nos recherches en tenant compte de ces 'nouvelles' lectures et interprétations. De la même manière, ces contrôles sont le début des études de la réception des auteurs et des investigations de la vie d’Er. Szy. a entrepris cette tâche très ambitieuse, difficile, mais aussi passionnante et l’a menée à bien. il a poussé ses recherches très loin et nous les a communiquées pleinement.

Alors que nous quittons à petits pas la consultation de documents papier en faveur d’espaces électroniques, nous pensons qu’il est très important de profiter de l’immensité de ces derniers pour publier de telles recherches. La bonne formule serait peut-être un mélange des deux supports: le format papier tel qu’il existe ici, mais une version électronique de l’annotation qui permettrait de sonder sa richesse.

Strasbourg

*James Hirstein*


Lycia, in south-west Asia Minor, is one of the best studied parts of the eastern Roman empire. Close and usually friendly relations with Rome stretched back at least to 167 BC, when the region was recognised as independent from Rhodes, and the Lycians probably then instituted a cult for *Dea Roma*. Two recently published *foedera*, one probably dating to the second century BC (SEG LVII 1664), the other to 46 BC during the dictatorship of Caesar (SEG LV 1452), established *amicitia* between Lycia and Rome on a legal basis. The region became a province under Claudius, standing on its own from AD 43, and joined to Pamphylia after AD 70. Throughout the late hellenistic and Roman imperial periods, both during its quasi-independence and as a province, Lycia operated politically as a close-knit and formally organised federation of cities. In the provincial period the members of this federation met annually at their main sanctuary, the Letoon, between Xanthos and Patara, in the lower Xanthos valley, the Lycian heartland. For understanding how the constitution of the federation operated we are heavily dependent on the large dossier of documents which was carved on the heroon of Lycia’s most famous citizen and benefactor, Opramoas of Rhodiapolis. There were two consultative bodies, the *archairesiakē ekklesia* and the *boule*.

---


2 Nous avons signalé quelques erreurs de détail en examinant divers aspects de l’annotation de Szy. Quelques fautes mineures dans le texte latin ont attiré notre attention: p. 44, 885 lire non pas quo vis mais quouis; p. 46, 903 non pas e triuuis, mais e triuiis; p. 358, 36 non pas conatis mais conati et p. 321, 60 non pas uluntaten, mais –m.

3 For the rich harvest of new epigraphic finds, see C. Schuler (Hg.), Griechische Epigraphik in Lykien. Eine Zwischenbilanz (2007), and especially his own introduction (9–26).

Both in the hellenistic period (Strabo 14.3.3) and under the Roman empire, the cities of Lycia were represented in federal gatherings in proportion to their size and importance. However, both the qualifications for membership of the federal institutions and the detailed mechanisms by which the Lycians in practice reached political decisions are not completely transparent and remain a matter for discussion. At all events it is clear that the leading position in the federation was the archierosyne, the high priesthood of the imperial cult. High priests were chosen annually by the electoral assembly and were expected in return to make generous donations to the federation and/or individual member cities. Opramoas is the prime, but by no means the only well documented example of these.

This new study is a detailed prosopographical and socio-historical study of the 135 attested holders of the Lycian high priesthood. After an introduction to the state of current research, which includes a justification of the prosopographical approach which the book adopts, there are four substantial chapters, each divided into subsections. Chapter 2, 'Geschichte', deals with Archierosyne and Lykiarchia in the hellenistic period, and then discusses the two institutions (which in this new context were one and the same) under the Roman empire. Chapter 3, 'Institution', examines the key imperial office of archierous and its counterpart the archiereia as a social and political institution, discussing the requirements that office holders were expected to fulfil, and the rights to which they were entitled. Chapter 4, 'Euergetismus und Karriere', deals with the political and euergetistic activity of the high priests, especially in the various Lycian cities, and discusses the cases in which Lycian high priests also followed Roman equestrian or senatorial careers. Chapter 5, 'Gesellschaft', deals with the social context in which the high priests and their family members operated. This is divided between family connections, honours and office holding in the cities, activities in the Lycian federation, which included dealings with Roman provincial governors, and relations with the Roman emperors. Chapter 6 offers some brief general conclusions. Chapter 7, the longest in the book, is a prosopographical catalogue of 135 Lycian high priests, 110 of whose names are known. All the thematic chapters are based on close analysis of inscriptions, especially four major texts or groups of texts, which provide the basis for our understanding of the political and social environment of Roman Lycia: the large group of decrees and letters relating to Opramoas, which were carved on his mausoleum at Rhodiapolis (TAM II.3, 905); the smaller dossier of comparable documents which honoured another important Lycian benefactor, Iason of Kyaneai (IGR III 704); the texts for C. Iulius Demosthenes at Oinoanda under Hadrian, and the genealogical inscription carved on the tomb monument of Licinia Flavilla, also at Oinoanda (IGR III 500, with SEG XLVI 1709). These dossiers and other epigraphic texts are repeatedly exploited throughout the book to illustrate different aspects of the subject matter, and are duly listed in a detailed register of epigraphic
sources. However, despite the clear formal organisation of the book’s main chapters, there is inevitable overlapping between them in the discussions and for this reason the lack of a proper subject index is regrettable.

