunhedria*

\(^{166}\) *GIBM* 587; Oliver (1941): 105, no. 20; cat. no. 23; above, Chapter Four, pp. 122-125.
\(^{167}\) Cat. no. 24.
\(^{168}\) Cat. no. 31.
in the city of Ephesus, and that by the late second century the term *sunhedrion* had begun to be used more indiscriminately so that it came to mean a *sunhedrion* rather than the *sunhedrion*. As such, the *gerousia* appears to be the beneficiary of two citizens of the third century.\(^{169}\) Both Zoticus the son of Artemidorus and Aurelius Baranus are said to have feasted or entertained ‘all the *sunhedria*’. It may be noted that in the case of Zoticus, this action is based totally on a restoration; nonetheless, the extant inscription honouring Baranus renders the supposition entirely plausible. If it is correct that the *gerousia* could be included among the ‘all the *sunhedria*’, then the tradition of providing distributions to the *gerousia*, among other recipients, was still alive as late as AD 239, the *terminus ante quem* of Zoticus’ inscription.

There are, however, significant differences to be noted. First, the inclusion of “all the *sunhedria*” rather than specifically the *boule* and the *gerousia*, for example, as the beneficiaries, although it appears more generous on the part of the benefactor, renders a position among the recipients less and less privileged. Second, the distributions provided by Zoticus and Baranus are not identified with a specific term, and appear in both cases to have been allotments of food rather than small gifts of money: Zoticus’ *hestiasas* has clear associations with feasting, and Baranus’ *hypodexamenon*, in the sense of receiving a visitor as a host, implies food rather than money. This may suggest a change in the perception of which gifts were appropriate for the *gerousia*.

The phrase “all the *sunhedria*”, in addition to suggesting a diminished importance among the beneficiaries, may also indicate a diminishment in the overall importance of the *gerousia*: it was no longer felt necessary to specify that a distribution had been provided for the *gerousia*. This should not be carried too far, however. Zoticus appears

\(^{169}\) Cat. nos. 45 & 48.
to have been a member of the *gerousia*, though the phrase *gerousiastes* is largely restored. Those offices which can be seen on the stone are not inconsistent with the position of a *gerousiastes* (*neopoios, kouros, chrysophoros, essen, naophulax*), so there is no strong reason to question the restoration. The inclusion of the term cannot be other than a sign that the *gerousia* still enjoyed some prominence in the city and that its members continued to occupy a relatively high position in the esteem of their fellow citizens. Moreover, Zoticus entertained two Roman visitors to Ephesus, Annius Anullinus Percennianus and Aurelius Pinarius Gemellus. The inclusion of this service is by itself an indication of Zoticus' wealth and importance among the citizens of the city: it cannot be imagined that such officials would reside anywhere but with the rich and influential. The specification of the titles of the two Romans increases the significance of his service by enhancing the importance of his guests. It is possible that Zoticus was an extra-ordinary member of the *gerousia* for this period, but it seems unlikely that the *gerousia* had completely faded into obscurity. The perception of the *gerousia* had, nonetheless, changed.

Zoticus' inscription may provide evidence for one additional right enjoyed by the *gerousia* during the late-second and early-third centuries. It will be recalled that the *gerousia* sought exemption from billeting soldiers from the general Prepelaus, on behalf of the Temple of Artemis, and that this may have been paralleled in the first century AD.

---

170 Above, Chapter Five.
171 There may be additional evidence for distributions provided to the *gerousiastai* in the late-second and early-third centuries. Van Rossum (1988): 161 suggests that [*τοῖς ἐκ γερουσιασ]ταῖς* should be read in place of the generally accepted [*τοῖς ἐκ πολείτι]ταῖς* in the decree recording Nicomedes' re-institution of a sacrifice to the emperor and to Artemis (Cat. no. 56). Because of both the uncertainty of the *gerousia*'s role in cash distributions at this time and the position taken in this work that this inscription presents an instance of cooperation between the *gerousia* and another body in the celebration of this sacrifice, [*τοῖς ἐκ πολείτι]ταῖς* has been printed in the catalogue.
by a similar exemption.\textsuperscript{172} The members of the *gerousia* themselves may not have received any personal benefits from this exemption, but through its association with the temple, the body must have benefited. At that time, it was most likely Imperial officials who would be billeted, as in the case of Zoticus, rather than soldiers. That Zoticus served as host, therefore, might suggest that the *gerousia* lost this privilege sometime between the first and third centuries. Commemoration of such billeting, though, does not appear to have been common. There is, in fact, only one parallel use of the verb *epidemeo* in the published inscriptions of Ephesus, though this is not an honorary inscription; the verb is most often used for the hosting of participants in games or festivals, or simply of xenoi.\textsuperscript{173} The rarity of commemorations of individuals who had hosted Roman officials can be seen as an indication that such billeting was obligatory and therefore not appropriate for mention in an honorary inscription. Zoticus’ inscription, then, becomes an anomaly. If it is assumed that the billeting exemption was still in effect, though, the mention of his hosting of Percennianus and Gemellus is easily explained: Zoticus was officially excused from billeting the Roman officials by virtue of his membership in the *gerousia*, but he voluntarily chose to perform this service and so earned for himself a highly unusual honour.

The *gerousia*’s rights and privileges appear to have been significantly reduced in the late second and early third centuries. There is no longer evidence that it was permitted to send embassies to the provincial proconsul, let alone the emperor, nor are there any letters responding to petitions or inquiries of the *gerousia*. It may, however,

\textsuperscript{172} Above, pp. 207-208 & 255.
\textsuperscript{173} Titus Flavius Potemon hosted the emperor Hadrian in AD 129 (*IEph* 1145); cf., for example, *SEG* 14, 640 (Caunus); *ISTRAT* 530, 668, 672, 678, 706 (Lagina).
continue to enjoy the attention of at least some benefactors of Ephesus in the form of feasts and, occasionally, the provision of oil.

6.5. *A Geronteion?*

The omission of one feature closely associated with the activities, rights and privileges in all periods of the existence of the *gerousia* should be immediately apparent: Where did it conduct its business? Was there a meeting house for the *gerousia*? Given the situation in Sardis where the palace of Croesus was given over to the *gerousia* of that city, one is inclined to answer affirmatively.\(^{174}\) Although Vitruvius seems to be imagining an association of older citizens (*seniorum*) somewhat different from the Ephesian institution, it is, nonetheless, still reasonable to suppose that a similar building existed in Ephesus.

Unfortunately, no building has been discovered in the city conveniently identified as belonging to the *gerousia*. To suppose that this building should be sought from among the numerous gymnasia of the city is unreasonable: a gymnasion for a meeting house does not seem to be in keeping with the activities of the *gerousia* which have been discussed in this chapter. The letter of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus to Ulpius Eurycles, it is true, does identify a building closely associated with the *gerousia*, which they call the *sunhedrion*. It will be recalled, though, that that building was probably not used as a meeting house, but as a storage area for Imperial statues.\(^{175}\) A single inscription mentions a *geronteion*, but there is no known building associated with this identification; nonetheless, the inscriptions may suggest an area of the city in which such a building may

---

\(^{174}\) Vit. 2.8.10: *Croesi domus, quam Sardiani civibus ad requiescendum aetatis otio seniorum collegio gerusiam dedicaverunt.*

\(^{175}\) Cat. no. 17; cf. above, pp. 228-229, n. 53.
have been located.\textsuperscript{176} Eleven inscriptions appear in the catalogue whose findspots are unknown. The remaining eighty come from various areas and buildings in the city (Table 6).

Several of these locations may be passed over immediately. Two of the inscriptions found in the Artemision were inscribed there because the boule and demos determined that they should be. Similarly, the prytaneion may be ruled out: six of the eight inscriptions mentioning the gerousia found there were kouretes-lists and were for that reason in the prytaneion. One of the two largest groups of inscriptions was found in or near the Church of St. John, but it is reasonable to suppose that they were moved there from elsewhere in the city during construction of the church or during subsequent repairs. Two of the three inscriptions found east of the Magnesian Gate are funerary inscriptions,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findspot</th>
<th>Cat. no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tetragonous Agora</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 31, 36, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of St. John</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20, 22, 24, 25, 28, 42, 45, 52, 66, 77, 78, 86, 88, 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15, 16, 17, 19, 23, 26, 39, 44, 54, 55, 56, 57, 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prytaneion</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18, 21, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadiane Street &amp; Harbour</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27, 48, 50, 51, 70, 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of the Magnesian Gate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30, 80, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemision\textsuperscript{177}</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 2, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konzilskirche</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agora</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholastica Baths</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Locations</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3, 34, 35, 41, 53, 58, 68, 71, 73, 75, 79, 82, 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Findspots</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29, 32, 37, 40, 49, 63, 69, 76, 81, 83, 89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Findspots of Inscriptions Included in the Catalogue

\textsuperscript{176}Cat. no. 34.
\textsuperscript{177} All three of these inscriptions were in fact found elsewhere other than the Artemision, but their original location was the Temple of Artemis.
as are those from the Konzilskirche and one each from the Harbour and Arcadiane Street. Several of the inscriptions found in the theatre were there for obvious reasons and do not associate the *gerousia* with the theatre: those texts which form a part of the Salutaris dossier were inscribed in the theatre as a public display by Salutaris himself; Gaius Stertinius Orpex' inscription was a similar display accompanying his distributions. It may be supposed that the majority of the others were inscribed in the theatre because of the prominence of the location rather than because of any direct connection with the *gerousia*: the inscriptions inscribed on the walls of the theatre were placed there at the instigation of the dedicators or benefactors.

Most of the inscriptions found in the Tetragonus Agora, though, have no immediately obvious reason for being there. Admittedly, eleven of these belong to the same series, but that they are a series may be significant: they were inscribed in an area which in all probability the *gerousia* itself selected. It was noted in Chapter Five that the *grammateus* of the *demos* was responsible for the display of Imperial decisions such as these, but given the *gerousia*'s interest in these particular documents, it must have been involved in the choice of location. One of the remaining four inscriptions found in this area is also informative: the honorary inscription of Octavia Capitolina, in which the *gerousia* is associated with the *boule* and *demos*. Another *gerousia* inscription from this area of the city may also be of value: the architrave inscription of Aphrodisius the son of Cleander was found in the southwest corner of the Agora, probably, according to the editors, in secondary usage.\(^{178}\) If the architrave was originally in the area, however, it is possible that the *gerousia* had a particular interest in this area – secondary usage does not necessitate relocation. If it is necessary for the *gerousia* to have had its own “meeting

---

\(^{178}\) Cat. no. 31; Knibbe (1968): 13-14, no. 5: “in Sturzlage, dort wohl in sekundärer Verwendung.”
house", it would not be unreasonable to suppose that it might be in this area of the city, perhaps associated with Aphrodisius' architrave.\textsuperscript{179}

This is, however, no more than a suggestion. By its very nature, the agora was the scene of a wide variety of inscriptions. It must not be supposed that the gerousia dominated the Tetragonous Agora, or even a portion of it. Nevertheless, the body may have had a presence in the agora and the area around it, particularly when one considers that Arcadiane Street and the Scholastica baths are not far from the Tetragonous Agora. Two additional inscriptions come from this area as well, one from Terrace House 2 and a second from the not-distant Theatre gymnasium.\textsuperscript{180} The gerousia may or may not have had a building of its own in this area, but citizens of Ephesus and visitors to the city must have been aware of the presence of that body in this quarter of the city.

6.6. Conclusions

The gerousia of Ephesus engaged in a variety of activities and enjoyed different privileges during the period of six centuries over which there is evidence. Naturally, these did not remain the same throughout the gerousia's existence, but rather changed and developed both as the city passed from kingdom to kingdom to empire and with the simple passage of time. Thus, the activities in which the body involved itself in the Hellenistic period form points of origin leading to activities attested under the Empire, while many of the rights and privileges possessed by the later gerousia appear to have

\textsuperscript{179} Two caveats are in order. First, the findspots of the inscriptions need not have been the original locations of the inscriptions, as in the case of those found in the Church of St. John or Aphrodisius' architrave, so that this is, and should not be taken as anything more than, a supposition. Second, it is not necessary that the gerousia had an official "meeting house". It was suggested in Chapter Five that the internal structure of the gerousia may have been somewhat informal, so that informal meetings (perhaps in the area of the Tetragonous Agora) would be possible. Furthermore, a secure location in which to keep its liquid resources may not have been required, given the institution's association with the Temple of Artemis for much of its history.

\textsuperscript{180} Cat. nos. 58 & 68.
developed out of those initially granted or upheld by the Hellenistic king Lysimachus through his general Prepelaus or by the city itself. The body reached a highpoint probably in the early second century, after which it began to decline, both in the activities it undertook and in the rights it enjoyed.

At the time of Lysimachus’ capture of the city, the *gerousia* was involved in the financial administration of the Temple of Artemis. An embassy sent by it requested and received exemption from the billeting of troops and taxation of temple lands. Shortly after the beginning of the first century BC, it gained a favoured position among the financial administrators of the Temple of Artemis, though it did not have complete control over the temple’s finances.

The *gerousia* may have continued to send embassies to various kings and generals during the Hellenistic period, but it is certain that it was sending ambassadors to Roman officials by the second half of the first century BC. The provincial proconsuls, possibly continuing a Hellenistic tradition, excused the body from billeting Roman officials and the payment of regular taxes and contributions.

Augustus and Caesar before him confirmed the privileged position which the *gerousia* held among the individuals or bodies in charge of temple loans. Its lending activities continued beyond the first century, but it appears to have become less effective guaranteeing the repayment of its loans; by the third century it was reduced, on at least one occasion, to taking rather than granting loans. A decrease in lending activity may be directly related to the loss of access to the emperor. During the Hellenistic period and the first century, it was able to send its embassies directly to the ruler, but Hadrian propagated an already existing trend by which its inquiries were given over to the
proconsuls until that individual became the regular authority to which the *gerousia* appealed.

The second century witnessed an increase in overseeing tombs and adherence to funerary instructions. The body is named in several instances as the recipient of a fine payable in the case of violation of the funerary inscription, sometimes alone and sometimes in the company of the *boule*. This may have been encouraged by the proconsul Aquillius Proculus at the beginning of the second century AD, but it had certainly begun by the end of the first century AD. It is a role in which the *gerousia* appears most often after the mid-second century.

As the *gerousia* gained more and more clear support from the early emperors, it began to take a more active role in the city as a whole, occasionally joining the *boule* and *demos* in honouring certain large-scale benefactors. This cooperation did not continue into the second century, though the body continued independently to honour certain of its grander benefactors on rare occasions during the first part of this century.

Overall, the *gerousia* gradually lost its position as the administrative body of at least some of the financial resources of the Temple of Artemis from the beginning of the Hellenistic period to the mid-third century AD; nonetheless, it continued to remain active in temple loans. This loss was accompanied by oscillations in its prominence in the public political affairs of the city. This was not, however, accompanied by a decline in the status of the individual members. The *gerouxiastai* continued to be citizens of wealth, at least until the date of the last known member, Zoticus the son of Artemidorus, in AD 231-239. With their wealth, a continuation of influence for the individual members and for the *gerousia* as a whole must also be assumed. The diminishment of the *gerousia*
suggests an evolution from a public or semi-private group at the beginning of the Hellenistic period into a more private and social group.

Although every effort has been made in this chapter to include as much detail about the *gerousia*'s activities and rights as possible, the treatment is necessarily incomplete. Several of the inscriptions which provide pertinent information are fragmentary and so are not as illuminating as they might otherwise have been. The inevitable consequence of this is that a degree of supposition and guess work is required. To cite only one example, the letter of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus to the *logistes* of the *gerousia* is partially lost, so that the details of the final portion have to be deduced.\textsuperscript{181} Fragmentary inscriptions are not entirely debilitating to the purpose of this chapter; of far greater significance is the fact that the evidence for the *gerousia* is by its very nature selective. It is unreasonable to assume that every detail of the daily workings of the *gerousia* – or of any public or private body – would have been publicly displayed in inscriptions. Furthermore, not every inscription which was originally erected has survived: some stones may have been reused; some inscriptions may have been chiselled out and replaced; some inscriptions undoubtedly remain undiscovered or simply unpublished. The possibility exists, therefore, and must be acknowledged that the *gerousia* may have been active in more areas than those detailed in this chapter.

\textsuperscript{181} Cat. no. 17.
7. CONCLUSION

At the end of the nineteenth century, D.G. Hogarth noted that the *gerousiai* known to have existed in Asia Minor under the early empire had nothing in common with those of the Greek mainland before the coming of Rome.\(^1\) It is important to note that Hogarth says nothing about the relationship between Roman, Hellenistic and pre-Hellenistic *gerousiai* in Asia Minor, only that the Doric and Asiatic institutions were distinct. The one obvious similarity between the Spartan *gerousia* created by Lycurgus and the Ephesian *gerousia* is the name. Naturally, the identical name encourages the search for ways in which the Doric and Asiatic bodies could be related, even if the Classical and Imperial bodies were not identical. Unfortunately, virtually no evidence survives for the pre-Hellenistic *gerousia* in Asia Minor to direct such an inquiry, but several facts which may be relevant do, nevertheless, emerge and may assist in the search for the origins of the Ephesian *gerousia*.

First, towards the end of the Peloponnesian War, Sparta actively supported and created small oligarchic governing bodies in various cities along the western coast of Asia Minor, particularly through the efforts of Lysander; Ephesus was among those cities which were subjected to a decarchy. Second, Sparta agreed to leave the Greek cities of Asia Minor to the suzerainty of the Persian Empire after the unsuccessful revolt and death of Cyrus. Third, groups of special advisors in Persia were called by the Greeks *epikletoi*. Fourth, Alexander the Great replaced a small oligarchic ruling body in Ephesus by establishing a democratic constitution. Finally, the *gerousia* and *epikletoi* existed side by side at the beginning of the Hellenistic period in Ephesus, subordinate to the *boule* and *demos*.

\(^1\) Hogarth (1891): 69.
One can, therefore, postulate the following early history of the Ephesian *gerousia* with the recognition that it is theoretical only. It had its origins not in the decarchy established by Lysander, but possibly in an oligarchy set up in opposition to it by the Persians after the official withdrawal of Sparta from the coast of Asia Minor at the beginning of the fourth century BC, or in a group of citizens who acted on their own authority in this or a similar time of crisis. This oligarchy or group of citizens was medized by the introduction of permanent or semi-permanent advisors, the *epikletoi*, Persian appointees. Under the Persian Empire, the *gerousia* and *epikletoi* administered the city, subject, presumably to the satrap, and were most likely involved in the affairs of the Temple of Artemis as well. Alexander deprived this double-body of its political powers, which he granted to the *boule* and *demos*, but it continued to exist, associated primarily with the temple.

At this point, the beginning of the Hellenistic period, it becomes easier to trace the patterns of development of the *gerousia*, though such a task is by no means free from difficulties nor is it entirely free from speculation. The *gerousia* and the *epikletoi* became more closely bound until a single term sufficed to identify the hybrid group. The size of the body is unknown for this period of its existence, but it is reasonable to suppose that it was not significantly larger the proposed Persian appointees or citizens, which need not have been significantly more numerous than Lysander's ten decarchs. By the mid-first century AD, though, it had grown to between one hundred and one hundred and twenty members. The body continued to grow over the course of the first century until there were approximately four hundred *gerousiastai* in AD 104. Beyond this year, there is
insufficient evidence to determine the number of members but it probably continued to grow during the prosperous second century.

At some point, though, membership numbers must have levelled off or even declined. The honour and public status associated with membership varied throughout its existence, but probably began to drop after a highpoint in the mid-second century AD. The latest certainly dated inscription in which it appears was erected during the reign of Philip the Arab, but the gerousia's absence thereafter is not an indication of a sudden disappearance. Rather, commemoration of membership in the gerousia diminished for some reason, possibly, but not necessarily, associated with the political turmoil and rapid succession of emperors during the mid-third century. A change in attitudes may also have been involved in the failure of the gerousia to appear beyond the mid-third century. As gerousiastai lost their claim to honour (or their perceived honour) on the basis of their membership, that membership must have been seen as less desirable and the gerousia consequently became less and less significant in Ephesus; there would, therefore, have been even less reason to commemorate one's membership.

The gerousiastai themselves were wealthy citizens of Ephesus, though not the wealthiest or most socially significant. Religious positions appear frequently among their public offices, but there is no certain case of an individual enjoying membership in both the gerousia and the boule, nor is any gerousiastes known to have been an Imperial priest or a prytanis. The gerousia was, both in terms of social status and political power, subordinate to the boule, but membership did, during its highpoints, bring a certain degree of public prestige and may even have served as a means of gaining access to membership in the boule. There is, however, no indication of how membership to the
gerousia was gained; very little evidence exists to support the proposition that a fee was paid for entry.

The actual workings of the gerousia cannot be determined from the present state of evidence. One would assume that it had access to a meeting place. Lack of evidence also hinders the investigation of the internal organization of the gerousia. Several officers are known – secretaries, gymnasarchs, legal representatives, auditors and, once, a treasurer – but only two appear always to have been members, namely the secretary and the treasurer; the gymnasarch could be a member, but did not have to be, while legal representatives and auditors were externally appointed. It may be inappropriate to look for a rigid ranking of officers of the gerousia, but the secretary would seem to be the most obvious choice for a leading official.

The greatest change in the history of the body was that authored by Alexander the Great, and not its disappearance from the epigraphic record in the Hellenistic period or the city’s transfer to Roman rule. The activities which the gerousia undertook from the beginning of the Hellenistic period to the mid-third century AD suggest that it evolved continually and not through sudden changes. Its first appearance shows it representing the interests of the temple regionally to the king, specifically Lysimachus, and locally to the city. The gerousia was at this time subordinate to the boule and demos, but was nonetheless able to dispatch embassies on its own authority. By the first century BC, the gerousia had become active in some sacred loans. That it seems to have acquired a privileged position among the lenders of the city by this time suggests that it had been involved in the administration of temple loans for some time before this. This favoured
position, along with the right of dispatching envoys, appears to have been maintained unchanged into the Imperial period.

The body may have gained some equality with the *boule* and *demos*, joining those bodies as a partner in honorary inscriptions and possibly, on occasion, in embassies; it may, however, be more correct to say that the *boule* and *demos* lost some of their authority under the Romans than to say that the *gerousia* gained. This apparent equality, as far as the epigraphic evidence shows, does not persist into the second century, when the *gerousia* ceases to appear beside the *boule* and *demos* in honorary texts. The privileged lending position, though, received Imperial support during the second century as it had in the first. There was, however, an important change in the nature of that support: the proconsul of Asia appears to have become the *gerousia's* source of Imperial backing. The *gerousia*’s ease of access to the emperor – originally manifested in its ability to send ambassadors and to receive replies in the forms of letters – diminished as the proconsuls of the province began to take a more active interest in its affairs. This diminishment may have progressed so far by the third quarter of the second century that the *gerousia* could only appeal indirectly to the emperor.

In the late second and early third centuries, the *gerousia* appears in funerary inscriptions as the caretaker of certain tombs and as the recipient of fines in the case of violations of the sepulchral specifications. It is by this time an kind of unofficial guarantor of some funerary arrangements, but this role may have originally developed at the beginning of the second century, when it was given an interest in seeing that violators of the terms of one endowment fund certainly and possibly a second were held responsible.
Throughout the Roman period, the *gerousia* ensured that it remained benevolent in the eyes of provincial officials and emperors through the use of the title *philosebastos*, the erection of Imperial statues, and the occasional celebration of feasts in honour of the Emperor. This representation contributed to the *gerousia*’s ability to continue to exist under the Roman government, an existence which was probably assisted by a policy similar to that of Trajan in Bithynia: if the formation of assemblies of citizens had been upheld in Rome’s early treaties with particular cities, those assemblies were permitted to continue. It is not an unforgivable assumption to deduce from this that a body such as the *gerousia* of Ephesus, composed of many wealthy and prominent citizens of that city, should have been permitted to continue, given that it had certainly existed in the city for almost three centuries before the establishment of the principate, and quite probably for four. Moreover, it was closely associated with the Artemision, which may have further justified its continued existence in the eyes of provincial officials.

