APPENDIX II

DATES OF THE ASIARCHS FROM A FAMILY OF CIBYRA

Rosalinde Kearsley presented arguments in "A Leading Family of Cibyra and some Asiarchs of the First Century," that one family with several generations of Asiarchs could be traced back so that at least one Asiarch could be dated to the late first century BCE. Her conclusion, however, is not correct.

Members of the family from Cibyra are mentioned in several inscriptions from that city (IGR 4.883, 906-10, 912) so that the order of the generations can be reconstructed. On the basis of IGR 4.908, Kearsley proposed a dating of the family that was earlier than that of Halfmann. IGR 4.908 honors Ti. Cl. Celsus Orestianus and his wife Flavia Lycia, who held provincial highpriesthoods in Pergamum. The crucial phrase is in l. 7-9: ἀρχερατεύσαντας τῆς Ἀσιᾶς τῶν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ δίς νεωκόρῳ Περγάμῳ ναῶν. Kearsley took this phrase to mean "who held highpriesthoods of Asia of the temples in once and twice neokorate Pergamum;" i.e., one held a highpriesthood when Pergamum had one provincial cult and one held a highpriesthood when the city had two such cults. If this were true, it would provide a firm date around 114 CE (when the second provincial cult was established) for the last members of the family; then generations could be calculated back into the first century BCE at approximately 30-year intervals.

This reading of the highpriesthood phrase is awkward because it requires one plural participle to refer to two highpriesthoods by two different people that are allegedly distinguished by the number of cults in the city at the times of service. More importantly, such a translation of the phrase would be unparalleled in the hundreds of inscriptions naming provincial highpriests and highpriestesses. The normal practice in such an inscription is to use as much praise for
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the city and the honorand as possible. If a city has two provincial cults, an inscription does not remind the reader that the city once had only one such cult.

The inscription does not refer to Pergamum’s first and second neokorate periods. Rather, it uses the city’s standard titulature (see above, p. 58) that appears in inscriptions such as IGR 4.331 and 4.1688 as a development of Pergamum’s claim to be the first city to have a provincial cult of the emperors (see IGR 4.456, 470 from the first neokorate period). The phrase does not call Pergamum “once and twice neokorate.” It should be translated: “who held high-priesthoods of Asia of the temples in first and twice neokorate Pergamum;” i.e., in twice neokorate Pergamum which was also the first city of Asia to be honored by a provincial cult. This means that the husband and wife can only be dated to some time during Pergamum’s second neokorate period (114-215). Since the language used in the group of inscriptions would fit much better in the late second/early third century CE, Halfmann’s dating of Orestianus’s father, Polemon, to the period of Marcus Aurelius is to be preferred.

Kearsley objected that Halfmann’s dating required the identification of M. Deiotarianus the Lyciarch (IGR 4.907, 912) with the equestrian and tribune Ti. M. Deiotarianus (IGR 3.472; 500 col. 3, l. 28-30), even though their titles are different (the former is a Lyciarch and not called an equestrian, nor is he named with military offices). She argued that such omissions would be inexplicable.3 This argument based on the absence of titles is not trustworthy, though. The number and kind of titles listed for an individual could vary according to the nature of the particular inscription, and according to that person’s place in that specific inscription. In IGR 4.907 (see above, p. 112, n. 177, for the text of the inscription), only Ti. Cl. Polemon, the person honored by the inscription, is described as equestrian; his brother, Ti. Cl. Deiotarianus, would have had the same rank but is not listed as equestrian because the dedication was not in his honor. Another example is found in IGR 4.912 where their mother is honored as the mother of senators, but the son Polemon is mentioned without any offices or status. This phenomenon is even more clear in two inscriptions from Phokaia: IGR 4.1323 honors a certain T. Fl. Hermokrates with a list of offices (imperial, provincial, and municipal) he has held, but he appears as a secondary
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