As the Lycian high priests were not allowed to hold office for a second time, we have some information about 54% of the c. 250 holders of this office between the creation of the province in AD 43 and the end of the third century AD. This compares favourably with the 213 named high-priests of the much larger neighbouring province of Asia, attested over a rather longer period, who represent a smaller proportion of the original total, as the number of provincial temples in Asia grew to five by the early third century, each with its own high priest.1 According to Pliny HN 5. 100 ff there were thirty-six cities in the imperial Lycian federation. This was an underestimate to judge by the 45 places, mostly with city status, that are listed in the Lycian Stadiasmus, the monument at Patara which listed the communities and the roads that connected them soon after the creation of the province.2 The attested high-priests and Lyciarchs come from twenty-two of these cities.3

R. rightly maintains the view that the high-priesthood of the Lycians, a description attested for the first person to hold this office, Eirenaios of Xanthos, ἀρχιερεύς Λυκίων,4 was essentially identical with the post of λυκιάρχης. The use of the different terms depended on the context in which they were used. Lykiarches becomes increasingly common in the later evidence. In this respect the Lycian evidence corroborates the use of archiereus and Asiarches to denote the corresponding imperial high priests in Asia. These were not separate offices but different ways of denoting the same position. The terms Asiarches/Lykiarches were not only shorter, but also politically and socially more eloquent. One of the reasons why they were so often applied in honorific texts to the high priests is that these were surely the words most often used in the acclamations of the assemblies, which hailed the provincial leaders on their election to office and on similar occasions. Such ἐπιβοήσεις were a regular feature of the electoral and honorific protocol of the Lycian voting assemblies, and we can surely assume that when the annual candidate was elected to become ἀρχιερεύς τῶν ἕβασιτῶν, the delegates showed their approval with a cry of Λυκιάρχης.5 Strabo 14. 3. 3 indicates that the term had already been introduced to designate the


2 For simplicity, I have attributed nos. 38 (Iason s. Embromos) and 40 (Demetrios s. Embromos) from R.’s list to Arykanda, as Embromos is also the name of another high priest attested there (no. 59). The name itself is typical for East Lycia, as R. notes in her prosopographical commentaries.

3 R. 35 and 166–7, citing an inscription that has only been partially published.

4 See Kokkinia, Opramoas Inschrift, 266 (index) for the references.
leaders of the federation, precisely at the time of their election, in the Hellenistic period: ἐν δὲ τῷ συνεδρίῳ πρῶτον μὲν Λυκιάρχης αἱρεῖται, and the practice was naturally continued under the empire.

R. 57–60 is puzzled by the term ἀπὸ λυκιαρχίας, which is used to describe high-priests or members of their families in the third century. After a speculative attempt to relate the usage to changed onomastic practices in the third century, she favours the notion that the term characterises the individual’s social status, ‘aus der Lykiarchie her(kommend)’. It seems more natural to understand it as a reference to distinguished ancestry, ‘descendant of lyciarchs’, thus corresponding to earlier and fuller formulations, which refer to Opramoas’ descent from προγόνων λυκιάρχων καὶ ἐν ταῖς πατρίσιν πρωτευόντων (TAM II, 3 901 III E, 4–7), or προγόνων λυκιάρχων καὶ πρωτευσάντων (TAM II, 3 903 V A, 6–7). These references to Opramoas’ forebears should surely not be understood as references to hellenistic lyciarchs (so R. 51), but to the family’s connections to high priests in the immediately preceding generations since the founding of the province. In one case the description ἀπὸ λυκιαρχίας is applied to a woman from Pisidian Termessos, Aurelia Neikiane Dibidoriane Armasta (TAM III, 1, 277 with R. 229 n. 66). In this case she should be removed from the list of Lycian priests or their immediate family members. This is an exceptional case of a family in a neighbouring region being able to trace a family connection to the Lycian high-priesthood in an earlier generation.

R. shows that Lycian society at the elite level was homogeneous. Members of the leading families naturally intermarried to the extent that the high-priests of the second century AD, despite the restrictions on repeated office holding, came from only twelve families. 1 Several families could trace their origins back over many generations, as the impressive stemmata in this study demonstrate (R. 120–8, 243–52). For the most part endogamy prevailed, so that although marriage connections were commonplace between leading families in Lycia, very few of them established comparable links outside the province. This did not prevent a modest, but not disproportionately small number of leading Lycians from making equestrian or senatorial careers.