The *gerousia*, though, was not simply a body of citizens which was allowed to remain: it has been seen that both emperors and proconsuls of Asia were involved in the affairs of the *gerousia*. Although the *gerousia* had probably lost the majority of its political powers by the beginning of the Hellenistic period, it remained an influential body under the empire because of the status of its individual members and because of its longstanding existence. It did, however, retain some political elements. The existence of a *logistes* of the *gerousia*, even if he was only an irregularly appointed individual, is, perhaps, one of the most obvious of its political features. That a *logistes* or *curator* could be appointed suggests that a public, officially recognized position was occupied by the *gerousia*. It must be noted, however, that this body does not normally appear alongside
the *boule* and *demos*, particularly for the period during which *logistai* are known to have been appointed for the *gerousia*. Moreover, the appearance of the *gerousia* beside the *boule* and *demos* seems to be limited to honorary inscriptions. It is unlikely, therefore, that the *gerousia* formed a third political partner for the *boule* and *demos*.

The constitutional position of the *gerousia* in Ephesus is unclear. It cannot be definitively stated that it was political, social or religious. At all periods for which there is currently evidence, it seems that it was involved in the lending of temple resources and its own secular resources. It enjoyed a privileged position in the city through the social status of its individual members and its connections with the Temple of Artemis, and was thereby enabled to associate itself, sometimes on an equal footing, with the *boule* and *demos*. Such an association was probably not the result of a defined constitutional position, though. Its official political powers probably disappeared for the most part with Alexander’s restoration of a democratic constitution, after which it became a semi-public association of Ephesians engaging in financial activities; it was at all times closely involved with the affairs of the temple.

The Imperial Ephesian *gerousia* may have nothing in common with the original Doric institution. The two bodies were not, however, completely separate. Originally, the Ephesian *gerousia* was most likely genuinely political, but, beginning in the Hellenistic period, it began an evolution into a body which, by the mid-third century AD, was no longer an administrative body whose decisions and actions directed Ephesian policy. The changes which can be observed in the epigraphic evidence for the *gerousia*, particularly in its activities and privileges, should be seen as natural developments, influenced by Roman rule, perhaps, but certainly not caused by Roman rule.
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Appendix I: Catalogue of Inscriptions

The criteria determining the inclusion and exclusion of inscriptions in this catalogue have been discussed in Chapter Three and need not, therefore, be repeated here. It may be well, however, to review the arrangement of the inscriptions. The primary divisions of the catalogue are very broad: an inscription is either Hellenistic or Imperial in date. Because the vast majority of gerousia-inscriptions fall into the latter category, they have been further subdivided by type, of which six are identified: Imperial letters, Dedicatory inscriptions, Honorary inscriptions, Public decrees, Lists of names and Funerary inscriptions. The three Hellenistic inscriptions can all be classified as Public decrees.

Each inscription is accompanied by references to earlier editions, by an identification of its findspot, by its measurements and by an estimate of its date whenever possible. The first reference in the case of each inscription is the source for the text presented. Alternate readings, when they affect the gerousia or its members, are provided in footnotes. Illustrations of the inscriptions have been collected when possible and presented in the second appendix.
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I. Hellenistic Inscriptions

A. Decrees

(1) FiE IX/I/1 a2; I Eph 1449.1-10; GIBM 449; SGDI 5589; SIG³ 353; Oliver, SG 1:

honorary decree of boule and demos of Ephesus for Euphronius the son of Hegemon of Akarnania; fragments on two blocks found built into the proscenium of the theatre but originally from the Artemision. Measurements of the original block (including several other inscriptions): 208.4 x 60 cm. Date: 302-294 BC; the general Prepelaus, who is the recipient of the embassy referred to in this inscription, captured Ephesus on behalf of Lysimachus in 302 BC. The city was lost, until Lysimachus once again captured it in 295 or 294. Prepelaus was a general whom Cassander sent to assist Lysimachus in the campaigns leading up to the battle of Ipsus in 301 BC, so it cannot be taken for granted that he remained with Lysimachus throughout the seven years following Ipsus until the recapture of the city. He is known from Diodorus to have been present in the city in 302 BC, but it might make more sense for Euphronius to lead an embassy to him if he was not present in the city. Illustration: Fig. 5.

εδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ: Ἡρογίτων εἶπεν: περὶ ὧν οἱ νεωτοίς καὶ οἱ κουρίτες καταστάθηκες διελεύθησαν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ ψήφισμα ήνεγκα τῆς γερουσίας καὶ τῶν ἐπικλήτων ὑπὲρ Εὐφρόνιον πολιτείας, δεδοχθεὶ τῇ βουλῇ:

ἐπείδη Εὐφρόνιος Ἡγήμονος Ἀκαρνανίας πρῶτερον τῇ εὐνοίᾳ ὑπὸ καὶ πρόθυμος διετέλει περὶ τὸν δήμον τὸν Ἐφεσίου καὶ νῦν ἀποστάλεις πρὸς Πρέπελαον ὑπὸ τῆς γερουσίας καὶ τῶν ἐπικλήτων ὑπὲρ τοῦ σταθμοῦ τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ τῆς άτελείας τῇ θείᾳ, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐν ἄπασι καρποῖς διατελεῖ χρήσιμος ὑπὸ καὶ κοινῆ τῷ δήμῳ καὶ ἱδίαι τοῖς εὐνοχοῖς τῷ μὲν πολιτῶν ἑγκώθησαν ἐπανέκει τῇ Εὐφρόνιον εὐνοίας ἑνεκήν ἦν ἔχει περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τὴν πόλιν, καὶ δοῦσαι αὐτῶι πολιτείᾳ ἐφ’ ἵσιν καὶ ὀμήν, αὐτῶι καὶ εἴγονοι, ἀναγράφαι δὲ αὐτῶι τῇ πολιτείαν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος δῦ καὶ αὐτῶι πολιτείᾳ ἁμαρτημέναι εἰσίν: ἐπικληρῶσα δέ αὐτῶι καὶ εἰς φυλήν καὶ εἰς χιλιαστῶν, ὅπως ἄν εἰδώλια πάντες ὅτι ὁ δήμος ὁ Ἐφεσίων τούτων ἑυεργετοῦντας τὸ τε ἱερὸν καὶ τὴν πόλιν τιμᾶι δωρεαίς ταῖς προσηγούσαις.

Translation:

Decreed by the boule and demos; Herogiton proposed the measure; concerning which things the temple warden and the kouretes having been appointed debated with the boule and concerning which they brought a decree of the gerousia and the epikletoi regarding the citizenship of Euphronius, it has been decreed by the boule:

Since Euphronius, the son of Hegemon, the Acarnian has formerly shown himself well disposed and enthusiastic toward the demos of the Ephesians and now, since, when an embassy was sent to Prepelaus by the gerousia and the epikletoi regarding the billeting
Section I: Hellenistic Inscriptions
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of soldiers around the temple\(^1\) and the goddess’ right to be free of taxation, he has arranged it by means of the embassy that the goddess’ right to be free of taxation continues, and since he has accomplished other things at all opportune times being helpful both publicly to the demos and privately to those of the citizens who appeal to him, it has been decided both to praise Euphronius for the sake of the kindness which he shows to the sanctuary and the city, and to give to him citizenship on an equal and fair basis, to him and to his descendants, and to erect a record of his citizenship in the sanctuary of Artemis where the other records of citizenship are also erected; and to allot him both to a Tribe and to a Thousand, so that all may see that the demos of the Ephesians honour those who are benefactors of the sanctuary and of the city with proper gifts. He received the Tribe Ephesus and the Thousand Argadeus.

(2) IEph 1470.1-10; GIBM 470; Oliver, SG 2; SEG 30, 1299: honorary decree of boule and demos of Ephesus for a Boeotian; found built into the proscenium of the theatre but originally from the Artemision. Measurements: 32.5 x 22.18-27.18 cm. Date: 302-281 BC. Illustration: Fig. 6.

\[
\text{[\text{δδοξεν ἔπει \\ ἐπεὶ τὴν δήμοιν]}}
\]

\[
\text{[----------- εὔπειρον καταστάσει]}
\]

\[
\text{[θείωσαν ἐπὶ τῇ ὀλλαχῷ τῶν νεω-} \\
\text{ποιῶν, καὶ τὰ τὸ ψήφισμα τῆς γερ[-ου-]}
\]

\[
\text{[σιας καὶ τῶν ἐπικλήσεων ὑπέρ---]}
\]

\[
\text{[ων]ος τοῦ αὐλητοῦ διδόχθαι}
\]

\[
\text{[τῇ βουλῆ καὶ τών δήμων ἐποιεότα-} \\
\text{[ων]α Ἰσμηνόδορον Βοιώτην [τὸν αὐλή]}
\]

\[
\text{[τῇ]ν καὶ στεφανώσαι αὐτόν [χρυσέωι]}
\]

\[
\text{[στεφάνῳ καὶ ἀναγγέλαι]}
\]

Translation:

It was decreed by the boule and demos; [...] proposed the measure; when the temple wardens were before the boule in accordance with the decree of the gerousia and the epikletoi on behalf of [...] on the flute-player; it was decreed by the boule and demos to praise [...] on the son of Ismenodorus the Boiotian flute player and to crown him with a golden crown and to announce....

(3) IEph 8; SIG\(^3\) 742; two decrees of the city of Ephesus regarding Mithridates VI on a marble plaque; found near the aqueduct. Measurements: 130 x 75 cm. Date: 86/85 BC. Illustration: Fig. 7.

\[
\text{[ἐπείδη, τῷ δήμῳ]}
\]

\[
\text{[φυλάσσων]τος τὴν πρὸς Ὀρμαῖος τοὺς κοινοὺς σωτήρας παρα-} \\
\text{[λαίδιν εὐνοίαν καὶ ἐν πάσιν τῖς ἐπιτασσομέ[νοις προθύμωσ]}
\]

\[
\text{[πεθαρχ]εύσιος, Μιθραδάτης Καππαδοκί[ας βασιλεύς παρα-]}
\]

\(^1\) For σταθμός as the billeting of soldiers, see Roussel, REG 37 (1924): 79 & Robert, Hellenica 3 (1946): 79; cf. cat. nos. 12, 11; 13, 29; 14, 39.

βηθήσεως ἐργονομίας ἐξευγμένις εἶναι καὶ τοῦς ἑποτελεῖς καὶ παροίκους καὶ ἵερους καὶ ἐξελευθέρους καὶ ἔνσος, ὡσαν ἀναλάβωσιν τὰ ὁπλα καὶ πρὸς
Translation

...since, when the demos was preserving the ancient goodwill which they have toward their common saviours the Romans and when the demos were enthusiastically obedient to every command, Mithridates the king of Cappadocia, having violated the agreements with the Romans and having collected his armies, attempted to become the master of lands to which he had no right, and since, having first seized our outlying villages, he deceived us and he took over our city surprising us with the mass of his armies and with the unexpectedness of his advance, and since our people, having from the beginning preserved our goodwill to the Romans, taking the opportunity to lend aid to the common efforts, has decided to take up the war against Mithridates for the sake of the authority of the Romans and the common freedom, with all the cities with a common will having thrown themselves into the struggles for these things, it has been decreed by the demos: since the situation is fit for war and for the preservation, safety and salvation of the Temple of Artemis and the city and all the citizens and inhabitants of the city...
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It is necessary that all should with one mind endure the threat, it has been decreed by the demos since the situation is fit for the preservation, safety and salvation of the Temple of Artemis and of the city and its territory.

Those who have been stricken out or blackmarked by the sacred or public logistes, in any way whatsoever, will again be held in honour and the accounts and debts against them will be voided; and those marked for sacred or public trials or charged with sacred or public offences or for other debts, in any way whatsoever, their debts will be dropped and proceedings against them will be illegal. And if there are people who have rented the goddess’ land or have bought land, their affairs will remain for them according to the existing legal arrangements; and whatever sacred monies are owed, everything which is owed and due will be dismissed, except those which have been lent upon security by the sustemata or by lenders appointed by them, and the interest from these will not be incurred for the approaching year until such time as the demos finds itself in better conditions. And if there are people who have become citizens before now, their citizenship will all be respected and they will have a share in the same honours. And sacred and public cases are to be dissolved and powerless, unless they are regarding boundary lines or the settlement of allotments because of a dispute; those with equality and resident foreigners and sacred servants and freedmen and foreigners, whosoever takes up arms and registers to support the (Roman) leaders, will all be equal to and enjoy the same rights as citizens, whose names the (Roman) leaders will make known to the leading citizens and the grammateus of the boule. They will allot these men into tribes and Thousands. Locals and freemen and the inhabitants of the region who take up arms (will receive the same rights). Coming before the demos those, who have lent money according to the naval agreements and according to the written declarations and according to the deposits and trusts and costs and according to the purchases and compacts and written receipts and all loans have readily and willingly deposited them (the agreements, contracts and loans) with the demos, and they are releasing the debtors from what was owed, while those who remain of the possessors...for the possessors now, unless there are some who have lent or have had business with foreigners either here or...; regarding affairs relating to bankers, whoever has deposited security for the upcoming year or whoever has given loans or a pledge to someone who has accepted it, their affairs will remain according to the existing laws; whatever deposits or loans were made prior to this decree the bankers will give to the depositors or the depositors will return to the bankers the earned-interest calculated up to the tenth year, and they will pay the owed-interest in an analogous manner. But if in a certain year...when he has returned the...legally....

---

2 This should be a reference to individuals who have defaulted on loans made by the temple or by civic authorities. From what list they are to be removed is not specified, but it is conceivable that it was a census list, an excessive penalty, perhaps, for a private loan, but not necessarily so for a public or sacred loan.
II. Imperial Inscriptions
A. Letters from Roman Officials
(4) JÖAI 62 (1993): 119, no. 11 a 1-6: fragment of a letter to the gerousia of Ephesus; found in the Tetragonus Agora. Measurements: 20 x 29 x 10 cm. Date: Aratus son of Aratus was prytanis in 39/38; an Aratus also appears as a striker of coins in 49/48 BC and prytanis in 48/47 BC (IEph 9N.31, 9N.17). A Protogenes was prytanis in 34/33 BC (IEph 9N.47). Knibbe suggests that the Theodorus mentioned in ll. 1-2 may be the same Theodorus who delivered the letter to Octavian in 29 BC (Cat. no. 6). The inscription should therefore be dated to 2nd half of the 1st c BC.

Translation:
...sends greetings to the gerousia of the Ephesians. Theo...of the gerousia and those who upon the...Protogenes the son of Ouliadus...Aratus the son of Aratus...the son of Helicon....

(5) JÖAI 62 (1993): 113, no. 1.1-6: fragment of a letter of Caesar (?) or Octavian(?) to the gerousia of Ephesus regarding privileges; found in the Tetragonus Agora. Measurements: the next six inscriptions (5-10) are on a single stone measuring 141 x 66.5 x 21-25 cm. Date: 48/47-27 BC.

Translation:
...I have received, and I agree to preserve the honours and privileges of the elders. And what you have asked about the debts which are owed to the gerousia itself I wish that it be in accordance with your own laws and practices. Farewell.

(6) JÖAI 62 (1993): 114 no 2.7-16: letter of Octavian to the boule and demos of Ephesus, regarding a vote of the gerousia concerning its privileges; found in the Tetragonus Agora. Date: 29 BC.

Translation:
...
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Translation:

Imperator Caesar, son of the god, consul for the fifth time, hailed as Imperator seven times, sends greetings to the boule and demos of the Ephesians. If you are well, it is well, and I am healthy along with the army. Theodoras, Memnon, Protogenes, Heraclides, Sopater, Asclepiades, Aristion, Agathenor, Menodotus the ambassadors of the Assembly (εκκλησία) have given to me the decree from the gerousia, and afterwards they spoke about the conditions in it; therefore I accept the constitution of the gerousia, and I shall preserve...your customs and honours and privileges. Farewell.

(7) JÖAI 62 (1993): 115, no. 6.48-50: rescript of M Agrippa to the gerousia of Ephesus regarding its privileges; found in the Tetragonous Agora. Date: 17-14 BC.

Márkos de 'Agrippas tâ σύντα τείμια [καὶ] [φιλάνθρωπα ἔγραψε καὶ ἔχαρισάς[σ] τῆς γερουσίας.

Translation:

And Marcus Agrippa proclaimed and granted these same honours and privileges to the gerousia.

(8) JÖAI 62 (1993): 114, no. 3.17-26: letter of Tiberius to the gerousia of Ephesus regarding its privileges; found in the Tetragonous Agora. Date: 12/13 AD.

[Τιβέριος Καῖσαρ Σεβαστός υἱὸς, ἀρχιερεὺς, δημιουργικὴς] ἡγοῦσας ταῖς γερουσίας[σ] τῆς τοῦ τέταρτον προκειμένου[ν].

[Τιβέριος Καῖσαρ Σεβαστός υἱὸς, ἀρχιερεὺς, δημιουργικὴς] ἡγοῦσας ταῖς γερουσίας[σ] τῆς τοῦ τέταρτον προκειμένου[ν].

[Συμφέρει μὴ να ἔρχωσται στὸ έργον τό τοῦ τέταρτον προκειμένου[ν].]

Translation:

And Marcus Agrippa proclaimed and granted these same honours and privileges to the gerousia.

---

3 One might also read [τῆς γερουσίας] to avoid the introduction of εκκλησία, which does not otherwise appear in this series of letters.

4 This inscription is the sixth in the series, appearing after a letter of Gaius Caesar or Germanicus (cat. no. 10). As such, it seems to be out of chronological order in the arrangement presented by Knibbe.
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Translation:

Tiberius Caesar, son of Augustus, pontifex maximus, having the tribunician power for the tenth time, hailed as Imperator seven times, sends greetings to the gerousia of the Ephesians. I happily received from Curtius Proculus the decree sent by you which shows the goodwill of the elders both to my father and to our entire domus, believing because of it that you wish that your respect for me to be made clear. What honours and privileges my grandfather and father have confirmed for you, know that I, having made provisions, shall continue to preserve. Farewell.

(9) JOAI 62 (1993): 115, no. 4.26a-37: fragment of a letter of Germanicus (?) to the gerousia of Ephesus concerning its privileges; found in the Tetragonus agora.
Date: Germanicus was in northern Asia, in the region of Nicaea, in AD 18 (Knibbe; Tac. Ann. II.54).

Translation:

Germanicus Caesar, son of Augustus, proconsul, sends greetings to the gerousia of the Ephesians. Your ambassador, Menodotus, by whom the decree and the..., having met me in Nicaea...has shown us and so it...towards our entire domus...being honoured with public praise they have displayed respect for my father and myself...being received by me took care...both the customs of the gerousia and the practices of it I shall attempt not only to continue to preserve but also to augment for the better. Farewell.

Date: AD 1-4 or AD 18.

Translation:
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Translation:
Germanicus Caesar, son of Augustus, proconsul, sends greetings to the gerousia of the Ephesians. Tiberius Claudius D..., your ambassador has seen me about your affairs and he has spoken about your honours and privileges and he has shown that you are piously disposed toward my domus; and I have promised him that I am in the same way attentive to you; therefore I welcome your reverence, and what honours and privileges my grandfather and father have granted to you, these I shall preserve and augment. Farewell.

(11) JÖAI 62 (1993): 116 no. 7.1-4: Fragment of a letter to the gerousia; found in the Tetragonus Agora. Measurements: the following four inscriptions (11-14) are on a single stone measuring 99 x 73 x 20 cm. Date: the restoration of όμοι in the fourth line, if correct, suggests that the letter was sent by a proconsul following the actions of his predecessor. The letter also appears on a block separate from that on which the preceding letters appear; the other letters (12-14) appearing on this block are from the proconsul Publius Petronius, and are dated to AD 29-32, so that this letter should be dated to earlier than AD 29.

Translation:
...I have granted to the assembly of the elders; I shall take care that they might possess these honours and privileges without impediment, those honours which were in effect and which my predecessor preserved. Farewell.

(12) JÖAI 62 (1993): 116-117, no 8.7-18: letter of the proconsul of Asia Publius Petronius to the gerousia of Ephesus regarding its privileges; found in the Tetragonus Agora. Date: Publius Petronius was consul in AD 19 and proconsul of Asia for six years beginning in AD 29/30 (PIR² P 269; Corsten [1999]); the inscription dates to the first year of his proconsulship.

Translation:
...
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[Ἐξεσθε νῦν τών ἡμάς τῶν τε παρὰ διοίκησιν ἐν-
[γυνῶν καὶ λογίας καὶ ἐπισταθημένων εκτός εἰ μή τινα αὐτός διὰ ἀνάν-
[κην δήμοσιαν] γυναμαστε δεξίως, πρὸς τε τούς οἰκελοντας ὑμεῖν
[καὶ πράξεις] γειτήσαι κατὰ τούς ἴμετέρους νόμους.
Translation:
Publius Petronius, proconsul, sends greetings to the *gerousia* of the Ephesians. Tiberius Julius Heras, who is also your gymnasiarch, has shown to me the rights of the elders, which the Augusti have granted to you and which all the proconsuls before me uniformly preserved absolving you of the securities for the assize district and of donations and of billeting. So I have written to you to say that I also am willing to preserve these privileges; because of the worthiness of your city and because of your dignity. I gladly promise not only to preserve your rights but also to increase them, and I absolve you from the securities for the assize district and of donations and of billeting except if because of a public emergency I myself specify someone by name, and regarding those who are indebted to you and have business with you, it shall be done in accordance with your own laws.


[Πόπλιος Πετρόνιος ἀνθύπατος τῷ β’ Ἐφεσίων
[γερουσία χαίρειν ἐνυπάρχουσα ὑπὸ σωμάτων Ἰωάννην Ἰουλίαν καὶ Σεβαστῆς καὶ Συνκλήτου καὶ γυναικάρχον ὑμῶν ἀτηραμένου ἐπιθετοῦμαι με, διὸ ὁ Σεβαστὸς Ἰουλίας καὶ ὁ Συνκλῆτος καὶ Ἡρακλῆς ὑμῶν.

 Translation:
Publius Petronius, proconsul for the second time, sends greetings to the *gerousia* of the Ephesians. When Lucius Cosinius To..., a priest of Tiberius Caesar Augustus and of Julia Augusta and of the Senate, and your gymnasiarch, met me and asked me to confirm as much as Augustus the son of the god and the proconsuls before me proclaimed, namely to preserve your exemption from liturgies..., billeting and donations, and to reallease you from the securities for the assize district, I was quite pleased to promise in this respect to write...Cosinius who is my dear friend and extravagantly honoured by me eagerly requested on your behalf. Therefore I release you from billeting and donations and securities for the assize district except if because of an emergency I...
specify someone by name, and I will also preserve your customs and your privileges, so that you might enjoy them even without a specific request.

(14) JÖAI 62 (1993): 118-119, no. 10.32-42: letter of the proconsul of Asia Publius Petronius to the gerousia of Ephesus regarding its privileges; found in the Tetragonus Agora. Date: the inscription dates to the third year of Petronius’ proconsulship, AD 31/32.

\[\text{Translation:}\

Publius Petronius, proconsul for the third time, sends greetings to the gerousia of the Ephesians. Since Alexander the son of Alexander, who has been appointed gymnasiarch of all the gymnasia for the upcoming year, appeared before me concerning your rights, which the Augusti granted to you and which the governors before me have uniformly preserved, and which I, in the time of my tenure, have also preserved, wishing on account of your honourable standing not only to preserve your rights but also to increase them, I, on that account, release the Elders from billeting and the securities for the assize district and from the other things, which I have already specified earlier, and if any others...I grant to you...of these contrary to no customs...to bring it before the tribunal.