The political unity and coherence of Lycia was reflected in the close-knit structure of its aristocratic society. Another factor underlying this regional unity was the geographical interdependence of the narrow coastal strip, with its important harbours, the major and very fertile river valleys, above all the Xanthos valley, and the highland interior. For environmental and especially climatic reasons there will have been a regular seasonal population movement between coastlands and the interior. In this respect R.’s book would have been improved by a simple map to illustrate the geographical and physical background to the interrelationships that she so ably documents in the epigraphic record.

Lycia’s political organisation gave rise not only to its federal institutions but also to a distinctive style of political activity. The principle of maintaining a form of proportional parity lay behind its laws and customs, so that no city or individual was allowed to exert excessive influence. This essentially oligarchic principle is already implicit in the proportionally different weight given to the voting power of different cities in the league. It must also have led to the regulation that no one should hold the high-priesthood a second time. The fact that the rule appears not to have been broken over some 250 years is important testimony to the relatively untroubled prosperity of Lycian society through this long period.

1 Zimmermann, ‘Die Archiereis des lykischen Bundes’.
R. notes only one instance, in AD 237, when the high priesthood remained unfilled, and one occasion in AD 118, when Opramoas’ youthful brother, Apollonius III, took the office with parental support. Presumably this was a year when no suitable elder candidate was available. In this respect the organisation of the Lycian high priesthood was unique. In Asia high priests could serve a second term; in the central Anatolian province of Galatia, cases are attested of high priests serving six, seven, and perhaps even ten terms of office. This points to a significantly different social structure from the relative egalitarianism to be found among Lycia’s elite society.

The description of the Lycian constitution, which Strabo derived from Artemidorus, already referred to Lycia’s orderly constitution and political processes in the later hellenistic period, which contrasted with the anarchic conditions more typical of the mountain regions of southern Asia Minor: Λύκιοι οὕτως πολιτικῶς καὶ σωφρόνως ζώντες διετέλεσαν ὅτε... ύστε... ὑπ’ οὐδενὸς ἐξηρήματα̂ν αἰσχροῦ κέρδους... ἄλλ’ ἔμειναν εἷς πατρὶς διοικήσας τοῦ Λυκικοῦ συστήματος (Strabo 14.1.3). It is not by accident that three of the Roman governors, in letters which testify to the virtues of Opramoas, referred to the provincial community as τοῦ σημαντικῶτα ἔθους (TAM II.3, 905 III A 6–7; V F 5–6; IX E 7). The federation strictly regulated the distribution of honours among its deserving members, so that benefactors and office holders were publicly recognised, but in appropriate ways that did not disturb precedent. Thus the decrees of the federation distinguished between five grades of honour awarded to him, and had to be resolved by the intervention of the emperor Antoninus Pius and the provincial governor. It is not surprising, then, that Cornelius Proculus, the governor involved in the dispute about Opramoas, should write in a subsequent letter to the city of Myra, that he approved the titles by which the city had agreed that Opramoas should be addressed, εἰ μὴ τούτ’ ἔστιν ὑπενάντιον ἢ τοῖς νόμοις ἢ τοῖς ἀθέους τοῖς πατρίῳ̂μιν (TAM II.3, 905, X D 12–13).

Opramoas dossier documents a dispute that arose in connection with the granting of a high priesthood to him, and had to be resolved by the intervention of the emperor Antoninus Pius and the provincial governor. It is not surprising, then, that Cornelius Proculus, the governor involved in the dispute about Opramoas, should write in a subsequent letter to the city of Myra, that he approved the titles by which the city had agreed that Opramoas should be addressed, εἰ μὴ τούτ’ ἔστιν ὑπενάντιον ἢ τοῖς νόμοις ἢ τοῖς ἀθέους τοῖς πατρίῳ̂μιν (TAM II.3, 905, X D 12–13).

Reitzenstein’s prosopographical approach in this excellently documented monograph pays more attention to social than to political questions, but provides a sure basis for future work on elite Lycian society under the Roman empire. Like the society that it describes, the investigation focuses tightly on Lycia itself. There is room for more comparative study which would emphasize the peculiarities of Lycia in contrast to other regions and provinces of the Roman east, and also help to explain the special relationship between the Lycians and Rome which continued long after the treaties of the republican period. In the meantime this is a fine addition to the growing bibliography of the region.

Sheffield
Stephen Mitchell

1 TAM II 3, 905 IV D, 8–9; V B 2, V G, 6–8, with R. 70 and 181–2.
3 Kokkina 2000 114–6 argues that the different grades of honour corresponded to portrait busts, statues and crowns in different combinations and made from materials of increasing value (bronze, gilded bronze, gold).
4 TAM II 3, 905 VII G; cf. IGR III 704 III 18–25, a comparable dispute relating to another high priest, Iason of Kyaneai; both discussed by Kokkina 2000 225–31 and R. 193 and 197.