(15) IEph 27D.370-413; Oliver, SG 3.370-413; cf. GIBM 480.243-284; Rogers (1991): 174-176, D.370-413: Letter of Publius Afranius Flavianus approving the benefactions of Gaius Vibius Salutaris; found on the southern analemma of the theatre. The inscription is a part of a much longer inscription including seven documents concerning Salutaris’ benefactions. The text is organized in six columns forming a trapezoid measuring on the left 208 x 12.5-20 cm and on the right 403 x 12.5-20 cm; cf. cat. nos. 53 & 54. Date: Tiberius Claudius Antipater Julianus was prytanis during the proconsulship of Aquillius Proculus (PIR² A 999), under whom Afranius Flavianus (PIR² A 443) was propretor. AD 104. Illustration: Fig. 8.
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Translation:

During the prytany of Tiberius Claudius Antipater Julianus in the month of Poseideon.

(372) Afranius Flavianus, the legate and propraetor, sends greetings to the magistrates, boule and demos of the Ephesians. Vibius Salutaris, our very dear friend, being on account of his rank most noble and furthermore being a man of the best character, because of the disposition which he holds towards us, has shown himself to be a friend, one of the most loyal and fervent, which he has demonstrated in many cases, even if he escapes the notice of most men, since he holds goodwill and concern for you. But now since he has made his signal affection, which he has had for the city from his youth, clear to all, and since he believes that it would be in keeping with his lifestyle and conduct to adorn and to exalt both the sacred and the common affairs of your great and noteworthy city, and since he has now done honour and reverence to the most manifest goddess Artemis and of the house of the Emperors with gifts and the dedication of money, I rejoice for you, because of the man, and for myself equally, because of the reciprocation and the testimony and the response to him from you with appropriate eloquence; therefore I believe it is owed to him by you to the end that many others also might be zealous in the same way, that this man should be seen to receive a reward in accordance with his merit.

(392) But this would be most welcome and dear to me of all things, if my friend, whom I honour and esteem in particular, should be seen among you as worthy of recognition and reward. But concerning the endowment of money and of the statues of the goddess and of the busts, how it will be necessary to use them and which man is to be appointed to the administration of them, I believe that it is seemly that he who has dedicated these things should propose a motion and that you should decree in that way. And when appropriate things have been ratified by the donor himself and by you yourselves, I wish that the endowment remain on those terms unchanged by anyone or by any proposed decree to dissolve or redirect the funds. But if someone attempts in any way whatsoever either to advise some such thing or to propose a measure about the redirection and re-interpretation of the things which shall now be ratified by him and by you, I wish that he pay immediately to the temple of the greatest goddess, Artemis, a penalty of twenty-five thousand denarii and to the fiscus of the Emperor twenty-five thousand denarii and another twenty-five thousand denarii for a distribution to the gerousia, just as Aquillius Proculus, the most illustrious proconsul, approved and specified the penalty in the letter with which he formerly responded to you. Farewell.
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(16) I Eph 1486.1-16; GIBM 486; SIG³ 833; Oliver, SG 7 Hermes 4 (1870): 178-81:
Letter of Hadrian to the gerousia of Ephesus, found in the theatre.
Measurements: 75.9 x 129.3cm. Date: Gaius Trebonius Proculus Mettius Modestus was proconsul of Asia in AD 119/120 (PIR² M 568), the predecessor of Cornelius Priscus, the proconsul of AD 120/121 (PIR² 1420).

Translation:
Imperator Caesar son of the divine Trajanus Parthicus, grandson of the divine Nerva, Trajanus Hadrian Augustus, pontifex maximus, holding the tribunician power for the fourth time, consul for the third time, sends greetings to the gerousia of the Ephesians.

Mettius Modestus, vir egregius, has done well granting your rights to you in his judgment; but since you have shown that many men are usurping your money as they are seizing the property of your debtors claiming that they are not the heirs but that they themselves are also creditors, I have sent a copy of your decree to Cornelius Priscus, vir egregius, the proconsul, so that if such a thing should be the case, he may appoint someone who will both judge the disputed matters and exact all that is owed to the gerousia. The ambassador was Cascellius Politicus, to whom a travelling expense should be given, if he did not undertake this embassy of his own accord. Farewell. September 27. When Publius Rutilius Bassus was grammateus.
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(17) *IEph* 25.1-61; Oliver, *SG* 11; *FiE* II, pp. 119-122, no. 23; *JÖAI* 1 (1898) 78-79;
cf., *GIBM* 497; *OGIS* 2 508: Rescript of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus to the
logistes of the *gerousia*; found in the theatre. Measurements: the text was
inscribed on five marble blocks: // 1-14: 59.5 x 123 x 29cm; // 15-21: 22 x 59.5 x
29 cm; // 22-40: 59.5 x 134 x 29 cm; // 41-47: 23 x 63.5 x 29 cm; // 47-61: 123 x
62 x 29. Date: AD 162/163. Illustration: Figs. 9-12.

Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Μάρκος 'Αυρήλιος 'Αντωνινός
Σεβαστός καὶ Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Λεύκιος Αὐρήλιος Οὐήρος
Σεβαστός 'Αμμενιακός Οἰλίπιος Ἑθυκλεῖ

χαίρειν.

ὅτι μὲν ὑπ' ἀνθυπάτων δοθέντα σε τῇ γερουσίᾳ τῶν Ἑφεσίων

λογιστὴν ἐκείνοὺς ἔδει, περὶ ὧν ἡμέρες, ἀναφέρειν, αὐτοῦ τοῦ εὐγνω-

μούνος ἐδήλωσας ἑπιστάμενος, καὶ ἡμεῖς διὰ τοῦτο ἐπεμνηθήμεν,

ὡς μὴ βασίδιος ἀνάγεσθαι τινάς τῷ παραδείγματι. ὁ δὲ πρῶτον ἡμῖν

ἐκουσάς,

τὸ περὶ τῶν ἄργηρων εἰκόνων, πράγμα ὡς ἀληθῶς τῆς ἡμετέρας συνχωρήσει-

[ως] προσδέμενον-ν, δῆλον εστὶ σοι καὶ τὴν εἰς τὰς ἄλλας ἑρωτήσεις

ἀφορμὴν συμβε-[

[βλη]μένου. τὰς οὖν εἰκόνας τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων, ὧς ἀποκεῖσθαι λέγεις ἐν τῷ

συνε-

[δρ]ὶ ὁ τούτῳ, παλαιάς, ἑνὶ μὲν λόγῳ, πάσας δοκιμάζομεν φυλαχθῆναι τοῖς

νύμασιν, ἐφ' ο-

[ε]ς] γέγονεν αὐτῶν ἐκάστη, εἰς δὲ ἡμετέρας χαρακτήρας μηδὲν τῇ τῆς ὦλης

ἐκείνης


[.......]

[..............] ἐχουσὶ τὰς μορφὰς, κὰν δους γνωρίζεσ[θ]αι τῶν προσώπων

τῶν χα-[

[ρα]κτήρας, ταύτας καὶ] σοι παρέστη λελογισμένως, ὅτι τοῖς αὐ[τῖς ὧς] δεῖ

φυλαχθῆναι ψυχ-[

[μα]σιν, ἐφ' ὧς γεγόνασιν] περὶ δὲ τῶν σώμας ἤγαν συντεθραυ[σ]μένων, ὡς

ἀναφέρεις, καὶ]

[ο]δεμίσιν μορφὴν ἐτι] φαίνει δυναμένον τάχα μὲν ἄν καὶ [τούτων ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ

τοῖς βα-]

[θ]ροὺς ἐπιγραφῶν, τ]ᾶς δὲ ἅν καὶ ἔκ βιβλίοιν, εἰ τινὰ ἐστὶ τῷ [συνεδρίῳ

τούτῳ ......]

[.............] τὰ ψυχράματα συνπορισθεῖ σε τοι[ς] προγεγονόσι μᾶλλον τήν]

[τειμ]ήρα ἀνακοινοθητα [ήπερ διὰ τ]ής ἀναχω[νείς]ς ἐξαφανισθῆναι τῶν]

ἐκόνων. τῇ δὲ χοποίεσθαι πρῶτον μὲν σε παρὰ τούς [- 24-26 -]

τα λαμβάνει ὑπὸ τοῦ μετροῦ τῆς λογιστείας· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ [- 26-28 -]

ὑπήρξον καὶ τὸ συνχωρηθῆναι διεπράξαν παρ' ἡμῶν [- 25-27 -]
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πραξθήναι, Ἒπειτα καὶ ἄλλους πρὸς τὸ μάλιστα ἄνες [- 20-22, σος ἄν]
ὁ κράτιστος ἀνθυπατός ἐστε ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς γερουσίας ε[ἰτε ἐξ ἀπαντῶν τῶν
ποιέ-]
τῶν δοκιμασίας. τὸ δὲ κατὰ Σατορνεῖνον τὸν δημόσιον [- 16-18 ]
ὅν παρὰ τῶν χρεωστῶν τοῦ συνεδρίου πολλὰ κεκομίσθαι λέγεται [χρήματα, μὴ
προσηκόν-]
σῆς τῆς εὐσπράξεως, τοιούτων ἔστων· εἰ μὲν γὰρ τι εἰσήγηταν, ὅν ἄ[πειλθεν,
οὔδ' ἄλλῳ]
παρὰ τούτῳ ἐτή διάφορον, ὅτι σοὶ, ὃ προσῆκεν, ἐδοσαν οἱ δόντες, οἶδον τι καὶ ὃ
[ἐπιτροπος ἦ-]
μῶν ἐν τὸις ἰδίοις τῆς ἡμετέρας οἰκίας λογισμοὶς προσέταξεν
φυλάσσεσθαι[θαί, χωρίς τοῦ]
βλάπτεσθαι τινα τὴν τῶν προσώπων ἐναλλαγὴν τῶν ἀπειληφότων, [τότε σοῦδε-]
μία θημία παρηκολούθησεν· εἰ δὲ κάκεινα δεδώκασιν, ὃ μὴ προσήκον ἦν, κ[αὶ
ὁ ἀπολα-]
βῶν ἡράμισον τὰ κο[μισθέντα, τότε,] εἰ μὲν τι εὐρίσκοιτο ἰδίον ἢ ἐχών ἢ
καταλελ[οπός]
ἐκείνος, τὸ δὴ προσο[γρευνομένου πε]κούλιον, τοῦτο συλλέξασθαι πάν
ὄφειλεις: [εἰ δὲ]
καὶ οὕτως ὑπὲρ τὴν [δῶν]μην τὴν ἐκεῖ[ν]ον προσδεί τι τῇ γερουσίᾳ τῶν
ἐπιστραθέντων[ν]-
π' αἰοὶ καὶ κατασχ[ημ]ένων, ἐπιγν[ώμ]ων ὁ κράτιστος ἀνθυπατός γενέσθαι
βιο[ποιμέ-]
νὸς ὑπὸ σοῦ, πρὸς ο[ὑστ]ίμας ἑπανελθεῖ[υ] σε δεῖ τῶν ἐκείω καταβεβληκότω[ν,
διακρίνων]
τρόπου [. . . . . . .]
[- 16 - τ]ετεικός ἀποδεικνύει, παραστα[η [- 22-24 - ]
[- 12 - ἀνευ]γ[κ]ένι κελευσθήναι τὰ κοινὰ ἀποδοθέντα [- 14-16 - ]
[- 16 - ]τίωνα, σχεδὸν ἀναγκαίον ποιοῦσι καὶ σοι τὸ χρ[- 16-18 - ]
[- 17 - ]το συγχωρεῖν· ὠσπερ γὰρ ἀλλὸ πολλὰν ἄνδ[- 16-18 - ]
[- 17 - ]συν, οὕτως, ἐπειδὰν αὐτοὶ τινες αἰτοῦν [- 16-18 - ]
[. . .]α[σθ[α]ί] τοὺς βλαπτομένους [- c.45 - ]
[συν]ό[λο]υ τοῦ συνεδρίου κοι[νήθαι [- c.40 - προ-]
[σ]τεναί τῷ κρατίστῳ ἀνθυπ[ατῷ - c.44 - ]
[. . . ο]ὐ καὶ γὰρ τούτῳ τὸ σκεμ[μα] [- c.44 - ἀ]-
ναφάνν, ὡς λέγεις, ἐπὶ τοὺς [- c.44 - ]
σὺν εὐνοοῦτος εἴτε εἰς παρασ[- c.44 - ]
ῥησιν αὐτῶν ἑκείνων, τι ἄλλῳ [- c.42 - γε-]
ρουσία, τὸν δὲ ἀνθυπατόν καὶ ἅ[ντιστρατηγὸν? - c.32 - ]
ρο[ὐ]ν εὐγνωθεὶν ἐκαστα ἐξευρεῖν [- c.44 - ]
Imperator Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Augustus and Imperator Caesar Lucius Aurelius Verus Augustus Armeniacus send greetings to Ulpius Eurycles.

You yourself have shown in your understanding, and we have been reminded through this affair that it was necessary for you having been appointed by the proconsuls to the gerousia of the Ephesians as their logistes to look into those things about which you were uncertain, because some men may not easily see this as a precedent. But what you first communicate to us, concerning the silver busts, a matter which indeed truly requires our approval, has clearly been used by you as a starting point for your other additional questions.

(11) So, in a word, we believe that all the ancient busts of the emperors, which you say are stored in this assembly chamber (συνεδρίου), should be preserved under the names upon which each of them originally was, and that none of them should be changed into our representations; for we who are not otherwise eager for our statues, are far less ready to receive other representations altered to show our features; but however many of them as ...they have forms... and however many of the faces as may be recognized as portraits, these it is also possible for you upon inquiry to determine upon which bases they belong, for it is necessary to preserve them with the same names; but concerning those which are quite excessively damaged, as you report, and can no longer show any feature, either those of them which are inscribed on the bases, or from the records, if there are any... in this assembly room...the names may be deduced, so that honour may be restored for our predecessors rather than disappear through the re-smelting of the busts. And at the smelting first you from the ...may receive from the record of the accounting office; but since...you began and conducted the gaining of approval from us, for... to be done, since...others in particular...whom..., vir egregius, the proconsul might approve either from the gerousia itself or from the whole body of citizens.

(28) As to the matter about Saturninus the public slave...who you say has collected a great deal of money from the debtors of the gerousia (συνεδρίου), although it was not appropriate for him to perform the collection, the case is this: if he has turned in anything of what he has received, it is nothing but this, that those who have paid have not

---

8 One is to imagine the imperial representations as standing on inscribed bases. It is the emperors' decision that the bases and representations should be retained as is. The sunhedrion in which these representations were stored is clearly a building, one which would seem to have been associated with the gerousia. The nature of this association is not at all clear. It is unlikely to have been a meeting house of the gerousia, though. The verb ἀποθέωμαι can be understood as "to store something for a common purpose or for safety", but this sense appears primarily in classical authors. The verb in later authors, as in this case, implies indefinite storage or neglect: the statues were placed in the sunhedrion in order to do something with them. The sunhedrion should therefore be understood in this case as a storage area, a type of attic, which was used by the gerousia.

9 To sunhedrion, it seems, cannot mean anything other than the gerousia in this case.
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paid the appropriate person, as our procurator of the private accounts of our household advised them to guard against, with no of harming anyone in the exchange the persons of the recipients, and no punishment should follow; but if those men (the debtors) have given to a person who was not the appropriate man, and the receiver has hidden what he has collected, then, if that man should be found to possess or to have bequeathed some private property, this being called the peculium, you ought to collect all this; if, on the other hand, in this situation there remains anything in excess of his property of those things which have been collected for the gerousia and which has been kept back by him, let the proconsul, vir egregius, being informed by you judge to whom of those who have paid it is necessary for you to return the property, judging from the time which has passed and from the... of manner... having paid gives proof, he would present...to be ordered to return those things wrongly paid...for the payment.

(43) But continual delays of the debts...his grandfather Sabinus, as you say, ... almost necessary for those doing and for you ... the conceding; for just as I respect great ... even so, whenever some of them...a case...that those who have been harmed should...of the whole gerousia (συνεδρίων)...should be directed to apply to the proconsul, vir egregius...for even this question...recourse, as you say, to the...of the one who pays or to the...of themselves, any other...the gerousia, but that the proconsul and proprietor (?)...find each thing nearby....But the...from these...is not only according to the arrangement...they apply, but also to the...they will apply to the and instead...to learn.... Farewell.

(18) IEph 214.1-12: Letter of an unknown proconsul to the gerousia; found in the prytaneion. Measurements unknown. Date: Aelius Martiales was Asiarch under Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, or Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. AD 161-180.

Translation:

... vir egregius the proconsul to the...Emperor-loving ...gerousia...sends greetings.

When...of the rights...the Asiarch Aelius Martiales, vir eminentissimus ... has the monuments the custom...generosity which is appropriate to him...shall pay, for it is not right that a man should oversee such an honour, when...in the most distant past and the...many proofs; for no...of the type that you seek ... I pray that you are well.
B. Dedicatory Inscriptions

(19) *I Eph* 35.1-23; Oliver, *SG* 4; *FiE* II pp. 147-149, no. 28; *CIL* III 14195n4; *ILS* 7193: bilingual dedication to Artemis Ephesia and the *gerousia* of Ephesus by Gaius Vibius Salutaris on a statue base; found at the northwest corner of the Theatre terrace. Measurements unknown. The statue base is a part of Salutaris’ benefactions which were approved in AD 104. Illustration: Fig. 13.

[Dianae Ephesiae]
[et Ephesiorum gerusiae]
[C(aius) Vi*bius, C(aii) fil(ius), Vof(entina), Salutaris, promag(ister) portuuum provinc(iae) Siciliae, item promag(ister) frumenti mancipalis, praefec(tus) cohor(tis) Asturum et Callaecorum, trib(unus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) XXII Primigeniae]

P(iae) P(idelis), subpro- curator provinc(iae) Mauretaniae Tingitanae, item provinc(iae) Belgicae, Dianam argenteam, item imagines argenteas duas, unam urbis Romanae et aliam gerusiae, sua pecunia fecit ita, ut omni ecclesia seu praesidio bases ponerentur ob quorum dedicationem in sortitionem gerusiae sacravit sestertia decem septem millia nummum.

Apxeπις Σεπταὶ καὶ τῇ φιλοσεβάστῳ γερουσίᾳ Σεπταίων Γάιος Οὔεψιος, Γάιος Όλος, Οὐφεντίνα, Σαλτάριος, ἀρχώνης λιμένων ἐπαρχείας Σικελίας καὶ ἀρχώνης σείτου δήμου Ρωμαίων, ἐπαρχος σπείρης Ἀστούρων καὶ Καλλαϊκῶν, χειλι- ἀρχος λεγιώνος καὶ Πρευμπιτενίας Πιας Φιδήλεως, ἀντεπίτρο- πος ἐπαρχείας Μαυρετανίας Τιγιειτανίης καὶ ἐπαρχείας Βελγίκης, Ἀρτεμίδος ἄργυρας καὶ εἰκόνας ἄργυρας [β’.] Μίαν ἠγεμο- νίδος Ἐρυμηνής καὶ <Ἀλλήν της> φιλοσεβάστου γερουσίας, ἔκ τῶν ἱδίων ἐποίησεν ἁμαρτία καθέρωσεν, ἵνα τιθηται κατα ἐκκλησίαν ἐπὶ τῶν βάσεων, ὡς δὴ διάταξες αὐτῷ περιέχει. καθέρωσεν δὲ καὶ εἰς κλήρον τῆς γερουσίας δημαρία τετρακοσιελία διακόσια πεντήκοντα. ἐπὶ ἀνθυπάτω τοῦ Γαϊοῦ Ἀκυλλίου Πρόκλου, γραμματέων τοῦ Τιβερίου

Κλαύδιου
[Iou]μιανόν, φιλοσεβάστου καὶ φιλοπάτριδος, τὸ β’.

Translation:

To Ephesian Artemis and to the Emperor-loving *gerousia* of the Ephesians, Gaius Vibius Salutaris, the son of Gaius of the tribe Oufentina, having been the chief contractor for the harbours of the province of Sicily and the chief contractor for the municipal grain supply for the Roman People, prefect of the cohort of the Asturians and the Gallaecians, tribune of the twenty-second Legion Primagenia Pia Fidelis, subprocurator of the province of Mauretania Tingitana and of the province of Belgica, has made a silver Artemis and two silver busts, one of the ruling city of Rome and another of the Emperor-loving *gerousia*, from his own money; which he dedicated so that they may be placed in every assembly (ἐκκλησία) on bases, as his donation specifies; he also donated four thousand two hundred and fifty denarii for a lottery for the *gerousia*. When Gaius...
Aquillius Proculus was proconsul, and when Tiberius Claudius Julianus, Emperor-loving and patriotic, was grammateus for the second time. 1

(20) IEph 940A.b.1-14; dedication by a neopoios; built into a wall of the Church of St. John. Measurements unknown. Date: AD 161-181.

διά τις Τύχην
[-----]χαρι...[-----]
[έβαστω νεο]ποιοφ και χρυσο-
[φόροι έκ] γερουσίας φιλο-
[σεβάστου]...2 και τοις τέκνοις
[αὐτοῦ Χα]ριζένω και Εὐτυ-
[χω και τῇ ἀπελευθέρα αὐ-
[τοῦ Εὔ]τυχιώ, καὶ Ἑλπιδηφό-
[μίδι τῇ γλυκυτάτῃ συν-
[βίῳ] καὶ Φαβίῳ Φαυστει-
[νιαν]ῷ ἑρμηνεύω καὶ 10
[Τεμιμασίω]
[-------]

Translation:
To good fortune;...and for an Emperor-loving temple-warden, a chrysohorus and a member of the Emperor-loving gerousia and for his children Charixenus and Eutyches and for his freedwoman Eutychia;3 and for Elpidephoris his dearest wife and for the sacred herald Fabius Faustinianus and for ...Timasius...

(21) FiE IX/1/1 no. c1; IEph 1060.1-15; Oliver, SG 19: thanksgiving to Hestia Boulaea and other gods; found in the hearth room of the prytaneion. Measurements: 139 x 115cm. Date: AD 214/215. Illustration: Fig. 14.

Φαβίου Φαυστείου καὶ γερουσίας
ἀρχιερείας Ἑστίας Βουλαί<σ> καὶ Δήμητρι
cαι Δήμητρου Κόρη και Πύρι άφθαρτο καὶ 'Απόλλωνι
Κλαρίῳ καὶ Σωπόλι καὶ πάσιν τοῖς θεοῖς, ὅτι
ολοκληρώσαν με μετά τοῦ συμβίου μου 'Ακακίου
cαι τῶν τέκνων μου καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων μου
tὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἐκτελέσασαν τὰ μυστήρια πάντα
ἐνυπήρξω ἀποκατεστήσανω: 5
όιδε ἐκουρήθησαν
Ἐυάνδροις γερουσίαστης
Περιγένης φιλοσέβαστος γραμματεύς 10

1 The phrase φιλοσέβαστος and the dating formula are absent in the Latin.
3 Εὐ]τυχίω should probably be understood as an error for Εὐτυχίη.
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Translation:
I, Favonia Flaccilla, prytanis, gymnasiarch and high priestess, give thanks to Hestia Boulaea and to Demeter and to Kore the daughter of Demeter and to incorruptible Fire and to Clarian Apollo and to Sopolis and to all the gods, because they have blessedly restored me with my partner Acacius and with my children and with my family after I had performed and completed the mysteries for a year.

The following were the kouretes:

Evandris, a member of the gerousia; the Emperor-loving Perigenes, the grammateus; the Emperor-loving Amyntianus; Fabius Curiacus the hearth guardian; Fabia Zosime, who was the basket-carrier; those who brought the towels were: Damo, Priscilla, Nunechis and Luciana. Farewell.

(22) IEph 957.8-23; Oliver, SG 18.8-23; AE 1926: 15; JÖAI 36 (1946): 13-14; SEG 4: 535: Thanksgiving to Artemis; found in the Church of St. John. Measurements: 59 x 82 x 34cm. Date: On the basis of the lettering, Keil dates the inscription to second or third century AD. The tribal name Antoniane indicates that the inscription may have been erected during the reign of Antoninus Pius at the earliest, or, if the tribe was created in response to the constitutio Antoniniana, during that of Caracalla (cf. above, pp. 55-58, 75 & cat. no. 67; Knibbe [1962-1963]: 30). Late second or early third century AD. Illustration: Figs. 15 & 16.

To good fortune; I, Titus Flavius Asclepiodorus of the tribe Antoniana and of the Thousand of Paianieis, a voluntary temple-warden, having served as essen twice piously
and generously with Flavia Phoebe my daughter and with my partner in office Aurelius Epagathus and having twice served on the night watch at my own expense, being also a member of the Emperor-loving gerousia, give thanks to you, queen Artemis.

(23) IEph 1587.1-15; Oliver, SG 20; GIBM 587: dedication to Artemis; found in the theatre. Measurements: 82.8 x 55.2cm. Date: late second or early third century AD. Illustration: Fig. 17.

... when I was the sacred herald of Saturninus, of the elders...

To Good Fortune; I, Marcus Aurelius Agathopus, give thanks to the god and to Queen Soter and to the Tyche of the gerousia, because I have preserved the trust of the gerousia along with all my family. The same was grammateus and gymnasiarch. Farewell.

(24) JÖAI 55 (1984): 120, no. 4211.1-9; SEG 34, 1125; BE 1987: 194: thanksgiving to Artemis; found near the Church of St. John. Measurements: 44 x 50 x 65 cm. Date: late second or early third century.

During the service of Marcus Aurelius Posidonius as chief wand-bearer; I, Aurelius Niconianus Eucarpus the son of Agathemerus, a voluntary neopoios, a
Section II: Imperial Inscriptions
B. Dedicatory Inscriptions

chyrsophorus and a member of the gerousia, gymnasiarch of the gerousia, give thanks to you, queen Artemis, because I have piously and generously served as essen twice....

(25) JÖAI 55 (1984): 119-120, nr. 4210.1-10: funerary inscription; found near the Church of St. John. Measurements: 35 x 50 x 65. Undated, but associated with (Cat. no. 24=JÖAI 55 [1984]: 120, no. 4211 [Knibbe]).

[chry derives from the Greek word for gold, and was a common name in ancient Greece. It is often associated with wealth, beauty, and divine favor. - Ed.]

Translation:
...of Attica...of Eukarpia and...a member of the gerousia...the daughter of Stratonice...the brother of...the sunhedrion...

(26) IEph 1575.1-14; GIBM 575; Oliver, SG 21: dedication by Marcus Aurelius Artemidorus and Marcus Aurelius Attalus; found in the theatre. Measurements: 62.75 x 52.7cm. Date: late second or early third century. Illustration: Fig. 18.

Translation:
...of Attica...of Eukarpia and...a member of the gerousia...the daughter of Stratonice...the brother of...the sunhedrion...

---

Translation:

To Good Fortune; Marcus Aurelius Artemidorus the son of Attalus, an Emperor-loving member of the gerousia, a temple-warden, a revered aedile, and an outstanding liturgist; and Marcus Aurelius Attalus, an honorary member of the boule and an Olympian victor, the son of Artemidorus, who was a member of the gerousia and a neopoios....

(27) IEph 972.1-28; so-called list of grammateis of the gerousia; found at the end of the harbour at the end of Arcadiane street. Of the seven named individuals, only two are identified as grammateis, so there is little reason to interpret this document as a list of grammateis, let alone grammateis of the gerousia. The inscription was carved by five stone-masons (ll 1-10, 11-14, 15-17, 18-21, 22-28). Measurements unknown. Date: early-third century.
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Translation:

May it be well; the Emperor-loving Marcus Aurelius Parnassus the son of Asclepides; the Emperor-loving Marcus Aurelius Asclepides the son of Parnassus, also the priest. May it be well; to good fortune, Marcus Aurelius Gaius son of Gaius; to good fortune, Aurelius Hagnias the son of Euporus, the grammateus; Falcidius Epigonus, the grammateus of the gerousia and Falcidius Zosimus the son of the grammateus and an honorary member of the gerousia; to good fortune, Aurelius Attalus, an honorary member of the boule, the son of Artemidorus, who was a member of the gerousia, a temple-warden and a chrysophoros.


[άγαθη τῷ χη] (28)

Translation:

To Good Fortune. I, the son of Asiaticus...and a member of the gerousia, give thanks to Artemis concerning those things which when I prayed I received...having served Artemis reverently and well as a neopoios...my wife....


[άγαθη τῷ ν.] (29)

Translation:

To Good Fortune; during the service of...as chief wand-bearer; I,...a voluntary neopoios and grammateus of the elders and of the assembly of chrysophoroi, give thanks to you Queen Artemis.

---

6 The association of the gerousia and the chrysophoroi in this manner is unusual. The chrysophoroi are more closely associated with the neopoioi and kouretes (IEph 940A & 4330), so that νεοποιῶν may be a restoration preferable to πρεσβυτέρων; cf. above, Chapter Five, p. 146-147
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ο’Αρτέμιδι
Καίσαρι
πρεσβυτέροις
Ποπίλλιος
βάσσος
καθέτρωσεν.

Translation:

Popillius Bassus dedicates this to Artemis, to Caesar and to the Elders.

(31) *IEph* 442.1-3; *JÖAI* 48 (1966-7): 13-14, no. 5: Architrave inscription; found in the SW corner of the Tetragonus Agora. Measurements: 71 x 262 x 43-64 cm. Undated, but the use of such multiple generations becomes increasingly characteristic later in the Empire (Knibbe). Illustration: Fig. 19.

αγαθή τύχη,

’Αφροδείσιος Κλεάνδρου τοῦ ’Ηρώδου διὸ τοῦ ’Απολλωνίου γραμματέως
καὶ γυμνασιάρχος κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ τῆς φιλοσεβάστου γερουσίας.

Translation:

To Good Fortune. Aphrodius the son of Cleander the son of Herodes the son of Herodes the son of Apollonius, simultaneously the *grammateus* and the *gymnasiarch* of the Emperor-loving *gerousia*.

---

7 *IEph*: “Stammt die Inschrift aus dem Gymnasium der Alten?”
C. Honorary Inscriptions

(32) *ZPE* 120 (1998): 71, no. 8.1-7; Honorary decree for the *prytanis* Glaucophon;
unknown findspot. Measurements: 30 x 33 x 8 cm. Glaucophon son of Mandrylus was
prytanis and *agonothetes* in 36/35 BC (*IEph* 9N.43-44). Illustration: Fig. 20.

Translation:
The *boule* and the *demos* and the *gerousia* have honoured Glaucophon the son of
Mandrylus the grandson of .... He was *prytanis* and *agonothetes* for the Taurian games...
most prosperously ... and having founded from his own money both the ... and the ball-
court.

---

(33) *IEph* 803.1-5; *AAWW* 102 (1965): 104 no. 3; *AE* 1967: 483; *RPh* 41 (1967): 70;
honorary inscription for Epaphras; found in front of the south gate of the agora.
Measurements unknown. Date: Epaphras was priest of the divine Augustus; since
Σεβαστού is singular, the priesthood most likely took place in the early first century
AD.

Translation:
The elders have honoured...Epaphras, priest for life of the divine Augustus...and
*vir egregius*; he is a good and estimable man...having dedicated...ten thousand denarii
for lending out for the...f the sacred assembly.

---

1 Engelmann and Büyükkolancı (1998) note both ἡ γερουσία and οἱ νέοι as possible restorations for line
1. Both have their merits. The Ταύρεα in line 4 and σφαϊριστήριον in line 7 suggest that Glaucophon’s
benefaction was directed towards athletic aspects, in which case νέοι is preferable since the *neoi* are more
often associated with gymnastic activities than the *gerousia* is. Alternatively, the association of the *neoi*
with the *boule* and *demos* is very rare in Ephesus, while the *gerousia* does appear with both bodies in
honorary decrees (cf., cat. no. 36, *AE* 2000: 1408; cat. no. 37, *IEph* 657A), so that ἡ γερουσία may be
preferable.
(34) *IEph* 2113.1-18; Oliver, *SG* 6: honorary inscription for Gaius Stertinius Orpex; found in the stadium. Measurements unknown. Date: although Orpex is not named in this inscription, he is known to have established a foundation providing for distributions of money and statues of Asclepius, Sleep and Health (*IEph* 411, 720, 4213). Second to third quarter of the first century AD. Cf. cat. no. 72.

Translation:

...in the Temple of Artemis...with the statues with every individual adornment of the goddess and with the covering; the same individuals also built in the stadium on the right side two wedges of seats with the dividing white stone wall and with the exedra which is in front of their project; and they also donated money to the *boule*, so that from the annual interest they might receive a cash distribution in the agora in front of their statues. And in the same way they donated money to the *gerousia*, so that they might receive a money distribution in the stadium in front of their statues, and they also donated (to the members of the *boule* and *gerousia*) as surety of these expenses the revenue from another property; and they also set up in the gymnasium statues of Asclepius, Health and Sleep with all their individual adornments....

---

*IEph*: [και] παντὶ γὰρ τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος

2 *IEph*: [και] παντὶ τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερῷ κόσμῳ καὶ.

3 *IEph*: εἰπεὶ τοῦ[ου] μήματος αὐτῶν ἐξ ἑτέρου χρήματος κληρονόμους; Oliver’s reading is preferred here since it would be unusual to donate a lottery (κληρονόμος καθέρωσαν); one donates a sum of money for a lottery.

4 Oliver: Ἀσκληπίου σὺν Ὕπνῳ σὺν Ὕπνῳ σὺν Ὕπνῳ σὺν παντὶ αὐτῶν κόσμῳ in *IEph* 4123 (cat. no. 72), though, this is unlikely.
C. Honorary Inscriptions

(35) *IEph* 987.1-27 and 988.1-30; *JOAI* 45 (1960): 87-89 no. 14 I & II: honorary inscriptions for Vipsania Olympia and Vipsania Polla; found in the Byzantine Baths. Measurements: 95 x 52 x 30. Date: the absence of mention of a *néocorate* has suggested to the editor that the inscriptions are earlier than AD 88.

Translation:

The *boule* and *demos* have honoured Vipsania Olympia, the daughter of Lucius Vipsanius Apelles the son of Neon of the tribe Cornelia and Claudia Polemonis the daughter of Pytho; she served reverently as priestess of Artemis and completed the mysteries and sacrifices in a worthy manner; she decorated the temple and everything around it on the days most suitable to the goddess, and she performed the public sacrifices and she offered distributions to the *boule* and the *gerousia*; she made a gift of

---

5 Since the inscriptions record identical donations, it is not unreasonable to suppose both priestesshoods took place during the prytany of Gaius Licinius Dionysodorus.
five thousand denarii for the repair of the colonnade; she was priestess during the prytany of Gaius Licinnius Dionysodorus.

The boule and demos have honoured Vipsania Polla ...the daughter of Lucius Vipsanius Apelles the son of Neon of the tribe Cornelia and Cladius Polemonis the daughter of Pytho. She served reverently as priestess of Artemis and she performed the mysteries and sacrifices in a worthy manner; she decorated the temple and everything around it on the days most suitable to the goddess; she performed the public sacrifices and she offered distributions to the boule and the gerousia; she made a gift of five thousand denarii for the repair of the colonnade. She was priestess during the prytany of Gaius Licinnius Dionysodorus.

(36) JÖAI 69 (2000): 86, no. 19; AE 2000: 1408; SEG 50, 1146; honorary decree for Octavia Capetolina; from the agora depot. Measurements: 42 x 49 x 10cm. Date: the script is probably from the 1st century AD.

Translation:

The boule and the demos have honoured Octavia Capetolina because of her prudence and generosity.

(37) IEph 657A.1-4: honorary inscription for Marcus Com...; unknown findspot. Measurements unknown. Date: probably 1st century AD.

Translation:

The Senate and the gerousia and the People have honoured Marcus Com...

(38) IEph 702.1-16; JÖAI 18 (1915): 281-2; AE 1920: 74; Oliver, SG 5: honorary decree for Titus Peducaeus Canax; statue base reused north of the north gate of the Tetragonous Agora. Measurements unknown. On the basis of the text, Keil has dated this inscription to the late first century AD.

Translation:

The Senate and the gerousia and the People have honoured Titus Peducaeus Canax.
The Senate and People have honoured the Emperor-loving Titus Peducaeus Canax, a gymnasiarch of the elders. He served as prytanis of the city and as priest of Roma and Publius Servilius Isauricus; he also provided oil in the following year for the citizens and he made donations of money to the boule and the gerousia, and he demonstrated his piety most completely regarding the mysteries, and he also offered money for the spectacles.

(39) IEph 2061.1.1-23; FIE II, pp. 174-176, no. 61.II; AE 1913:143b: honorary decree for Titus Flavius Montanus; found in the theatre. Measurements: 240 x 330 cm. Date: Montanus was the recipient of numerous honours connected to his building activities (IEph 498, 528, 2037, 20611, 2062, 2063); he was also a procurator under Trajan. AD103-116. Illustration: Fig. 21.
The *boule* and *demos* have honoured Titus Flavius Montanus who was twice prefect of the craftsmen, highpriest of Asia of the common temple of Asia in Ephesus, *sebastophant* and *agonothetes* for life. He provided and donated a theatrical show during his high-priesthood, giving also gladiatorial fights and beast-hunts. He also provided for the citizens a mid-day meal costing three denarii for each man, and he did everything which was fair for the *boule* and the *gerousia*. He also counted out for the dredging of the harbour seventy-five thousand denarii. He served famously as *agonothetes* of the common games of Asia. Lucius Vibius Lentulus, the procurator *a rationibus* of Imperator Nerva Trajanus Caesar Augustus Germanicus Dacicus from the income which was bequeathed by him in his publicly registered testament erected this.

(40) *IEph* 1599.1-4; *GIBM* 599; Oliver, *SG* 8; *ITralles* 2: honorary inscription for Claudius Bassus; from Ephesus, not Tralles. Measurements: 25 x 41.4cm. Date: Oliver suggests that Bassus may be the Claudius Bassus who is honoured in Smyrna as an *agonothetes* of the Nemesia under Hadrian (*IGRR* 4.1431). AD 117-139. Illustration: Fig. 22.

Translation:

To Good Fortune. Claudius Bassus, a member of the *gerousia*.

(41) *IEph* 618.1-23; Oliver, *SG* 9; *IKeramos* T6: honorary inscription for Marcus Ulpius Aristocrates of Ceramus; found near the aqueduct. Measurements unknown. Date: by the second pentetetric Hardianeia, the inscription dates to shortly after AD 140.

To Good Fortune. Marcus Ulpius Aristocrates, a member of the *gerousia*.
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Translation:

Marcus Ulpius Aristocrates of Ceramos the son of Hierocles, the high-priest of the temples of Asia in Ephesus and agonothetes of the great Hadrianeia in the second cycle of five years, having given ... thousands for the office of the high-priesthood ...for the preparation...and another...thousand... for the ...and having also been appointed logistes of the gerousia, which is loyal to the Emperor, by the divine Hadrianus, and being loved by the greatest Imperator Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius..., who, also was appointed ten times as logistes of the gerousia... eighty thousand... the Emperor-loving gerousia of the first and greatest city of the Ephesians set this statue up.

(42) JÖAI 62 (1993): 129, no 21.0-13; fragment of an honorary decree; from the Church of St. John. Measurements: 43 x 41 x 28 cm. Date: Knibbe dates the inscription to the first half of the second century on the basis of the lettering.

6 Eph: δι[ανομήν ἐποίησε τῇ] | γερουσία λογίσταις ἐνεκέν (Eph 618); the presence of a logistes is not consistent with descriptions of such distributions in other inscriptions, though. Oliver’s reading of δ[ἰθέντα τῇ] | γερουσία is, therefore, preferred here.

7 Oliver reads: Σι . Μ . Ι . -σι μ[υριάδῶν] π', ἡ φιλοσέβαστος [κοινῆς] Βουλής. Γερουσία seems to be a more reasonable restoration as the boule appears otherwise not to be involved.

8 The editores principes suggest for the beginning: [---ερατεύσασαν τής Ἀρτέμιδος ἐρεύνησαν τὰ τε μυστήρια καὶ τὰς θυσίας ἄξιος ἐπιτελέσασαν καὶ καταστέψασαν τὸν τε νιαν καὶ τὰ περὶ αὐτὸν πάντα ἐν ταῖς ἐπιφανεστάταις τῆς θεοῦ ἡμέρας, ποιήσασαν τὰς κτλ.; cf. cat no. 35.
Translation:

...having performed the public sacrifices and having offered distributions to the *boule* and to the *gerousia* from the sacrificial victims and in the same way also for the sacred servant and for the sacred victors in the Artemiseia, and having devoted her own money to the endowments of her father for the *prytaneion* and the gymasiarchy and all the remaining donations...

(43) *IEph* 1544.1-12; *GIBM* 544; Oliver, *SG* 15; *Hermes* 4 (1870): 215, no. 29; *CIL* III 6078, 12254; *ILS* 1925: bilingual honorary inscription for Tiberius Claudius Secundus; found in the basilica on the south of the commercial agora. Measurements: 105.4 x 60.25 x 57.75cm. Date: A freedman of Tiberius Claudius Secundus erected a statute during the proconsulship of Marcus Lollius Paulinus Decimus Valerius Asiaticus (AD 108/109; *IEph* 857, 1545; *PIR*² L 320.). Tiberius Claudius Secundus is also honoured on an undated inscription as *viator tribunicius* and *lictor curiatus* (*IEph* 646). Oliver and Curtius, however, date the inscription to the age of the Antonines. Mid-second century. Illustration: Fig. 23.

Ti(berio) Claudio
Secundo
viator tribunic[io]
accenso velato, lictori curiato, gerusia h[o]-
noris caussa sua [pecunia.]
η γερουσια ἐτείμησεν
Τι(βεριον) Κλαύδιον Σεκοῦδ[ον]
συματορα τριβουνικ[ου]ν.
ἀκκῆνσον οὐηλάτον,
λεικτορα κουριάτον,
ἐκ τῶν ἱδιῶν.

Translation:

The *gerousia* has honoured Tiberius Claudius Secundus, a tribune's bailiff, a veiled attendant and a lictor of the curiate assembly, from its own funds.⁹

(44) *IEph* 1604.0-13; *GIBM* 604; Oliver, *SG* 10: honorary inscription for a hymnodos; found in the theatre. Measurements: 97.9 x 50.2. Date: Tiberius Julius Reginus was *agonothetes* in AD 170 (*IEph* 1105, 1105a, 1105b, 1106a, 1130, 1605, 1621). Illustration: Fig. 24.

[- - - - - φιλοσεβάστ.]
του ὑμωρδοῦ,
ὶεροκηρύξ, γραμ-
ματεὺς Ἀδριανεῖων,
ὑμνωδός νεμητής

⁹ Although phrased differently, the Greek and Latin texts are translations of one another.
Zoticus the son of Artemidorus, a member of the gerousia, a member also of the Assembly (συνεδρίων) of the temple-wardens, kouretes and chrysophoroi, having twice served as essen and as temple-guard, and having also completed all the mysteries, having feasted all the assemblies (συνεδρία) and the guests who were dwelling in the city at the time, namely Annius Anullinus Percennianus, vir egregius, the procurator of the grain supply in Rome, the recipient of a salary of two hundred thousand sesterces, and Aurelius Pinarius Gemellus the procurator of the 0.5% tax on inheritances; on behalf of these....
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\[
\text{[η βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος]}
\]
\[
\text{[ἐτείμησαν]}^{10}
\]
\[
\text{Οὔτικος}
\]
\[
\text{Σενεκάν}
\]
\[
\text{τῶν κράτιστον}
\]
\[
\text{χειλιάρχων [δούκ[α]]}
\]
\[
\text{κόρτης δεκάτης[ς]}
\]
\[
\text{πραιτωρίας}
\]
\[
\text{[[Φιλιππιανής]]}
\]
\[
<δούκα> υπηξιλατιώνων
\]
\[
\text{κλάσσης πραιτωρίας}
\]
\[
\text{Μεισμάτων καὶ}
\]
\[
\text{Ραβεννησίων,}
\]
\[
\text{ἐκδίκεωτος τοῦ}
\]
\[
\text{συνεδρίου}
\]
\[
\text{Τιβ(ερίου) Κλ(αυδίου) Μοσχᾶ φιλοσεβ(άστου)}
\]
\[
\text{ἀδιελεύθερος ασιάρχου}
\]

\[
\text{[............ ]}
\]

Translation:
The *boule* and *demos* have honoured Vibius Seneca, *vir egregius*, tribune of the tenth Praetorian cohort Philippian, leader of the standard bearers of the Praetorian fleets at Messene and at Ravenna, when the Emperor-loving Tiberius Claudius Moschas, the brother of the Asiarch, was the advocate of the assembly.

(47) IEph 892.1-23; FIe IV, III, p. 283, no. 30; JOAI 49 (1968-71): 65, no. 6: honorary decree for Claudia Caninia; built into the Scholastica Baths. Measurements: 108 x 50-56 x 50-56 cm. Date: Claudia Caninia Severa is is also honoured in IEph 635c. The hymnoder Tiberius Claudius Moschas was honoured under Philip the Arab (IEph 645). Claudia’s father, Tiberius Claudius Severus, is probably the Severus who was consul under Septimius Severus (IEph 648; PIR² 1025, 1028). AD 244-246 (cf. IEph 737; CIL 16.149, 151, 153). Illustration: Fig. 25.

\[
\text{[η βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος]}
\]
\[
\text{[ἐτείμησαν]}
\]
\[
\text{[Κλαυδίαν Κανεινίαν]}
\]
\[
\text{Σεούραν}
\]
\[
\text{τήν λαμπροτάτην}
\]

\[
^{10} \text{IEph: [τὸ συνεδρίου τῆς, φιλοσεβ(άστου) γερουσιάς]; cf. above, Chapter Four, pp. 118-119; Chapter Five, pp. 162-163; Chapter Six, pp. 237-238; cf. cat. no. 47.}
\]
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Translation:
The boule and demos have honoured Claudia Caninia Severa, femina egregia, of consular standing through her ancestors, the priestess and adorner of Queen Artemis and a pious prytanis and one who has seen the Great Olympia, the daughter of Tiberius Claudius Severus, the first of the Ephesians to become consul, and Caninia Gargonilla, of consular standing through her ancestors, since she has adorned our fatherland in many and great ways; Tiberius Claudius Moschas, Emperor-loving hymnode, leader of the boule, first strategos, eirenarch, brother of an Asiarch and advocate of the Emperor-loving gerousia of the Ephesians oversaw the erection of this statue.

(48) IEph 951.1-16; JÖAI 26 (1930): 57: honorary inscription for Aurelius Baranus; found in a late wall near the harbour. Measurements: 120 x 18 cm. Date: on the basis of the lettering, Keil dates the inscription to the late second or early third century AD. Illustration: Fig. 26.
By a decree of the *boule* and *demos*. Aurelius Baranus, an Emperor-loving and generous temple warden, who entertained the city for eleven days and feasted the outstanding *boule* of the Ephesians and all the assemblies, and one thousand and forty citizens, being himself a member of the assembly of the temple-wardens and *chrysophoroi*. Marcus Flavius Domitianus, an Emperor-loving son of an asiarch and an Asiarch himself, and the advocate of the *clarissima boule* of the Ephesians, has set up the statue at his own expense.

(49) *IEph* 3058.1-16; *FiE* III, p. 143, no. 58: honorary inscription for Marcus Aurelius; unknown findspot. Measurements: 91.5 x 51.5 x 48.2cm. Date: Third century. Illustration: Fig. 27.

Translation:

...the gymnasiarch of all the gymasia, first *grammateus* of the *demos*\(^\text{11}\) and an *agonothetes* on many occasions, the son of the Emperor-loving Marcus Aurelius Artemidorus, an asiarch and himself an *agonothetes* on many occasions, a descendant of the Emperor-loving Marcus Aurelius Metrodorus, a *grammateus* of the *demos* and an outstanding liturgist, having dedicated with his father five thousand Attic denarii; Aurelius Antoninus Julianus, a member of the *gerousia* and magistrate (of the *sunhedrion*?), arranged for the erection of this statue.

(50) *IEph* 627b.1-5: statue base found in the Arcadian street. Measurements unknown. Undated.

Aυρ(ήλιος) Όρφεύς δίς

'Εφέσιος γερουσίας

χρυσοφόρος καὶ ἀγωνοθέτης

Translation:

Aurelius Orpheus the son of Orpheus, an Ephesian, a member of the *gerousia*, a *chrysophorus* and an *agonothetes*.

(51) *IEph* 707c.1-4: honorary inscription for Lucius Pomp...; found in the harbour. Measurements unknown. Undated.

ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δήμος ἐπείμησαν

ἐπείμησαν

Αὐτίκου Πομ[π- - - - ]

πρεσβύτερον.

Translation:

The Senate and People have honoured Lucius Pomp... an elder.


[ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δήμος ἐπείμησαν - - - - - - - ο]ν Γάι[ρ]ιον Μην-

[δόμορον] ἐλαιοθείνα πάντα τῶν γυμνασίων δρακτῷ, μὴ λαμβάνοντα

[---] γυμνασίαρχο[ν] τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀγ[κ]<ων-

[θέτη τών] - - - - - - - κ]αὶ πανηγυριαρχον τῶν μεγά-

[λαν -- καὶ τῶν μεγάλων Πασ]ή[θων], λαμπρός καὶ μεγάλοιον-

[χώς] - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - [5]

[---] παρασχόγα, κατακλείνατα

[---] Ἰώσει ἐν τῷ ιερῷ τῆς Ἄρτεμιδος

[---] ὅπου πολείτας, εἰσωχήσαντα δὲ

[τὴν τε κρατήσαν μεγαλίων πασήθων καὶ] πολείτας ἐξακαλλιόνως 12

[---] εἰσόδοντα τοῖς πολείταις

[---] ἱς ἑκατόν ἐβδομήκοντα

[---] ?ποίησαντα] θεορίων ἡμέρας πέντε

[---] ε]ς τὸ έλεον δημάρχει

[---] ἱπατίς καὶ ἀναλώμαι-

[---] ἐκ]τενώς καὶ

[---] αὐτίως τοῦ γένους καὶ τῆς πα]τρίδος

[---] ]ΠΛΟΣΕΙΣ

12 Cf. cat. no. 48.
Translation:

The *boule* and *demos* have honoured ... Gavius Menodorus...who supplied oil for all of the gymnasia, not taking... the gymnasarch of the elders and *agonothetes* of the ...and panegyriarch of the Great...and of the Great Pasithea, brilliantly and magnanimously... having provided in the very year of his prtyany..., having provided a banquet...in the temple of Artermis [for?] the citizens, and feasting the outstanding *boule* of the Ephesians and six thousand citizens...having given to the citizens...one hundred and seventy...having put on five days of games...denarii for oil...and the expenses...in a manner worthy of his family and his fatherland.
D. Public Decrees

(53) *JRS* 73 (1983): 116-125; *SEG* 33: 946; *IEph* 3214: endowment for heroic honours at a grave. Found near Apateira. Measurements: the inscription is in three fragments measuring: 80 x 36 x 27 cm; 84 x 51 x 22 cm; 35 x 34 x 12 cm. Date: C.P. Jones dates the inscription to the end of the first century AD.

...but if someone adds anything within, let that decree which is in contravention of these arrangements be invalid, and let the one who does this pay for the further adornment of the goddess Artemis and of the Augusti ten thousand denarii and another ten thousand denarii for a cash-distribution for the Elders, which money the archons of...
the subsequent year and the *paraphulax* shall administer; but if they do not do this, they will owe (the fine) and they will be prosecuted by any who wishes, be he citizen or foreigner, earning by the performance of this task one half of the money which is to be paid over; and of the appropriate things in the heroon and of the things prepared for the performance of the heroic honours mention has been made below, which has also been indicated on the stone stele in the heroon; thirteen inscribed statues of Nonnia Paula, fourteen portraits of Aphrodisian stone, two square marble Hermas with bronze faces, and two other square marble Hermas, two portraits of Theban and Alexandrian stone,...marble water jars...nineteen Alexandrian mosaics, thirty-six Alexandrian..., ...marble lions on top of the heroon...two marble..., a sun dial, two public inscribed stelai, two lead statues of javelin-throwers, ... an iron tripod, seven... wooden bases; but if anyone of the aforementioned friends of Peplus, to whom a share of the honours has been apportioned, should die childless while Peplus is still alive, that one (Peplus) shall appoint in his stead someone else from those who are suitable to stand in his place for these heroic rites.


B: *IEph* 27B.134-332; Oliver, *SG* 3.134-332; cf., *GIBM* 481.61-228: Letter of Gaius Vibius Salutaris offering a benefaction to the Senate and People of Ephesus in the form of a legal document.

The text of the Salutaris dossier, of which A and B are two documents, is organized in six columns forming a trapezoid measuring on the left 208 x 12.5-20 cm and on the right 403 x 12.5-20; cf. cat. nos. 15 & 55. Date: Tiberius Claudius Antipater Julianus was prytanis during the proconsulship of Aquillius Proculus (*PIR*² A 999), under whom Afranius Flavianus (*PIR*² A 443) was praetor. AD 104. Illustration: Fig. 8.

A

επὶ πρυτανίας ημῶν

Ποιεῖσθαι ταύτα ἐν χρήσει

[τῇ] δοξῇ ὑμῶν καὶ τῷ νεωκόρῳ δημῷ φιλ[ε]ς

[πε][ρὶ] δικαίωμας Τιβέριου Κλα[υ]dioύου Τιβέριου Κλαύδιου Ἀλεξάνδρου [υδρο][υος], εὐσεβίσθης,

[Kypēiōn]

[Τινιλαννοῦ], φιλόπατρις καὶ φιλοσέβαστας[ς, ἀγνο[ς], εὐσεβ[ής],

[γραμματείς το[ῦ] δήμου τὸ β', καὶ ο[ι] στρατηγοι τη[ς] πόλ[εος] φιλοσέ-

[βαστος, ἐπιτιθης το[ὺς] φιλοτείμοις] ἄνδρας περὶ την [πόλιν καὶ κατὰ

[πάνα ἀποδειξαμένων]ς] στρατηγὴν γνησίους πολειτ[ῶν α.]μοβαϊ-1

[ων κρή τυχεῖν τειμών πρός] τὸ ἀπολαύειν μὲν τοὺς ε̃ [ποι]斛[σαμ-

[τας ἡδή την πόλιν, ἀποκείθοτι δὲ τοῖς βο[i]λομένοις περὶ τὰ]

[ὅμοια ἀμι[λασθαι, ἀμα δὲ τοὺς] ἐσπούδα[κή]τας τὴν μεγίστην θε-

[δόν Ἀρτέμ[ν τειμῶν, παρ’ ἡς] γείνεται πάσιν τὰς κάλλιστα, καθήκει[ι]

[παρά τῇ πόλις τὸν εὐδοκιμεῖν, Γαίας] τε Οὐθίνος Σαλοςτάριος, ἀ-

[νὴ ἱππικῆς τὰ[ζε]ις, γένει καὶ ἀξία διάστημος, στρατείας} τε καὶ

[ἐπιτροπᾶς ἀ[πὸ] τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν αὐτοκράτορος κεκοσμημένος,}

---

1 *IEph* 27A, l. 9 & Rogers (1991): 152, A, l. 9: ἀποδειξαμένων];* Oliver, *SG* 3, l. 9: ἀποδειξαμένων].
πολείτις ἡμέτερος καὶ τοῦ βουλευτικοῦ συνεδρίου, πρὸς πατρὸς.

[τε ἀγαθὴ χρώμα[ενος διαθέσι, ὡς καὶ τὰς ἀπὸ τῆς τύχης ἐπὶ τὸ κρέ[σ-]
[σου προκοπᾶς κοσμε[ειν ἡ] τῶν ἡλίων σημώντη, εὐσεβῶν μὲν φιλοτεί-
[-μως] τὴν ἀρχηγεῖν πο[κιλ]οις μὲν επισύνας ἐπούδακεν περὶ τὴν ἱρα-
-[κειν], μεγαλοψύχο[ις δὲ] καθιερώσεσιν τὴν πόλιν κατὰ πάντε[μη-]
[κεν, προο[ετι δὲ καὶ πρὸς θε[λαν] εἰς τὴν ἐκκλήσιαν ὑπέσχετο[ν ἄνε] τι-
[ν!] πεικονίσματα καθιερώσειν, ἐν μὲν χρύσου, ἐν δὲ ἀργύριασ.

ἐπίπεδο, ἐπὶ[ερά δὲ ἀργύριασ ἔπεικονίσματα δικτα, ἐ[κόνας τε] ἐ

φιλοτέμος εἰ[κοσι, πεντε μὲν] τοῦ κ[υ]ρίου ἡμῶν αὐ[τοκράτορος].

Νέρουσα Τραία[νοῦ Καίσαρος Σ]εβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ, Δακικοῦ, καὶ

τῆς ἱερωτάτης γνατικοῦ αὐτοῦ Πλωτεινῆς καὶ τῆς ἱερ[άς συνκλη-
 [του] καὶ τοῦ Ἐραμίων ἅπακον τάγματος καὶ δήμου, [τούτων δὲ χω-


[τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῶν εξ φυλών καὶ] βουλής καὶ γερα[σίας καὶ κρι-]

βελα[ς-]ς]ς αφότου [...ακ[---]

Traces of 16 lines

[--- ὑπὸ τῶν φυλάκων, συνεσπευμε[μένων καὶ] δύο νε[οποι-]


[νων [συμπροσπομο[ντόν τῶν] ἐφ[ή]βων [α]πὸ τῆς [Μαγνη-

[τής [πύλης εἰς τὸ θεάτρον καὶ] ἀπὸ τοῦ θε[άτρον κατὰ]

tὸν αὐ[τὸν ὁρὸν, τῇ τῇ ν[ομίσματι ἀρχ[ερατικοῦ]

[ἐτοὺς θε[ῦ καὶ εἰς τὰς ἑ[πὶ καθ'] ἐκαστόν μήνας α[θρισ-


Σεβ[αστεῖων καὶ Σω]τηρῶν [καὶ τῶν π]λεντ[ετρικῶν μεγά-


5 lines are missing

[--- τῶν δὲ χρημάτων τῶν καθιερώ-

[ωμένων ὑπ[νὰ] αὐ[τοῦ Ἕφεσίον τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ γερουσίᾳ]

[καὶ πολ[ειταὶ καὶ ἐ]φή[βως καὶ παῖσιν ὑπέσχετο αὐτός]

[ἐπὶ τοῦ σφ--- ἐκδανιστῆς γενέσθαι]

[καὶ [τε]λείων τόκο[ν ὅρι[α]μα[ῖον [α[σαριαῖον]

[διαρθε[π[η[που< ο>' καθ'] ἐκαστον ἐ]ι[νατον κα-

[τὰ τ]'ην ἀπατάξειν αὐτόπ τῆς γεν.]ε[σε[α]ὶ τῆς θεου [ημερά-]


[θ]ερ[ωμένον, ὅταν βουλή[θή], ή τὸς κληρο[μοὺς αὐ-

[το]π] τὴν πόλει, κοιμο[μέ]νου τῶν ἐκαστοῦν προο[ποι-

[πο] προ[πομένον περὶ] [ο[ν] ἀπατ[αμία διάκλατον εἰς ἡγοπό-


[βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου, καὶ νό[υ]ν τῆς ἐπα[ρχ]ειας [ηγεμο-

[νεύοντες ὁ κράτιστος ἄνα] ἀν καὶ εὐεργε[τ]ής [Ακο[ν]ι] ἁλι-

--- 1 Eph 27A, l. 55-6 & Rogers (1991): 154, A, l. 55-6; π[εντετρικῶν ---]--- [ν ἑκόρταις; Oliver, SG
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[ος Πρόκλος, ο άνθυπατος, και 'Αφράνιος Φλασούκας,
νός, ο πρεσβευτής και της στρατηγος, άν[γ]ερβλήτωρ]

[τη φιλανθρωπία και διά Φλασούκας τη νομοθετεί τη
την άγδρους μεγαλοπυχιά, ώς γνήσιος] πολείται <η-
μένων αυτών, καθ' άνθυπατος άντων αυτών και δι' επιστολῶν
[συνήσιμοι] αντέγραψαν, έπεκέλευσαν, ώστε δι' αυτών
είπατεν περί των καθενών αυτών άντων, δηδοθ' ονο
Σαλούταρκον, ανδρα] είσεβεθέν
[μέν] προς τούς θεούς, είς δέ την πόλιν φιλοτείμοι, τε-
τειμήσατε ταίς κρατίστας ζημιάς έκκομών τε αναστάσε-
σαι εν [τε τ]ι' ίερω τής Αρτέμιδος και εν τούς επισημοτάτας
tόπων τής πόλεως, άναγωρεύονται δέ αυτά και χρυσόν
στεφάνια εν ταῖς έκκλησίας ώς σπουδαία ζωνταν και φιλάρ-
ταται την δε παράστημα των προγεγραμμένων ει-
ρών και την πρό κοινωνίαν από τού τι' ίερον εις το θεα-
τηρόν και την έκ τού θεάτρου εις το ίερον τής Αρτέμιδος
[μετακομιδήν ποιήσασι κατά τήν διάταξιν καθήκουσαν [εν-
τος [εκ τῶν νεοποιών δύο και σκηπτρούχου και τούς]
φυλάκουσιν -------------------
7 lines missing
[----------] τὸν νικὸν τῆς Αρτέμιδος ----
[---------- τὸν καθήκοντον το----------]
[---------- τὴν δε διατάξειν αὐτῶν τοῦ κυρίαν εἰς τοὺς, ἀμετάθετον.
[ακαταλύτου, ἀπαράλλακτον εἰς τὸν τόπον έκποντα χρόνον.
[ἐκεῖ δὲ τὰς έκεῖντα προς τὸν οίκον εἰς τὸν άρχόντα τίς πα-
[ρά τὴν διάταξιν τὴν δια ψηφίσας τοις κυριώτης] συμβας [ν] ἢ
[έλλαξε, ἢ τοῦ άκυρον ἀπὸ τὸν έκατον τὴν διατάξειν] έτοι, δὲ τοῖς
[τού τοιαύτων ἢ εἰς εἰσήγησας] εν [ν] ἀποτελείσωτον εἰς προς[σ]χό-
[μησαν τῆς κυρίας Αρτέμιδος διήνυσιν] β' μ'/ πρὸς [ε ἢ] εἰς τὸν τοῦ κυρίαν
καὶ]

[σαρκῶς φύσιν ἄλλα] διήνυσιν τῆς Β' μ'/ πρὸς [ε] καὶ τοῦτοι το[ι] ἢ-
[γείμονες Ακούσσλαός Πρόκλος, ο άνθυπατος, και 'Αφράνιος]³
[ος Φλασούκας, ο πρεσβευτής καὶ της στρατηγος, δι' ἐν-
[πιστο]λων το [προγεγραμμένον πρόστειμον ὄρισαν.
[πρός δὲ τοις κατ' έκαστας τὴν το πρός τὴν πό-
[λιν] μ'] γεγονόν τοις αὐτούς καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὴν θεον ευσέβειαν
[την τούτων καὶ τοῦ τούτῳ τοῦ ψήφεπος] ματιος
[τῆς βούλης καὶ τοῦ δημοῦ κεκυρωμένην διά] ταξιν, [ἀναγ]ραφήν
[νοι -------------------]θα[...σ[...]
[------------------------]
[----------] ν εν μέν τοι θεάτρῳ [επὶ τῆς νοσίας πα-

³ Cf. cat. no. 15, ll. 408-411; Chapter Six, pp. 264-270.
Section II: Imperial Inscriptions  
D. Public Decrees

[ρόδου τοίχων] αὐτόν μαραμέριν, ἃ [ου[λείται αὐτός, ἐν δὲ]
[τῷ Ἅρτεμι]σιῷ ἐν τόπῳ ἐπιτηδείῳ, φιλοτείμασις ἕνεκα καὶ
[ἀρετής] καὶ περὶ τῆς διαμονῆς τῶν ἐ

[dedúxhæi tῆς boulês kai tōi nevoke]ρoç dêmou filosè[βástoi]n]
[gevénßdæi, katóthi proýge[](p)ta]n.
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[ἀρά]ν δ', γραμ-μάτων θ', τα και αυτα καθηρωμένα τη τε Ἀρτέμιδι [και τη τφλ-] σ[εβά]στω 'Εφεσίων βουλη. ὠμοίως και ἄργυρεα Ἀρτέμις λαμπαδηφόρος-
ρη[ο]ς, ὀλίχης λ', και εικών ἄργυρεα τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ψαμιλων, [ὀλίχης λ',
και εικών ἄργυρεα τῆς φιλοσεβάστου γερουσίας, ὀλίχης λ [... τα και] αυτα καθηρωμένα τη τε Ἀρτέμιδι και τη τ' Ἐφεσίων γερουσία.

verständlich και ἀλλ' Ἀρτέμις ἄργυρεα λαμπαδηφόρος, εἱμερής-

tη 'εν τη εξέδρα τῶν ἐφήβων, ὀλίχης λ', συνκιών ε', γραμμάτων ...] και εικών ἄργυρεα τοῦ ἱππικοῦ τάγματος, ὀλίχης λ', ἤμιουν-

κιον, γραμμάτων γ', και ἀλλή εικών ἄργυρεα τῆς ἐφηβείας[ες, ὀλίχης λ'.] τα και αυτα καθηρωμένα τη τε Ἀρτέμιδι και τας κατ' ενιαυτον[ν ο että-
[σι]ν ἐφήβων. ὠμοίως και ἀλλ' Ἀρτέμις ἄργυρεα λαμπαδηφόρος, ἤχου-
[σα] φιάλην, ὀλίχης λ', συνκιών .. γραμμάτων .. και εικών ἄργυρεα-
[θεο]ς Σεβαστοῦ, [ὀλίχης λ', συνκιών .. γραμμάτων .. και εικών ἄργυρεα φυ]-
[λης Σεβαστῆς, ὀλίχης λ', τα και αυτα καθηρωμένα τη τε Ἀρτέμιδι και]
[τοις αει εἰ] ζωομέν[νων πολείταις τῆς Σεβαστῆς φυλῆς. ὠμοίως και ἀλλη]
["Ἀρτέμις ἄργυρεα "---------------, ὀλίχης λ'.]

και εικών ἄργυρεα τοῦ φιλοσεβάστου Ἐφεσίων δήμου, ὀλίχης λ.]

και εικών ἄργυρεα φυλῆς Ἐφεσίων, ὀλίχης λ .. τα και αυτα καθηρωμέν[ην]
[τη τε Ἀρτέμιδι και τοις αει εἰ] ζωομέν[νων πολείταις τῆς Ἐφεσίων φυλῆς.]

[ὁμοίως και ἀλλ' Ἀρτέμις] ἄργυρεα [--------------- χειρί
[--, ὀλίχης λ', συνκιών] τθ, και εικών ἄργυρεα .... ὀλίχης λ, ] και
[εικών ἄργυρεα φυλῆς Καρπιναῖων, ὀλίχης λ', συνκιών .. γραμμάτων γ', τα]
[και αυτα καθηρωμένα τη τε Ἀρτέμιδι και τοις αει εἰςομένοις πο]λείταις]
[tῆς Καρπιναίων φυλῆς, ὠμοίως και ἀλλ' Ἀρτέμις ἄργυρεα λαμπαδηφό-
[ρος ......... ὀλίχης λ', και εικών ἄργυρεα Λυσιμάχου, ὀλίχης λ , γ'](αμμάτων) γ', και εικών]

[ἄργυρεα φυλῆς Θησίων, ὀλίχης λ .. τα και αυτα καθηρωμένα τη τε Ἀρτέμιδι]
[και τοις αει εἰςομένοις πο]λείταις τῆς Θησίων φυλῆς.] ὠμοίως και ἀλλή Ἀρ-
[τεμίς ἄργυρεα έξουσία τα τζ .... ὀλίχης λ', συνκιών γ', ἤμιους γράμμα-
[τος, και εικών ἄργυρεα Ἐ]φεσίων, ὀλίχης λ .. και εικών ἄργυρεα φυλῆς Ἐφ-
[εσίων, ὀλίχης λ', γ', ἤμιους κραμάτων .. τα και αυτα καθηρωμένα-
[να τη τε Ἀρτέμιδι και τοις αει εἰςομένοις πο]λείταις τῆς Ἐφεσίων φυλῆς.

[ὁμοίως και ἀλλή Ἀρτεμίς ἄργυρεα λαμπαδηφόρος "Καταστάλ-
[α .... ὀλίχης λ', συνκιών .. και εικών ἄργυρα Πίνοιος, ὀλίχης λ , και εἱκόνων]
[ἄργυρεα φυλῆς Βεμβειναίων, ὀλίχης λ .. τα και αυτα καθηρωμένα τη τε Ἀρ-

τεμίς και τοις αει εἰςομένοις πο]λείταις τῆς Βεμβειναίων φυλῆς.]

[ο δὲ προγεγραμμένοις σταθμοῖς τῶν ἐννέα ἀπεικονισμάτω]ν της θε-
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[λίδας τεθειμένας κ]αι ἐπιγραφ[ραμμένας] Θ' βάσεις [ἀνά γ', ὡς ἡ ἐπί] τούς βά-
[θροὺς καὶ ἡ ἐν τῇ δ]ιατάξει βρ[υλής, γερου]σίας, ἐφ[βείας καὶ φυ]λῆς καθι-
[σι]ς [μετα καὶ οἱ εἰκόνες] ἐν[τὸ ἱερόν τῆς Άρτεμίδος καὶ] παραδεδομένων ὑπὸ]
[τῶν φυλάκων, συνεπιμελουμένων ἕκ] τῶν νεο[ποιῶν δύο καὶ σκηντούχοι.]

[Moussaios, ἐφέ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδος τῷ ἐπὶ τῶν παραθη[κῶν], διαδεχομένων καὶ συμ-
[προπεμπόντων καὶ τῶν ἐφήβων ἀπὸ τῆς Μαγνητικῆς πύλης εἰς τὸ θέα]-
[τρον καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ θατροῦ μέχρι τῆς Κορησσικῆς πύλης μετὰ] πάσης [ἐπίπρε|-]
[πειας; ὁσακότας δὲ γενέσθαι καὶ ἐν πάσι τοῖς γυμνικάς ἅγιοι <ν> καὶ εἰ τινες]
[ἐτεραι ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου ὀρισθῆται ἡμέραι. μηδὲν δὲ ἐξ[εστώ]-
[μετακοινομήσας ἢ τά ἀπεικονίσματα τῆς θεοῦ ἢ τὰς εἰκόνας πρὸ τὸ]
[μετουσιοθῆναι ἢ ἀναχωνευθῆναι ἢ ἄλλωι] τινὶ τρόπωι κακουργηθῆναι[.] ἐπ<ε><ἰ]
[ὅ πατήσας τι τούτων ὑπεθινω]ς ἦτοι ἱεροσυλία καὶ ἄσβεσια καὶ οὐδὲν]
[ἥσον οὗ ἐπιδεικνύθη τοι[η]θεα τὸ προγεγραμμένος ἀπεικονισ-
[μασι] καὶ εἰκόσιον λετρών[] πιλ' ἐχοντος τὴν περὶ τούτων ἐκδικίαν ἔπι ἀνά-
[κή τοῦ στρατηγοῦ τῆς πόλεως.] τῶν δὲ καθερμένων ὑπὸ Σαλούτα.]
[πίου δηναρίων] β' μυρίων] τ[e]βλεπει τόκον Σαλοντάριος δραχμαίοι καθ' ἐκαστον]

[ἐνι-]

[αὐτοῦ] τὰ γει[ν]όμενα δημάρχα χίλια ὀκτοκάσια, ἀφ' ὧν δώσει τῷ γραμμα-
[τεί τῆς β]ουλῆς δημάρχα τετρακόσια[α π]ντηκότοινα, ὃπας ἐπιτελεῖ διανομήν]
[ταῖς] βούλευταις ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐν τοῖς προϊ[κοι] τῆς γενε[σίων τῆς μεγίστης θεᾶς Ἀρ-
[τέμιδος,] ἡ τεσδὲ εὐθὺς Θαρυγ[γί]λιον ἐκτῆς ἱσταμένου, γενομένης τῆς δια-
[νομῆς ἢ η[τῆς] πέμπτης, διδομένος εἰ]κάστῳ τῶν παρόντων δημαρίου εὐνό,
[μὴ ἔχοντος] ἑξουσίαν τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς διανομῆς ἀπόντω δύναι, ἐπεὶ ὁποτεισα-
[τω τῆς β]ουλῆς ὑπὲρ ἐκάστου δυνατοῦ τοῦ μὴ παραγενομένου καὶ λαβόντος]

[προστειμον δηναρία] ... εὰν δὲ μειζόνων γει[ν]ηται ὁ κόλλυβος, ὡστε]
[εἰς πλειόνας χωρεῖν, ἐξεστῷ καὶ [------------- ]

[---------------------------] α[να] κυ[λοι]ν. τομοὶ[ς ὁμοίως δο] 

[σει τῷ τοῦ συνεδρίου τῆς γερουσίας γραμματεῖ κατ' ἐνι.]

[αὐτοῦ ἐκαστον ἀπὸ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου τοῦκον δη(νάρια) τετβ']

[ἀσάρα Θ', ὡς ἐπιτελῆς κλήρον τῇ γενεσίω τῆς θεοῦ]

[ἡμέρα τοῖς τοῦ συνεδρίου μετέχουσιν εἰς ἄνδρας τῇ [ἀνά δη(νάριον) α'] ἐκα] 

[δὲ μειζόνων ἡ γενομένων κόλλυβος.] ὡστε εἰς πλειο[νας] 

[χωρεῖν, κληρώσας καὶ πλεύσας, εἰ]κάστῳ τῶν λαχ[ον] 

[τοι[ν ἃνα δη(νάριον ἐν λαμβάνοντας]. διδόσθω[δ] καὶ καὶ] 

[τοῖς τοῖς νεοκορόσι παρά] Σα[λοντάριος] τῷ καθερμῶν- 

[κότι εἰς διανομήν δη(νάρια) ----- καὶ τοῖς ἀσιαρχή[ςασι] τοῖς] 

---

7 An alternative to the unattested δώστει τῷ τοῦ συνεδρίου τῆς γερουσίας may be δώσει | τῆς φιλοσεβάστῳ τῆς γερουσίας. 
8 One might equally restore τοῖς τῆς γερουσίας μετέχουσιν.
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Translation:

(A) During the prytany of Tiberius Claudius Antipater Julianus on the sixth day of the month Poseideon. It was decreed by the boule and the Emperor-loving neocorate demos:

Concerning those things which Tiberius Claudius Julianus, the son of Tiberius Claudius Alexander, of the tribe Quirina, who is loyal to his country and Emperor-loving, a reverent and pious man, who is the secretary of the demos for the second time, and the Emperor-loving generals of the city have brought forward; since the men who are generous towards the city and who display in every way the affection of citizens born in the city should receive rewards in return equal to the enjoyment of men who have previously benefited the city, and the enjoyment built up for those who wish to compete for the same rewards, and which is equal to the enjoyment of men who have been zealous to honour the greatest goddess Artmeis, from whom the most wonderful things come to all, it is fitting for them to be honoured by the city; Gaius Vibius Salutaris, a man of the equestrian order, eminent in birth and worth, who has been honoured by our master the Imperator with military positions and procuratorships, who is our fellow-citizen and a member of the senatorial assembly (bouleutikov suneiditou), and who lives in a good manner following the conduct of his father, since, to complement the promotions of Fortune more with the great reverence of his lifestyle, he strove in his piety to fill the office of Archegetis munificently with detailed plans for the cult and honoured the entire city with bountiful dedications, and moreover even now approaching the assembly (ekklhsitou) he is promising to dedicate nine statues, one in gold on which silver is overlaid with gold, and eight other silver statues, and twenty silver busts, five of our ruler the Imperator Nerva Trajanus Caesar Augustus Germanicus Dacicus, and of his most revered wife Plotina and of the holy Senate and of the Roman equestrian order and of the populus of Rome, and in addition to these fifteen busts representing the city of the Ephesians, the demos, the six tribes, the boule, the gerousia, the order of the Ephebes ....

(48) ... by the guards, with two temple wardens and the staff-bearer assisting, to be carried and carried back, with the Ephebes receiving them and joining in the procession from the Magnesian gate to the theatre and from the theatre in the same manner, both at the new moon sacrifice of the archieratic year, and at the twelve sacred and customary meetings in each month of the Assembly (ekklhsitou), which is summoned twelve times each month, and at the festivals of the Sebasteia and the Soteria and the penteteric Great Epheseia...

(62) ... of the money donated by him to the boule, the gerousia, the citizens, the Ephebes and the paides of the Ephesians he himself promised to be the investor for the ...

9 The words rendered statue (ápikovmoikos) and bust (éikov) have been translated so with the intent to convey the distinction apparent in the Greek but to retain the similarity of media which is also apparent in the Greek.
and to pay as interest one as per drachma which will be distributed each year according to his arrangement on the birthday of the goddess, which is the sixth day of the month Thargelion having agreed that either he or his heirs would give the promised money to the city, whenever it was wanted, with those who are the leaders of each group receiving it; having announced the arrangement for all these things in private he deemed it worthy to confirm them also through a decree of the boule and the demos, and now the governors of the province, Aquillius Proculus, vir egregius, the beneficent proconsul, and Afranius Flavianus, the legate and the propraetor, both recognizing with unsurpassable philanthropy and affection the generosity of the man, like active citizens themselves, according as they replied to him and wrote happily in their letters, have decreed that they would introduce on their own authority the matters concerning Gaius Vibius Salutaris' donations.

(84) It has been decreed that Gaius Vibius Salutaris, a man who is pious toward the gods and generous toward the city, should be honoured with the greatest honours and with the erection of busts in the Temple of Artemis and in the most prominent places of the city, and that he should be publicly praised with a golden crown in the assemblies because he is zealous and devoted to Artemis; and that two of the temple wardens and the staff-bearer and the guards should oversee the aforementioned holy images and the carrying of the images before the general procession from the temple to the theatre and from the theatre to the Temple of Artemis in accordance with his arrangements each year....

(104) ... the Temple of Artemis...of those which are due...that his arrangements shall be authoritative, unalterable, indissoluble and immutable for all time. But if anyone, either a private citizen or a magistrate, should propose something contrary to the arrangements ratified in this decree or changes any of the arrangements, everything contrary to the arrangements will be invalid, and let the one who does any of these things or introduces such a measure pay toward the additional adornment of Queen Artemis twenty-five thousand denarii and to the Imperial fiscus another twenty-five thousand denarii, according as the governors, the proconsul Aquillius Proculus and the legate and propraetor Afranius Flavianus, viri egregii, have determined in their letters as the fine; so that his generosity to the city and his piety toward the goddess may be made clear, the arrangements made by him and ratified by a decree of the boule and demos ...to post...in the theatre facing its marble wall on the southern parodos, wherever he himself wishes, and in the Artemision in a prominent place, because of his generosity and virtue; and concerning the continuance of the money which has been donated by him to the boule and the gerousia and the citizens and the Ephebes he has promised that he will be the investor for this year in accordance with his endowment.... It has been decreed to be so by the boule and the Emperor-loving neocorate demos according as it has been written above.

(B 134) In the second consulship of Sextus Attius Suburanus and the first of Marcus Asinius Marcellus, on the [...] day of January; during the prytany of Tiberius Claudius Antipater Julianus, on the [...] day of the month Poseideon. Gaius Vibius Salutaris, the son of Gaius of the tribe Oufentina offered his endowment to the Emperor-loving boule of the Ephesians and to the Emperor-loving neocorate demos of the Ephesians, with regards to which he has dedicated on the terms noted below to the
greatest goddess, the Ephesian Artemis, and to the Emperor-loving neocorate *demos* of the Ephesians and to the Emperor-loving *boule* of the Ephesians and to the Emperor-loving *gerousia* of the Ephesians and to the six tribes of the Ephesians and to the annual Ephebes of the Ephesians and to the *theologoi*\(^{10}\) and to the *hymnodoi* and to the temple wardens and to the staff-bearers and to those who will be the *Paides* of the Ephesians and to the *paidonomoi* nine statues of the goddess, one in gold and the others in silver, and twenty silver busts and 20,000 denarii, in such a way that a silver bust of our ruler the Imperator Caesar Nerva Trajanus Augustus Germanicus Dacicus, weighing...pounds and three ounces, and a silver bust of Plotina Augusta, weighing three pounds, should be entrusted to Salutaris himself, the donor, and after the death of Salutaris the aforementioned statues should be given to the *grammateus* of the Ephesians at the aforementioned weight by Salutaris’ heirs, so that they might be placed during the councils (ἐκκλησίαι) above the seating area of the *boule* with the golden statue of Artemis and the other busts.

Let the statues and busts be:

(158) A golden Artemis, weighing three pounds and the two silver deer around it and the rest other gold plated, weighing two pounds, ten ounces and five grams, and a silver bust of the Roman Senate weighing four pounds and two ounces, and a silver bust of the most revered Emperor-loving *boule* of the Ephesians, weighing four pounds and nine grams, these dedicated to Artemis and to the Emperor-loving *boule* of the Ephesians.

(164) Likewise also a silver torch-bearing Artemis, weighing seven pounds, and a silver bust of the *populus Romanus* weighing...pounds, and a silver bust of the Emperor-loving *gerousia*, weighing...pounds, these dedicated to Artemis and the *gerousia* of the Ephesians.

(168) Likewise also another silver torch-bearing Artemis, resembling the one in the exedra of the Ephebes, weighing seven pounds, five ounces and...grams, and a silver bust of the equestrian order, weighing three pounds, nine ounces and three grams, and another silver bust of the order of the Ephebes, weighing...pounds, these dedicated to Artemis and to those who are the annual Ephebes.

(173) Likewise also another silver torch-bearing Artemis, holding an urn, weighing...pounds,...ounces and...grams, and a silver bust of the divine Augustus weighing...pounds,...ounces and...grams, and a silver bust of the tribe Sebaste, weighing...pounds, these dedicated to Artemis and to all who are citizens in the tribe Sebaste.

(177) Likewise also another silver [torch-bearing] Artemis, weighing...pounds, and a silver bust of the Emperor-loving *demos* of the Ephesians, weighing...pounds and a silver bust of the tribe Ephesea, weighing...pounds, these dedicated to Artemis and to all who are citizens in the tribe Ephesea.

(182) Likewise also another silver [torch-bearing] Artemis with a...in her hand, weighing...pounds and nine ounces, and a silver bust of...weighing...pounds, and a silver bust of the tribe Carenaea, weighing...pounds,...ounces and three grams, these dedicated to Artemis and all who are citizens in the tribe Carenaea.

\(^{10}\) The *theologos* may have prayed at the festival; in other cities, they were associated with the Imperial cult (Rogers [1991]: 53).
(186) Likewise also another silver torch-bearing Artemis with..., weighing..., and a silver bust of Lysimachus, weighing...pounds and three ounces, and a silver bust of the tribe Teia, weighing...pounds, these dedicated to Artemis and to all who are citizens in the tribe Teia.

(189) Likewise also another silver [torch-bearing] Artemis holding a..., weighing..., three ounces and half a gram, and a silver bust of Euonymus, weighing...pounds, and a silver bust of the tribe Euonymea, weighing three pounds, half an ounce and...grams, these dedicated to Artemis to all who are citizens in the tribe Euonymea.

(194) Likewise also another silver torch-bearing Artemis...Castalia, weighing...pounds and...ounces, and a silver bust of Pion weighing..., and a silver bust of the tribe Bembinaea, weighing...pounds, these dedicated to Artemis and to all who are citizens in the tribe Bembinaea.

(198) The aforementioned weight of the nine statues of the goddess and of the twenty busts was provided to Eumenes the son of Eumenes and grandson of Theophilus, that Eumenes who is strategos of the city of the Ephesians, through the agency of the weight-officer Hermias, a sacred servant of Artemis, while Musaeus, a sacred servant of Artemis in charge of dedications, joined in the receiving. The aforementioned statues will be set up at every customary assembly (ἐκκλησία) and at the sacrifice completed at the new moon of the archieratic year in the theatre by those responsible on the nine bases arranged in blocks and inscribed in groups of three, as the dedication on the bases and the dedication in the arrangements for the boule, the gerousia, the order of Ephebes and each tribe. And after the assemblies (ἐκκλησίαι) have been concluded the statues and busts will be carried back to the Temple of Artemis and handed over by their guardians, with two of the temple wardens and the wand-bearer joining them, to Musaeus, the sacred servant of Artemis in charge of dedications, with the Ephebes receiving them and joining in the procession from the Magnesian gate to the theatre and from the theatre to the Coressian gate with all due pomp; and it is to occur the same in the gymnastic games and if any other days are specified by the boule and the demos. But it shall not be possible for anyone to alter either the statues of the goddess or the busts in order to rename them or to re-smelt them or to do them harm in any other way, since the one who does any of these things shall be held accountable for sacrilege and impiety and the same weight and no less shall be shown to have been put into the aforementioned statues and busts, namely one hundred and eleven pounds; the strategos of the city is responsible under law for prosecuting in these matters.

(220) Of the twenty thousand denarii donated by Salutaris, Salutaris will pay 9% interest each year,11 making one thousand eight hundred denarii, from which he shall give to the grammateus of the boule four hundred and fifty denarii, so that he may perform a distribution of money to the members of the boule in the temple in the pronaos on the birthday of the greatest goddess, Artemis, which is the sixth day of the month of Thargelion, with the distribution occurring on the fifth day, with one denarius being given to each man present; the one who is charge does not have authority to give a share of this distribution to anyone who is absent because if he does so, he shall pay to the boule a fine of...denarii for each man who was not present but received the gift. If the interest

11 Literally, “Salutaris will pay interest per drachma per year.”
available is greater, so that it can provide for more, it shall be permissible also [to make a
distribution at a rate of? ...].

(231) In the same way he will give to the grammateus of the assembly (σωτερίων) of the gerousia\(^{12}\) each year from the aforementioned interest three hundred and eighty-two denarii and nine asses, so that a lottery may be conducted on the birthday of the goddess for those who are members of the assembly, up to three hundred and nine men, at a rate of one denarius each. If the available interest is greater, so that it can provide for more, he will allot more portions, but each of the recipients will receive one denarius. There will also be given to the temple-wardens in the donor’s, that is Salutaris’, house...denarii for a distribution of money and to the former Asiarchs whose names have been inscribed...denarii for a lottery at the rate of eleven denarii per person, with which they will purchase the materials for the sacrifice, with this lottery taking place on the fifth day. The grammateus of the gerousia will not have the authority to omit the distribution or the enrolment after the death of Salutaris, because if he does so he will pay the fine which was specified in these arrangements.

(246) In the same way from the aforementioned interest he will give each year also to the six tribe-leaders one hundred and twenty-five denarii, so that they may perform a lottery of the aforementioned dedication of the goddess for two hundred and fifty men by name from each tribe, with the winners receiving nine asses each. If the available interest is greater, it may be allotted by the tribe-leaders to other citizens.

(253) In the same way he will give from the aforementioned interest each year to the Ephebarch one hundred and twenty-six denarii, so that he may perform a lottery for the annual Ephebes on the birthday of Artemis for two hundred and fifty individuals by name, with each of the winners receiving nine asses, and the Ephebarch may take one denarius aside from these.

(258) In the same way he will give from the aforementioned interest also to the Highpriest of Asia of the common temple of Asia in Ephesus twenty-four denarii and thirteen and a half asses each year, so that from this on the birthday of the goddess he may perform a lottery for the theologoi in the Temple of Artemis, with each of those who have been registered by him and winning the lottery receiving two denarii and thirteen and a half asses, with the registration taking place on the fifth.

(265) In the same way he will give from the aforementioned interest each year to the priestess of Artemis on behalf of the hymnodoi of the goddess on the birthday of Artemis for a distribution eighteen denarii.

(268) In the same way he will give from the aforementioned interest at every regular assembly (ἐκκλησίας) to two temple wardens and to the wand-bearer four and a half asses, so that the statues of the goddess and the busts may be brought from the pronao to the theatre and back again from the theatre to the pronao along with the guards on the same day.

(273) In the same way he will give from the aforementioned interest each year to the paidonomoi fifteen denarii and thirteen and a half asses, so that on the birthday of the goddess they may perform a lottery for forty-nine Paides by name, with each of the

\(^{12}\) Or, “to the grammateus of the Emperor-loving gerousia.”
winners receiving four and a half asses on the same day in the Temple of Artemis, and with the \textit{paidonomoi} receiving separately nine asses each.

(279) In the same way he will give from the aforementioned interest each year to the one who performs the cleaning...the remaining thirty denarii, so that he may cleanse cleanse them each time when the statues of the goddess are carried back to the temple before they replace them in the pronaos of the Temple of Artemis.

(284) If any other person buys this lottery on a private initiative and wishes to pay the interest each year, let the buyer pay the aforementioned one thousand eight hundred denarii; it will not be permissible to pay any lesser amount contrary to these arrangements..., but making it secure. But if anyone buys it, and wishes to pay all the capital sum of the donation in advance, it will be permitted to him to pay it to the one who is obliged to receive it, giving five thousand as a capital sum to the treasurer of the \textit{boule} for the gifts donated to the \textit{boule}; and in the same way to pay four thousand four hundred and fifty denarii as a capital sum to the treasurer of the \textit{gerousia} for gifts donated to the \textit{gerousia}; and in the same way to pay two hundred and fifty-five denarii as a capital sum to the \textit{theologoi} and the \textit{hymnodoi} for their gifts; and in the same way to the \textit{grammateus} of the \textit{demos} as the remainder of the capital sum ten thousand two hundred and seventy-five denarii for the lotteries for the citizens and the Ephebes and the temple wardens and the wand-bearers and the cleaners, so that they may invest the money at a rate of twelve silver asses with reliable security and that they may complete the gifts from the annual interest without delay, as has been written above.

(304) But if Salutaris dies before he pays the twenty thousand denarii or before he arranges for the interest to be paid from the income of his estates, his heirs will be liable for the payment of the donated twenty thousand denarii and they will be liable for the interest until the conclusion of the payment, with them being liable for payment according to the sacred loan-regulations of the goddess and those of the Elders.

(312) Salutaris has promised, so that his generosity may begin in the current year, that on the birthday of the goddess he will give one thousand eight hundred denarii for the aforementioned distributions and lotteries.

(315) And it shall not be permitted to any magistrate, advocate or private citizen to attempt to alter or change or reorganize or divert anything or to propose a different measure for the donated statues or the money or its interest or to direct to any other income or expense or to do anything contrary to the aforementioned arrangements; let any action against the donations be illegal; and let the one who attempts to do anything in contradiction to these arrangements or to those aspects of these arrangements which have been approved and ratified by the \textit{boule} and \textit{demos} pay for the additional adornment of the greatest goddess, Artemis, twenty-five thousand denarii and to the fiscus of the Emperor another twenty-five thousand denarii.

(326) Let the aforementioned arrangements be in legal effect for all time..., just as Aquillius Proculus, the beneficent proconsul, and Afranius Flavianus, \textit{vir egregius}, the legate and propraetor, in their letters concerning these arrangements have approved and established the aforementioned fine. Gaius Vibius Salutaris, the son of Gaius, of the tribe Oufentina has brought forth the aforementioned endowment and gifts.
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(55) *IEph* 27G.447-568; Rogers (1991): 180-184, G.447-568; Oliver, *SG* 3.447-568; cf., *GIBM*, 481.318-406: additional benefaction of Gaius Vibius Salutaris. The text of the Salutaris dossier, of which G is the final document, is organized in six columns forming a trapezoid measuring on the left 208 x 12.5-20 cm and on the right 403 x 12.5-20; cf. cat. nos. 15 & 54. Date: Tiberius Claudius Antipater Julianus was prytanos during the proconsulship of Aquillius Proculus (*PIR*² A 999), under whom Afranius Flavianus (*PIR*² A 443) was proprietor. AD 104.

Illustration: Figs. 8 & 28.

Σέξτω Ἀττίῳ Σουμβουρανῷ τὸ β’, Μάρκῳ Ἀσι-νίῳ Μαρκέλλῳ υπάτου πρὸ τῆς Καλανδών Μαρτίων ἐπὶ πρωτάνεως Τιβ(ερίου) Κλαυδίου Ἀντιπάτρου Ίουλιανοῦ μνῆς 'Ανθεστηριώνος β’ Σεβαστῆς.
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του Ἑρμίου, ἵνα τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος, συνπαράβας[ν]·
tos kai synparalambánontos Mouxiou, ['erou]·
tῆς Ἀρτέμιδος, τοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν παραθηκῶν.

ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν προσκαθερομένων δημαρίων[ν χεῖ-]
λίων πεντακοσίων τελέσει τόκον [Σαλού·]
tάριος δραχμαίοι καὶ[θ'] ἐξακοσίον εἰςιαντοίν
τὰ γεννόμενα δημ[ρία]α δῆλε', [άφ' ὅν δώσει]
τῶν γραμματεῖ τῆς Ἐφεσίων βου[λῆς δη[νάρια]α] νε',]
ὅπως κλήρον ἐπιτελή ἐκ τῶν [βουλευτῶν τῇ ε']·

'ισταμένου τοῦ Θαρητηλίων[ος εἰς ονόματα]
ε'· οὕτω τε οἱ λαχόντες θυσ[ἰαν θύσουσι,]
tῆς Ἀρτέμιδι τῇ ἑκτῇ τοῦ μηνός, τῇ γενεσίῳ
tῆς θεοῦ, ἀγοράζοντες τοὺς δη[νάρια]α εἰκοσἰν
ἐπτὰ θήμασιν, καὶ τῇ[ν] ἐλα [δη[νάρια]α κ' ἀσ(σάρια) θ']·

δεπανήσουσιν ἐν τῷ ιερῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμι-·

δος εἰς τὴν [------------------- ]·
21 lines are missing; in this gap belong the 4 following lines
[---------------][[...]]δο[- --------- ]·
[ὁμοίως δώσει ἀπὸ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου τόκου]
[τοῖς χρυσοθρόφους καὶ] ἵνα[,οπ' εἰς πόλεως]
[δη[νάρια]α κ' ἀσ(σάρια) ι' ἣμισι, ὅπως κλήρον ἐπιτελώσι --- - ]·

[ὁμοίως δώσει ἀπὸ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου τόκου]

tοῖς παιδωνήμοις δη[νάρια]α κι' ἀσ(σάρια) δεκατρίᾳ ἣμισί,]

ὅπως ἐπιτελώσι κλήρον ἐκ τῶν παίδων πᾶν-

των ------------------- ]·

[------------------- ]·
[tῇ γενεσίῳ τῆς θεοῦ ἡμέρα εἰς οὐκομάτα,

ζηθηκόντα τρία· οὕτω τε οἱ λαχόντες εὑροῦνται]

ἐν τῷ ιερῷ τῆς Ἀρτ[έμιδος · · · · · · · χει-]

 accommodate τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος δη[νάρια]α ε'.

ὁμοίως δώσει ἀπὸ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου [τόκου]

καὶ τοῖς θεσμοφόροις εἰς διανομὴν δη[νάρια]α ζ',

ὅστε λαμβάνειν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ιερῷ τῆς Ἀρτέ-

μίδος τῇ γενεσίῳ τῆς θεοῦ ἀνὰ ἀσάρία θ"·

ὁμοίως δώσει ἀπὸ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου τόκου

καὶ τοῖς ἀκροβάταις τῆς θεοῦ εἰς διανομὴν

dη[νάρια]α ε', ὅστε λαμβάνειν αὐτοὺς τῇ γενεσίῳ

tῆς θεοῦ ἀνὰ ἀσάρια δεκατρίᾳ ἣμισιν.
When Sextus Attius Suburanus was consul for the second time and Marcus Asinius Marcellus was consul for the first time, on the twenty-second of February; during the prytany of Tiberius Claudius Antipater Julianus, on the second, Augustan, day of the month of Anthesterion. Gaius Vibius Salutaris, the son of Gaius, of the tribe Oufentina, a man who is reverent of Artemis and loyal to the Emperor, proposes a donation according to the foregoing decree, with regards to which he has additionally dedicated to the greatest goddess, the Ephesian Artemis, and to the Emperor-loving boule of the Ephesians and to the Emperor-loving gerousia of the Ephesians and to the chrysophoroi priests of the goddess Artemis and the victors in the sacred games for the city, and to those who will always be the Paides of the Ephesians and to the thesmoidoi of the common temple of Asia of the Emperors in Ephesus and to the acrobats of Artemis, subject to lawsuits and penalties, as was specified in the donation before this.
(461) He gives two gold-plated silver busts, so that with the statues of the goddess they will be in number thirty-one, and another one thousand five hundred denarii, so that with the previously donated money there will be twenty-one thousand five hundred denarii, in such a way that a silver bust of Athena Pammusus, weighing with the silver overlay of its base seven pounds, half an ounce and eight grams, dedicated to Artemis and to those who will always be the Paides of the Ephesians, and placed at every customary assembly (ἐκκλησία) above the bench where the Paides sit.

(470) And in the same way, a silver bust of the Empress as Concordia Chrysophorus, weighing with the silver overlay of its base six pounds, dedicated to Artemis and to those who are always the chrysophoroi priests and the victors in the sacred games for the city, and placed at every customary assembly (ἐκκλησία) above the bench where the sacred victors sit. The aforementioned weight of the busts and their bases was entrusted to Eumenes the son of Eumenes the grandson of Theophilus, that Eumenes who is the strategos of the city of the Ephesians, through the agency of the weight-officer Hermias, the sacred servant of Artemis, with Musaeus, the sacred servant of Artemis in charge of dedications, present and sharing in the receipt.

(485) Regarding the additionally donated one thousand five hundred denarii, Salutaris will pay as interest 9% every year, making one hundred and thirty-five denarii, from which he will give to the grammateus of the boule of the Ephesians fifty-five denarii, so that he may perform a lottery for the members of the boule on the fifth day of Thargelion for five men by name; these recipients will perform a sacrifice to Artemis on the sixth day of the month, which is the birthday of the goddess, buying...for twenty-seven and a half denarii, and the remaining twenty seven denarii and nine asses they will spend in the Temple of Artemis for the ....

...and in the same way he will give from the aforementioned interest to the chrysophoroi and to the victors in the sacred games for the city six denarii and thirteen and a half asses, so that they might perform a lottery...

(519) And in the same way he will give from the aforementioned interest to the paidonomoi fifteen denarii and thirteen and a half asses, so that they might perform a lottery for all the members of the Paides...

(524) ...on the birthday of the goddess for sixty-three individuals by name; and these winners will feast in the Temple of Artemis.... But if any of the winners, either of the men or of the Paides, either do not perform the sacrifices or feast in the temple, as it has been specified, they will pay for the further adornment of Artemis five denarii.

(532) In the same way he will give from the aforementioned interest to the thesmoidoi seven denarii for a distribution of money, such that they each receive nine asses in the Temple of Artemis on the birthday of the goddess.

(536) In the same way he will give from the aforementioned interest to the acrobats of the goddess fifteen denarii for a distribution, such that they each receive thirteen and a half asses on the birthday of the goddess.

(540) And in order to keep all the statues clean let it be permitted, as often as is approved, for them to be wiped clean with argyromatic earth by the one who is in charge of dedications, with two temple wardens and the wand-bearer present, but not to be wiped clean with any other material. And the remaining eight denarii will be given each year to
the one who is charge of dedications for the maintenance of the statues and the purchase of the argyromatic earth.

(550) Salutaris has also promised to give one hundred and thirty-five denarii, so that his generosity might begin in the present year on the birthday of the goddess. Let two of the temple wardens and the sacred victors and the wand-bearer and the guards bear the busts aforementioned and those previously dedicated in the donation before this and all the statues of the goddess from the pronaos to the theatre at every assembly (ἐκκλησία) and at the gymnastic games, and on any other days designated by the boule and demos, and back again to the temple and they will set them up with the Ephebes sharing in the receipt and accompanying the procession from the Magnesian gate as far as the Coressan gate after the assemblies (ἐκκλησίαι), just as the boule and demos have specified in the previous decrees.

(56) I Eph 26.1-28; FiE II, pp. 109-112, no. 20; GIBM 483B-C; Oliver, SG 12; Hermes 4 (1870): 198-201, no. 11: so-called decree of synedrion of the gerousia accepting a benefaction; found in the theatre. Measurements: The inscription is arranged on three marble blocks originally measuring 88 x 88 x 23 cm (left portion of II 5-20), 89 x 85 x 23 cm (center portion of II 1-20), 58 x 128 x 23 cm (middle portion of II 21-27). Date: AD 180-192. Illustration: Figs. 29 & 30.

Oliver suggests [Τι(βερίου) Κλ(αυδίου)] Νεικομήδους. An individual by this name appears in a list of kouretes during the prytany of Licinius Maximus Julianus in AD 104-105 (I Eph 1022; cat. no. 60). The Nicomedes of this inscription may, therefore, be the grandson or great-grandson of Tiberius Claudius Nicomedes the kouretes.
To Good Fortune. Concerning the matters which [ ] has brought forward; in the times following the foundation of the city, King Lysimachus, having become the master of the affairs of the city, arranged everything concerning both the mysteries and the sacrifices and our sunhedrion in the best way, with all reverence and kindness, and having dedicated both the temple and statue of Artemis the Saviour in...he arranged that

14 van Rossum (1988): 161 suggests τοῖς δὲ γερουσιασταῖς, which is not impossible given that the members of the gerousia did receive shares in cash gifts during the late second century. It might be unusual, though, to describe an allotment of the common funds of the gerousia to the gerousiastai themselves as a dianome.
all those having membership in the *sunhedrion*, after receiving from the common treasury of the *gerousia* [sum of money] each, should hold a feast and sacrifice to the goddess; but although the custom endured for a very long time, it was in later times neglected because of a lack of money. But now, since sufficient funds have been discovered through the efforts of [Tiberius Claudius] Nicomedes, the general financial supervisor of our *sunhedrion*, giving a singular sign of his diligence, the *gerousia* can, returning to the ancient custom, revere and sacrifice the annual sacrifices to the protector of our city, the goddess Artemis, and to our great ruler and the most manifest Imperator Caesar Marcus Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Sebastus Pius Felix on behalf of his everlasting life, in such a way that, it being not possible to spend less than [sum of money] Attic drachmas from the resources indicated by Nicomedes on the feast, each individual present may receive in addition to the cost of the meal one Attic drachma from the generosity of Nicomedes. Therefore, the members of the *sunhedrion* (*sunhedroi*) have resolved to ratify and ordain this forever through the following decree:

To Good Fortune. The *gerousia* shall uphold in perpetuity forever the decree which was passed on the principle of the aforesaid piety. And in the same way the members of the *sunhedrion* (*sunhedroi*) shall always uphold and fulfill their duties with respect to the feast with the *ekdikos* contributing in addition to the expense; and the...shall arrange for a torch-procession at the meals, and among the recliners...the members of the *sunhedrion* (*sunhedroi*) shall take part in the feast. If at any time other funds are not available to hold the feasts and sacrifices on the same scale...a contribution will be made to the revenue toward the expense of the sacrifices from the revenue of the exchange. All distributions to the citizens in accordance with this decree shall occur in the buildings around the Temple of Artemis the Saviour. The citizens shall celebrate the Augustan day each year in the twelfth month, in accordance with the previously ratified decrees. On each birthday of the Emperor a number of Ephesian elders not less than...

...since no one, not a magistrate or a private citizen or an advocate or...shall have the authority [to change] the things which have been decree. Concerning this matter, the entire *gerousia* in common has laid a curse upon anyone who attempts...and it has been decreed that that person shall become liable to charges of impiety and sacrilege; he shall also be liable to a charge of.... It has been decided to praise Nicomedes and his sons, and to publicly proclaim them as *patrogerontes*. It has also been decreed that the annual...in office and that he give the capital which has been found, to whomever the entire *gerousia* in common shall appoint...in reverence...when...was *grammateus* of the Elders.

(57) *IEph* 1393A.1-4: fragment of a decree of the *presbuteroi*; from the *parodos* of the theatre. Measurements: 16 x 24 x 5 cm. Undated.

[- - - - -]ρ. καὶ [- - - - ]
[- ἐδόθη]καὶ τοῖς πρεσβεῖς τενέσθαι καθότι]
[[- προγέγρα]πταί]
[- - - - - - -]εἰς[- - ]

Translation:

...it has been decreed by the Elders that it is to be written up accordingly...
(58) *JOAI* 55 (1983), 145 no. 4374; *SEG* 34, 1098.1-27: Fragment concerning financial affairs of the *gerousia* including a decree of the *gerousia*; found in Terrace House II. Measurements: 1.26 x 0.675 x 0.21m. Imperial?

Translation:
...it was decreed by the *gerousia* that for all which...or from what...nothing of the actual collection of the contribution...
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(59) JOAI 59 (1989): 197-210, no. 37, right column: a fragment of I Eph 1687; found in a late house east of the Konzilskirche, but originally from the Artemision.

Measurements: 30 x 87 x 58cm. Date: Reign of Tiberius.

...with Menicion and his wife Fabrica and their sons and his revered mother-in-law, two thousand five hundred denarii; Vedia Secunda, two thousand five hundred denarii; Gaius Sextilius Pollio, two thousand five hundred denarii; Heraclides Passalas, the elder and the son of Apollonius, two thousand denarii; Gaius Sextilius Proculus on behalf of himself, two thousand denarii, and on behalf of his wife, one thousand denarii, and on behalf of his son Pollio, five hundred denarii; Leucius and Publius Pactomeius, one thousand five hundred denarii; Aristeas the son of Hermolaus the son of Attalus with his mother Stratonice, one thousand five hundred denarii; Quintus Hortesius Ampodianus Rufus with his three sons and his wife Hortesia Procula, one thousand five denarii; Menocritus the son of Aratus with his wife Paula, one thousand five hundred denarii.

(60) FiE IX/1/1 no. b22; I Eph 1022.1.1-8: List of kouretes under Gaius Licinius Maximus Iulianus, prytanis in AD 105; found in the Hestia-room of the prytaneion. Measurements: 75 x 178 x 45 cm. Date: AD 105. Illustration: Fig. 31.
During the prytany of Gaius Licinius Maximus Julianus the son of Menander of the tribe Sergia, the pious and Emperor-loving kouretes were:

Gaius Licinius Maximus Vibianus the son of Menodorus of the tribe Sergia, a member of the boule; Marcus Caesellius Bassus, a member of the boule; Diodotus Asclepides Ephesius, a member of the gerousia; Tiberius Claudius Nicomedes, a member of the gerousia; Gaius Licinius Euarestus, a member of the gerousia; Asclepiodorus the son of Apollonius the grand of Asclepiodorus, a member of the gerousia.

(61) *FiE* IX/1/1 no. b29; *IEph* 1029.1-25: List of kouretes under Quintus Cerrinius Cimber, prytanis between AD 112 and 120; found in the porch of the prytaneion. Measurements: 139 x 115 cm. Date: AD 112-120. Illustration: Fig. 32.

During the prytany of Quintus Cerrinius Cimber the son of Lucius of the tribe Ultinia, the pious and Emperor-loving kouretes were:
Lucius Tarutilius Tyrannus, a *kouros* for the third time; Marcus Ugellius Montanus the son of Marcus of the tribe Fabia; Publius Cornelius Anicetus; Lucius Caecilius Rufus, a member of the *gerousia*; Callinicus Eucarpus the son of Callinicus the son of Bacchius; Tiberius Claudius Gemellus.

The sacrificing priests were:

Publius Cornelius Ariston, a member of the *boule* was the omen-taker; Mundicius the younger was the *hierophant*; Mundicius (the elder) was the *hagnearch* for life; Epicrates was the sacred servant who was the herald; Trypho was the revered servant who tended the incense; Trophimus led the libations; Parsius was the sacred servant who was trumpeter.

(62) *FiE* IX/1/1 no. b32; *IEph* 1032.1-26: List of *kouretes* under Gaius Terentius Flavianus, *prytanis* between c. AD 130 and 140; found in the hearth-room of the prytaneion. Measurements: 154 x 115 cm. Date: the daughter of Terentius Flavianus was honoured under Marcus Aurelius or Commodus (*IEph* 720a); Terentius Flavianus himself was *grammateus* of the *polis* in about AD 140. c. AD 130-140. Illustration: Fig. 33.
Translation:

During the prytanny of Gaius Terentius Flavianus the son of Gaius of the tribe Palatina, the pious and Emperor-loving kouretes were:

Gaius Terentius Beratius, a member of the boule and brother of the prytanis; Publius Beratius Posidonius; Lucius Tarutilius Quartus, a member of the boule; Tiberius Claudius Felix, a member of the boule; Quintus Nerius Saturninus, an extraordinary member of the boule; Publius Aelius Isas Flavianus, a member of the gerousia.

The sacrificing priests were:

Publius Cornelius Ariston, a member of the boule, was the omen-taker; Lysimachus Mundicius was the hierophant; Epicrates was the sacred herald; Onesimus was the sacred servant in charge of tending the incense; Metrodorus was the sacred servant who led the libations.

(63) FiE IX/1/1 no. b39; IEph 1039.1-12: list of kouretes; unknown findspot.

Measurements: 72 x 166 x 29 cm. Date: AD 150-192. Illustration: Fig. 34.

During the prytanny of ... the pious and Emperor-loving kouretes were:

... Venustus, a member of the gerousia.

The sacrificing priests were:

Lysimachus Mundicius the son of Lysimachus the son of Lysimachus, a member of the boule, was the hierophant; Publius Cornelius Ariston was the interpreter of omens; and Claudius Diadochianus; Epicrates was the sacred herald; Onesimus was the sacred servant in charge of tending the incense; Metrodorus was the sacred servant who led the libations; Lucius Cosinnius Gaeanus was the sacred servant who was the trumpeter.

(64) FiE IX/1/1 no. b40; IEph 1040.1-30: List of kouretes under Publius Aelius Pontius Attalianus, prytanis in the second half of the second century AD; found in the Hestia-roon of the prytaneion. Measurements: 176 x 115. Date: AD 150-192. Illustration: Fig. 35.
During the prytanny of Publius Aelius Pontius Attalianus, the pious kouretes were: Aulus Larcius Julianus, a kinsman of the prytanis and a member of the boule; Publius Claudius Trypho, a member of the boule; Bacchius the son of Zeuxius, a kinsman of the prytanis and a member of the gerousia; Aemelius Menander, a member of the boule; Apollonianus the son of Apollonius the son of Athenaeus, a kinsman of the prytanis; Lucius Sentius Orpegianus, a member of the boule; Epicrates the son of Epicrates the son of Salustius.

The sacrificing priests were: Lysimachus Mundicius the son of Lysimachus the son of Lysimachus the son of Lysimachus was the hierophant; Publius Cornelius Ariston was the omen-taker; Epicrates was the sacred herald; Onesimus, a member of the gerousia, was the sacred servant who was in charge of the incense; Metrodorus was the sacred servant in charge of the libation; Lucius Cosinnius Gaeanus was the sacred servant who was the trumpeter.
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(65) *FiE* IX/1/1 no. 654; *IEph* 47.1-7; *AAWW* 96, 41-42: List of donors and *kouretes* under Marcus Aurelius Menemachus, *prytanis* under Commodus. Found in the porch of the *prytaneion*. Measurements: the inscription survives on four fragments: 142 x 92 x 7-10 cm, 59 x 72 x 7-10 cm, 22 x 65 x 7-10 cm; 29 x 69 x 7-10 cm. Date: AD 180-192. Illustration: Fig. 36.

| επὶ πρυτάνεως Μ(άρκου) Αὐρ(ηλίου) Μενεμάχου |
| Τοῦ καὶ ἀνανεωσμένου τὸ ἱερὸν συνεδρίου τῶν κουρήτων δόντος διανομάς ὁσας καὶ τῇ γερουσίᾳ [[Ḳομῳδιανή]] |
| επὶ ἄρχοντος Φίλωνος β' τοῦ Ἐρμολάου φιλοσεβάστου καὶ Ἐρμεία β' Ἀπολλωνίου ὁσοι καθέρωσαν πρυτάνεις τοῖς κεκουρητευκόσιν |

Translation:

During the prytany of Marcus Aurelius Menemachus who, having renewed the sacred Assembly (συνεδρίον) of the *kouretes*, gave bountiful distributions also to the Commodian *gerousia*, when Philo, the Emperor-loving son of Philo the son of Hermolaus, and Hermelias Apollonius the son of Hermelias were archons, the following members of the prytany donated for the preparation of the *kouretes*:

[There follows a list of donors contributing seven thousand three hundred denarii and an incomplete list of *kouretes*.]

(66) *IEph* 1055B.1-13; *JÖAI* 53 (1981-1982): 108, no. 65: List of *kouretes*; from the Church of St. John. Measurements: 51.5 x 19 x 30 cm. Date: Dies the son of Alexander appears in an inscription dated to the reign of Commodus (*IEph* 613); Alexander the son of Dies also appears under Commodus (*IEph* 613a). AD 180-192.

| [- -] κούρης [- -] |
| [- -] δὲ Διήνους [- -] |
| [τοῦ] 'Ἀλέξανδρον [- -] |
| [τοῦ] Διήνους, ὁ[δέλφος [- -] |
| [τῆς] πρυτάνεως [- -] |
| [Αὐρ]ήλιος Τα-[ - -] |
| [άδελφος τῆς [- -] |
| [- πρωτάνεως [- -] |
| [- -] ἔλλοι [- -] |
| [- -] .αμυ[- -] |
| [- -] ἔτοι [- -] |
| [- -] γερουσίας [- -] |
| [- -] Ἰωβασίως [- -] |

Translation:

...and... the son of Dies...the son of Alexander...the son of Dies, the brother of the *prytanis*; Aurelius Ta...the brother of the *prytanis*...lus the son of...a member of the *gerousia*; Bassus...
(67) *IEph* 1057.1-14; *FiE* IX/1/1 Nachtrag no. 2: fragments of a list of *kouretes*; found in the hearth-room of the prytaneion. Measurements: the inscription survives in several fragments: 26 x 24 cm, 26 x 24 cm, 27 x 25 cm, 31 x 32 cm, 21 x 25 cm. Date: AD 180-192. Illustration: Fig. 37.

When our lord was prytanis...[the kouretes were:] Claudius Peius...a member of the *boule*; Men...Gabinus Antoninus...a member of the *boule*; Strate...Doryphorus...a member of the *boule*;...Aurelius...Aurelius Eros the son of Eros...acrobat...Marcus...Julius Marcianus...a member of the *gerousia*...a member of the *boule* was hierophant...when Aurelius Telephus and...were archons of the *boule* (συνεδρίου).

(68) *IEph* 907.1-19: list of *leukophorountes*; found in the theatre gymnasium. Measurements unknown. Date: ...appears in a list of donars dated to AD 216/217. c. AD 216/217.
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The following men were the wearers of white robes: the revered Tiberius Claudius Quadratus; Trypho the son of Juventius the son of...; Gellius Priscus, a chrysophorus; Gnaeus Julius Artemidorus, a member of the gerousia and a chrysophorus; Lucius Aurelius Trypho, a chrysophorus; ...Ageleius Quintus, a chrysophorus; Daphnes the son of Craterus the son of Apollonius; Justus the son of Justus the son of Justus; Craterus the son of Daphnes the son of Craterus the son of Apollonius; Priscus the son of Didymus the son of Dionices the son of Parius; Trophimus the son of Nicostratus the son of Nicostratus the son of Aelius; Philo the son of Apollonides the son of Diodorus; Carpimus Bous the son of Straticicus; Socrates the son of Miletes; Moschion the son of Zosimus; Lucius Aurelius Trypho the younger, a chrysophorus; Amianus the son of the revered Tiberius Claudius Quadratus; Ageleius Quintus the younger, a chrysophorus.

(69) IEph 2926.1-4; list of temple-wardens; unkown findspot. Measurements unknown. Date: The tribal name Antoniane indicates that the inscription may have been erected during the reign of Antoninus Pius at the earliest, or, if the tribe was created in response to the constitutio Antoniniana, during that of Caracalla (cf. above, pp. 55-58, 75 & cat. no. 69; Knibbe [1962-1963]: 30). Late second to early third century AD.

(70) IEph 1151.1-15: List of epheboi; found in Arcadiane street. Measurements: 105 x 92 x 25 cm. Undated.
... Emperor-loving son of Julius Lucullus... the Emperor-loving Proculus ... the Emperor-loving Rufus of the tribe Palatina... the Emperor-loving... Julian[us]... Hadrian... the agonothetes of the ephebes... Pompeius Sestullianus Titus Flavius Pompeius Marcellinus... Luceaus... Munatius Longinus... son of Primigenius the ephebarch... who also made endowments for the ephebes and for those accustomed to be honoured... on the birthday of the goddess, and who also gave distributions to the boule and to the gerousia and to all the assemblies in the same year; he was the sacred herald.
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(71) *IEph* 2295.1-4; *JOA* 52 (1978-80): 59, no. 127: funerary inscription of Gaius Octavius Magnus; found east of the city hill. Measurements: 53 x 72.5 x 36cm.

Date: Given the *nomen* and *praenomen*, one is inclined to assign an early imperial date to this inscription.

Translation:

This is the tomb of Gaius Octavius Magnus, elder.

(72) *IEph* 4123.1-21; *FiE* IV, 1. pp. 96-97, no. 23; cf. *AE* 1935: 169: bilingual funerary inscription for Gaius Stertinius Orpex and his family; from the plaster in the ceiling of the Konzilskirche. Measurements unknown. Date: Gaius Stertinius Maximus, the former owner of Orpex, was consul in AD 23. The inscription therefore belongs to the second to third quarter of the first century AD. Cf. cat. no. 34. Illustration: Figs. 38 & 39.

C(aius) Stertinius C(aii) Stertini Maximi consularis

l(ibertus) Orpex quondam scriba librarius hic situs est et

Stertiniia C(aii) l(iberta) Quieta

C(aius) Stertinius C(aii) f(ii)lius Marinus v(ixit) a(nnis) VIII

C(aius) Stertinius C(aii) f(ii)lius Asiaticus v(ixit) a(nnis) III

Stertiniia C(aii) f(ilia) Prisca v(ixit) a(nnis) VIII

οὗτος μετὰ Μαρείνης [τὴς] θυγατρὸς [---]

[-- -- -- -] ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ ἀνέθηκαν 'Ασκληπιὸν σὺν 'Υγιείᾳ σὺν "Υπνῷ σὺν παντὶ αὐτῶν κόσμῳ, καθιέρωσαν δὲ καὶ τῇ 'Εφεσίᾳ βουλῇ καὶ ἑρείσιν Χ πεντακισχέιλια, ἵνα πρὸς ταῖς τειμαῖς αὐτῶν ταῖς ἐν τῇ τετραγώνῳ ἄγορᾷ

[---]

[......] λαμβάνωσιν διανομὴν οἱ παρόντες ἀνά δραχμᾶς ἵσσωμιράς, καὶ τῇ γερουσίᾳ Χ δισειρίεα πεντακόσια, ἵνα λαμβάνωσι διανομὴν κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν ἑκαστὸν ἀνὰ δημάρχα β’, ὁμοίως καθιέρωσαν τῇ αὐτῇ γερουσίᾳ ἄλλα Χ χειλία πεντακόσια, ὅπως ἐκ τῆς προσόδου αὐτῶν κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν ἑκαστὸν οἱ κληροθέντες ἀνθρώποι λαμβάνοντι ἐπὶ ταῖς τόποις εἰς εἰσωγίαν ἑκαστὸς τὰ ἔδρα καὶ ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν τὰ τριάκοντα

[......] λαμβάνωσιν Χ εἰκοσὶ καὶ τραγεικῷ (?) Χ δέκα, ὁμοίως ἑκάστῳ [---]

[-- -- -- -- -] καὶ λείτους τρεῖς, φ[---]

Καλένδαις Μαΐασ

[-- -- -- -- -] ὁμοίως [---] εἰς τὸ γεροντεῖον Χ πεντακόσια.
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Translation:

(Latin) Gaius Stertinius Orpex, freedman of the consular Gaius Stertinius Maximus, who was once a bookkeeping clerk, lies here, as does Stertinia Quieta, a freedwoman of Gaius; and Gaius Stertinius Marinus, the son of Gaius, who lived eight years; and Gaius Stertinius Asiaticus, the son of Gaius, who lived three years; and Stertinia Prisca, the daughter of Gaius, who lived eight years.

(Greek) This one with his daughter Marina...dedicated in the gymnasium a statue of Asclepius with Health and Sleep with all their adornments, and they also donated to the boule of the Ephesians and to the priests five thousand denarii, so that beside their statues which are in the tetragonous agora...those who are present might receive a distribution of an equal number of drachmas; and they donated to the gerousia two thousand five hundred denarii, so that they might receive an annual distribution at a rate of two denarii each; in the same way, they donated to the same gerousia another one thousand five hundred denarii, so that from the interest of this money each year men who have been selected by lot might receive three denarii each at the places for a feast and so that from the remaining thirty denarii they might receive twenty for ... and ten for a tragic performance; and in the same way to each...and three pounds...on the Kalends of May...and in the same way the same for the gerontion.

(73) IEph 2109.1-14; JÖAI 53 (1981-1982): 94, no. 17; SEG 37: 908: funerary inscription in elegiacs; built into the south wall of the Library of Celsus. Measurements 31 x 180 x 40 cm. Date: if the stone was incorporated into the original building of the library and not later repairs, it must date to the first century AD at the latest.
But I do not lament such a mournful life nor having been snatched away from Glykon’s love and from his bed under the sun which is so sweet to all mortals.

By a blameless agreement of my husband the pity of our common friends did not leave me when I was bed-ridden with pains during childbirth. This tomb is...of the wife of the Emperor-loving Glykon, a temple warden, a strategos, an outstanding liturgist and.... The gerousia and those who have been temple wardens and the essenes of the goddess take care of this heroon.

(74) *IEph* 4117.a-d; *FiE* IV, I, p. 93, no. 17: funerary inscription by Iulia Domnula for herself and her family; found in the plaster of the ceiling of the Konzilskirche.

Measurements: 104 x 226. Date: Julia Domnula may be a freedwoman of Julia Domna. AD 192-212. Illustration: Figs. 40 & 41.

Translation:

Julia Domnula has prepared this tomb from her own money for herself and for Gaius Julius Phoebus her husband and for Gaius Julius Melior and for Gaius Julius Phoebianus; she lives; this tomb will not pass to the heirs; permission is also granted to Julianus and his descendants. The gerousia will take care of this tomb.

A share outside the crypt is also granted to the freedmen and their descendants; but if anyone opens my crypt once I have died, let him pay to the gerousia ten thousand denarii.

The boule will also take care of this tomb and of this crypt.
The great college of the Augustales will also take care of this tomb and of this crypt.

(75) JÖAI 26 (1930): 17-18, no. II.1-2: funerary inscription from a reused sarcophagus; found in the mausoleum of Claudia Tatiana. Measurements: unknown. Date: the inscription probably belongs to the second use of the sarcophagus. Keil dates the first inscription to the second half of the second century AD, so the second cannot be earlier than the third century AD.

\[\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\ \eta\ \sigma\sigmaο\rho\delta\ έστιν \ Ζωτίκου\ Ζωστατών\ \απέλευθερον\ γερουσιαστού\]
\[και\ \\gammaυναίκος\ \αυτού\ \Μουνία\ Ρουφείνας\ \και\ \Αυρηλίου\ \Μουνίου\ \Ρουφείνου.\]

Translation:
This is the tomb of Zoticus, a freedman of the Augusti and a member of the gerousia, and of his wife Munnia Rufina and of Aurelius Munnius Rufinus.


\[\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\ \η\ \sigma\sigmaο\rho\δ\ έστιν\ Κλαυδίου\ \'Αντιστίου\ \'Αντιόχου\]
\[\'Εφεσίου\ \γερουσιάστου\ \και\ \\gammaυναίκος\ \αυτού\]
\[Αυρηλίου\ \Ρουφείνης\ \και\ \\τέκνων\ \\αυτών\]
\[ζωσίν.\]

Translation:
This is the tomb of Claudius Antistius Antiochus, an Ephesian and a member of the gerousia, and of his wife Aurelia Rufina and their children. They are alive.

(77) IEph 2524.1-9; JÖAI 53 (1981-1982): 103-104, no. 50; fragment of a base; from the Church of St. John. Measurements: 46 x 45 x 40.5 cm. Undated.

\[το\upsilon\ ί τα\ \οικήματα\]
\[\sigma\upsilon\ \\tauη\ \\sigmaκουλώσει\]
\[\tauη\ \\Συνναδική\ \\kai\ \\tauη\]
\[\varepsilon\upsilon\ \\alphaυτό\ς\ \\sigmaσο\ ρ\ \\kai-\]
\[\mu\upsilon\\epsilonνη\ \\Συνναδική\]
\[\\kai\ \\\ο\ \\thηκα\ \\epsilonισ\ φ\]
\[\\Φλαβία\ \\Αυ[- -\kai-\]]
\[\\Μενεκρ[\ατους\ \\γερου-\]]
\[\\\sigmaις\ \\του\]

Translation:
These buildings with the marble revetment from Synnada and the marble from Synnada lying within them in the tomb and the graves belong to Flavia Aurelia (?) and Menecrates, a member of the gerousia.

[- - -] ΄Εφέσται πρεσβύτερων [- - -]

[- - έ]τερον ἔξεσται βληθῆναι ἂ μὴ αὐτοῖς τοῖς [- - -]

Translation:

...the Ephesians of the Elders...it is not permitted for another to be placed within, unless with these very...

(79) *IEph* 2446.2.1-4: sarcophagus for a member of the *gerousia*; from Panaghir Dagh (eastern face). Measurements: 130 x 290 x 135 cm. Undated.

ή σοφός ἐστιν σὺν ὦ ἐπίκειται καὶ τῷ πρὸ τῆς σοφοῦ ἀνωτέρω ἡμωαφίω καὶ τῷ κυκλώσει ανετῷ τόπῳ παντί καὶ τῷ . . . . . . . . . . . . θυγασιστοῦ ὑμνοδοῦ λαμπαδάρχου καὶ γυναικός αὐτοῦ Αὐρ(ηλίας) Κυρίλλης καὶ τέκνων·

ἐν οίς οὐδὲν ἔξεσται ταφῆναι, ἐπεὶ δώσει τῇ συνεργασίᾳ τῶν λινύφων ἡ μύριοι· οίς καὶ καθέρωσεν ἐξ ἐς ἔξωσιν.

Translation:

The tomb with what lies within it and with the grave altar in front of the tomb and with all the consecrated circular area and with...belong to...a member of the *gerousia*, a *hymnodos* and leader of the torch race and his wife Aurelia Cyrilla and their children; among whom it is not lawful for anyone to be buried; otherwise, he will give to the college of *linuphoi* ten thousand denarii; and he will donate to them five thousand denarii; they are alive.


γερουσιαστοῦ

αὐτῆς ἂ σοφός ἐστιν Αὐρ(ηλίας) Ἡσυχίου Πλακουντᾶ καὶ γυναικός αὐτοῦ

Αὐρ(ηλίας) Ἐλπιδος καὶ τέκνων· ἔξωσιν.

Translation:

This is the tomb of Aurelius Hesychion the baker, a member of the *gerousia*, and his wife, Aurelia Elpis, and their children; they are alive.

(81) *IEph* 1648.1-10; *GIBM* 648; Oliver, *SG* 17: funerary inscription for Publia Iulia Beryla; unknown findspot. Lines 1-3 and 6-10 were inscribed at the same time, but lines 4-5 appear to have been "inserted in smaller characters of different style, as an afterthought" (Hicks). Measurements: 42.3 x 74cm. Undated. Illustration: Fig. 42.

tὸ μυπατοῦ ἐστὶ

Ποπλίας,<1>ςουλείας<ς> Βηρύλας καὶ

τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς· ἔξωσιν.

καὶ τοῦ συμβίου αὐτῆς Μενάν-
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(82) *IEph* 2266.1-14: bilingual funerary inscription by Hellenia Meroe for herself; found in a building beyond Domitian-Street. Measurements: 88 x 69 x 30cm. Undated. Illustration: Fig. 43.

**Greek**

v(ivit) Hellenia Sex(ti) l(iberta) Meroe sibi et P(ublio) Castricio Valenti viro suo-

καὶ Καστρίκια Τράλλιδι ζῆν καὶ Ποιμέλω Καστρίκιω Ψτρόφος ζῆν καὶ [Καστρίκιω] Ἐλληνίω Ἀγαθόποδι ζῆν καὶ τοὺς τούτους ἑγγόνες τοῦτο τὸ μνημεῖον κληρονόμοις ὑπὸ ἀκολουθήσει τοῦτο τοῦ μνημείου ἡ γερουσία κηδεται

h(oc) m(onumentum) h(eredem) n(on) s(equetur).

**Translation:**

(Latin) Hellenia Meroe, freedwoman of Sextus, who is alive, has built this for herself and for Publius Castricius Valens, her husband. This monument will not pass to her heirs.

(Greek) Hellenia Meroe the freedwoman of Sextus, who is alive, has built this for herself and for Publius Castricius Valens her husband and for Bassus and Iucundus and Publius Castricius Hermas, who is alive; and for Castricia Tychice and for Publius Castricius Nymphodotus, who is alive; and for Castricius Trallis, who is alive; and for Publius Castricius Stephanus, who is alive; and for Castricius Hellenius Agathopus, who is alive; and for the descendants of these people; this tomb will not pass to her heirs; the gerousia will take care of this tomb.
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(83) IEph 1636.6-17; Hermes 4 (1870): 209, no. 18; CIL III 6087; GIBM 636; Oliver, SG 13: funerary inscription for Claudia Magna; unknown find-spot.

Measurements: 80 x 47.5 x 50 cm. Undated.

Claudia Magna
Tiberius Claudius
Diogenetou genē
mēnīm 1diā-

δς δυ ταύτα τα γράμ-

ματα εκκόψη ἦ

ἀλλότρια δοτὰ βαλὴ.

ὑπεύθυνος ἔστω τῇ

γερουσίᾳ καὶ συ'

καὶ τοῖς ταμίαις τῆς

πόλεως καὶ συ'

ἐξῆσεν ἐπὶ λῃ μῆνες β' ὦρας δ'.

Translation:
The wife of Tiberius Claudius Diognetes built this for her own mother Claudia Magna; whoever strikes out these letters or inter the bones of someone else will be liable to the gerousia for two hundred and fifty denarii and to the treasurers of the city two hundred and fifty denarii. She lived thirty-eight years, two months and four hours.

(84) IEph 2299B.1-14: two sarcophagi for Paulina and her family; from the Hermaion. Measurements: 80 x 70 x ? cm, 82 x 217 x 80 cm. Undated.

[ταύτην τῇν σορόν ἐ[ποίησεν ἐκατῆ - - - ]

[-- Παυλ]είνα: ζήτ. καὶ Φλαουία . [- - - ]

εὶ μῆ. [-- -]λία Γνατοῦ θυγατρὶ. Παυλίνη

[-- καὶ Φ]λαουίῳ Τυράννῳ τῷ ἀνδρὶ·

συνενε δὲ εξέσ- παλήσαι τούτῳ τὸ μνημεῖον ἢ τὰς ἐπι-

κεψενας νας σοροῦς ἢ εἰςενεκέθημαι ἢ τεθῆμαι εἰς αὑτὸ

ἡ ἐις τὰς σοροὺς βληθῆμαι· ὁμοίως συνενε δέξησαι τῶν κειμένων τινὰ

μεταθέται ἢ βαστάσαι ἢ μετεπιγράψαι τα τῶν ἐπιγραμμένων ἢ ἔπερον τι

προσγράψαι

ἡ εκκόψαι ἢ ποιήσαι τι ὑπεναντίον ταῖς ἐνεκχειραγμένοις· εἰ δὲ μῆ, ὁ
tολμήσας τι

παρὰ τὰ προγραμμένα ἢ ποιήσαις<ς> τι ὑπεναντίον τοῦτος

ἀποδώσει τῇ Ἐφεσίων βουλῆ δην(άρια) μ(ύρια) α',β"'f

καὶ τῇ Ἐφεσίων γερουσίᾳ δην(άρια) μ(ύρια) α',β"'

ἐξουσίας ὁστῆς παντὶ τῷ

βουλομένω ὄγειν περὶ τού-
tου.
Translation:

Paulina, who is alive, made this tomb for herself, and for Flavia...unless...for Paulina the daughter of Gnaeus...and for Flavius Tyrannus her husband; it is not permitted to anyone to buy this tomb or the associated tombs or to bury anyone in them or to insert anyone into these tombs; in the same way it is not permitted to anyone to remove any of those who are buried or to cast them out or to alter any of those things which have been inscribed or to add anything additional or to strike out or do anything contrary to these rules; otherwise, the one who has dared or has done anything against these rules will pay to the boule of the Ephesians twelve thousand five hundred denarii and to the gerousia of the Ephesians twelve thousand five hundred denarii, with responsibility for this lying with any who wish to act.

(85) JOAI 55 (1984): 124 no. 4265.1-15; SEG 34, 1140: funerary inscription for Poseas the son of Artemon and others; found near the Magnesian gate. Measurements: 59 x 38 x 29 cm. Undated.

Translation:

This is the tomb of Poseas the son of Artemon and of Diocles the son of Apollonius; Apollonius the son Artemon the son of Poseas, who is alive; Grapte the daughter of Artemon, who is alive; Gaius Lollius Rufus, who is alive. Antigonus the son of Antigonus, who is alive; Antigonus Gaius the son of Antigonus, who is alive; Plotia Elpis, who is alive. The gerousia shall have care of this tomb.

(86) JOAI 55 (1984): 140 no. 4364.1-4; SEG 34, 1159: funerary inscription for an individual of the tribe Quirina; fragment of a sarcophagus found near the Church of St. John. Measurements: 38.5 x 95 x 17.5 cm. Undated.

[αὐτὴ ἡ σοφὸς:] ἔστιν
[- - - - - K]ὑρείνα
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[ - ταύτης τῆς σοφού
[κήρεται ἡ γεροῦσια.

Translation:

This is the tomb of...of the tribe Quirina...the gerousia has care of this tomb.

(87) *IEph* 2437.1-2: fragment of a funerary inscription for an unnamed individual; found built into the theatre. Measurements: 115 x 120 x 30 cm. Undated.

[- - - -] μοῦ ἡ βουλὴ κήρεται.
[- - μοῦ ἡ γεροῦσια κήρεται.

Translation:

...the boule has care of my tomb...the gerousia has care of my tomb.


[- - - - τ]οῦ μ[ημείου τούτου κήρεται]
[- - ἡ γε]ρουσία κα[τ] - - -

Translation:

...the gerousia and the...have care of this tomb.

(89) *ZPE* 91 (1992): 291, nos 19-20: funerary inscription for Artemon and others; unspecified findspot. Measurements: 57 x 37cm. Undated. Illustration: Fig. 44.

'Ἀρτέμων Μητροδώρου,
Μυραλλίς Δημητρίου,
Φρύνιχος Ἀγήσωνος,
Ἀγήσων Ἀγήσωνος,
τοῦ μημείου
καὶ τοῦ βαιμοῦ
Στράτων πραγματικός
ἀπὸ γερουσίας κήρεται

Translation:

This tomb belongs to Artemon the son of Metrodorus, Myrallis the daughter of Demetrius, Phrynichus the son of Hageson and Hageson the son of Hageson.

Straton the pragrammatikos of the gerousia has care of this tome and altar.


[- - - - - - - - - - -] μένων [- -]
[- - - - - - - - - - -] μετακεινη-
[σαι ἡ γράμματα ἐκκ]όμοια, ὑπεύ-
[θυνός ἔστω τῇ γε]ρουσίᾳ Χ βφ
Translation:
...[if anyone dares] to remove the bones or to strike out the letters, let him be liable to the gerousia for two thousand five hundred denarii.


[- - - - - ]κηδεται
[- - - ή γερουσία

Translation:
... the gerousia has care [of this tomb]....
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Figure 3: Excavated City Centre of Ephesus (White 2004)
Fig. 4: Reconstructed Elevation of the Prytaneion (FiE IX/I/I, Beilage I & II)
Fig. 6: Cat. no. 2, line drawing (*GIBM*, 470)

Fig. 5: Cat. no. 1, line drawing (*FiE IX/I1*, Tafel I, A2)
Fig. 7: Cat. no. 3, photo *(IEph Vol. I, Tafel X, no. 8)*
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Fig. 8: Cat. nos. 15, 53 & 54, photo (IEph Vol. I, Tafel 35, no. 27)

Fig. 9: Cat. no. 17, photo, fragments a & b (IEph Vol. I, Tafel 25)
Fig. 10: Cat. no. 17, photo, fragments c & d (IEph Vol. I, Tafel 26)

Fig. 11: Cat. no. 17, photo, fragment e (IEph Vol. I, Tafel 27)
Appendix II: Maps and Additional Figures

Fig. 12: Cat. no. 17, line drawing (FLF II, p. 120, no. 23)
Fig. 13: Cat. no. 19, photo (*IEph* Vol. I, Tafel 31)
Fig. 14: Cat. no. 21, squeeze (FIE IX/I/I, Tafel XXVIII, C1)

ΦΙΛΟΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ Ν(ος)
ΟΠΟΙΟΣ ΑΥΘΑΙΡΕΤ(ος)
ΦΙΛΟΤΕΙΜΩΣ ΤΗΝ
ΑΡΧΗΝ ΕΠΙΤΕΛΕΣΑΣ
ΜΕΤΑ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΔΕΛ
ΦΟΥ ΔΙΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ

4>IAOTEIMZ TOYN

AIO|~ENOYZ

AYO AIZZHNIAS

(i)BQZ KAI (i)AOTEIMZ

KAI <(i)A.

TATPI MOY KAI TH ZYMH

NΩ MOY AYP. ΕΠΑΙΓΑΘΩ

ΚΑΙ ΝΥΚΤΟΦΥΛΑΚΗΣΑΣ

ΤΑΣ ΔΥΟ ΝΥΚΤΟΦΥΛΑΚΑΣ

ΕΚ ΤΩΝ 1ΔΙ(ων)

ΜΕΤΕΧΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΣΕΒΑ
ΣΤΟΥ ΓΕΡΟΥΣΙΑΣ ΦΥ. ΑΝΤΩΝΙΑ
ΝΗΣ Χ ΠΑΙΑΝΙΕΥΣ.

Fig. 15: Cat. no. 22, line drawing (AD 7 [1921-2]: 113, abb. 28)

Fig. 16: Cat. no. 22, photo (AD 7 [1921-2]: 113, abb. 28)
Fig. 17: Cat. no. 23, line drawing (GIBM 587a+b)

Fig. 18: Cat. no. 26, line drawing (GIBM 575)

Fig. 19: Cat. no. 31, squeeze (JÖAI 48 [1966-7]: 13-14, abb. 6)
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Fig. 20: Cat. no. 32, photo (ZPE 120 [1998]: 71, no. 8)

Fig. 21: Cat. no. 39, line drawing (FiE II, p. 175, no. 61.II)
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Fig. 22: Cat. no. 40, line drawing (BCH 10 [1886]: 517, no. 8)

Fig. 23: Cat. no. 43, line drawing (CIL III.6078)

Fig. 24: Cat. no. 44, line drawing (GIBM 604)

Fig. 25: Cat. no. 47, squeeze (FiE IV, III, p. 283, no 30, abb. 5)
Fig. 26: Cat. no. 48, photo (JÖAI 49 [1968-71]: 57, abb. 25)
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Fig. 27: Cat. no. 49, photo (FiE III, p. 143, no. 58)
Fig. 28: Cat. no. 55, photo (*I Eph* Vol. 1, Tafel 36)
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Fig. 29: Cat. no. 56, line drawing, fragments 1 & 2 (FiE II, p. 109, no. 20)

Fig. 30: Cat. no. 56, line drawing, fragment 3 (FiE II, p. 110, no. 20)

Fig. 31: Cat. no. 60, squeeze (FiE IX/I/I, Tafel XI, B22)
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Fig. 32: Cat. no. 61, squeeze (FiE IX/I, Tafel XIV, B29)

Fig. 33: Cat. no. 62, squeeze (FiE IX/I, Tafel XVI, B32)
Fig. 34: Cat. no. 63, squeeze (FiE IX/I, Tafel XIX, B39)
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Fig. 35: Cat. no. 64, squeeze (*FiE* IX/I/I, Tafel XX, B40)

Fig. 36: Cat. no. 65, squeeze (*FiE* IX/I/I, Tafel XXVII, B54)
Fig. 37: Cat. no. 67, squeeze (*FiE* IX/1/1, Tafel XXXIX, N2a, b, d)

Fig. 38: Cat. no. 72, photo (*FiE* IV, I, p. 96, no. 23)
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Fig. 39: Cat. no. 72, photo (FiE IV, I, p. 96, no. 23)

Fig. 40: Cat. no. 74, photo (FiE IV, I, p. 93, no. 17)
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Fig. 41: Cat. no. 74, photo (FiE IV, I, p. 93, no. 17)

Fig. 42: Cat. no. 81, line drawing (GIBM 648)

Fig. 43: Cat. no. 82, line drawing (CIL 3.6087)
Fig. 44: Cat. no. 89, photo (ZPE 91 [1992] Tafel 13