

G.M. ROGERS

THE CONSTRUCTIONS OF WOMEN AT EPHEOS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 90 (1992) 215–223

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## The Constructions of Women at Ephesos

Near the end of his description of the ancient city of Ephesos, Strabo of Amaseia wrote that "...the city, because of its advantageous situation in other respects, grows daily, and is the largest emporium in Asia this side the Taurus."<sup>1</sup> The growth of the city, both in terms of physical expansion, and then more conspicuously to modern visitors of the site, by the construction of major public buildings, continued throughout the first century A.D., and culminated in the architectural and visual transformation of the Upper Agora.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, at the beginning of the second century A.D., the Upper Agora of Ephesos had become the center of a small Roman town, adorned with Temples of Dea Roma, Divus Iulius, and Domitian, four fountain buildings, an Augustan Basilika, and a new Prytaneion, to which the Kuretes who celebrated the mysteries of Artemis each year were transferred sometime during the reign of Augustus.<sup>3</sup> This was an area of the early imperial city re-designed to make a Roman citizen, proconsul, or emperor feel at home.

Scholars have usually attributed this urban transformation, which did not stop at the borders of the Upper Agora, or the beginning of the second century A.D., to the euergetism of wealthy male benefactors, such as Tiberius Claudius Aristio, who, along with his wife Iulia Lydia Laterane, built the Street Fountain along the road from the Magnesian Gate to the Upper Agora between A.D. 102 to 117,<sup>4</sup> the Fountain of Trajan on the street known in antiquity as the Embolos around A.D. 102 to 104,<sup>5</sup> and the Palaestra of the Harbour Gymnasium, when he was an Asiarch, sometime during the reign of Domitian.<sup>6</sup>

In fact, inscriptions from Ephesos reveal that at least nine out of 58 major buildings, monuments, walls, or streets which would have been visible to the procession of C. Vibius Salutaris in A.D. 104, or shortly thereafter, were built, dedicated, or repaired by men, either as individuals or in groups.<sup>7</sup> In the cases of three buildings (but four separate projects), we are told explicitly that

<sup>1</sup> *Geography* 14.1.24.

<sup>2</sup> See W. Alzinger, *Augusteische Architektur in Ephesos*, Wien 1974, 145-52; G. M. Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos: The Foundation Myths of a Roman City*, London 1991, Chap. 3.

<sup>3</sup> See D. Knibbe, *Forschungen in Ephesos*, IX/1/1, Wien 1981, 13-69; 75-76.

<sup>4</sup> *Die Inschriften von Ephesos*, II, Bonn 1979, 424A; hereafter all inscriptions cited from this corpus (vols. Ia-VIII 2, Bonn 1979-84) will be abbreviated as *IE* (and then the number).

<sup>5</sup> *IE* 424.

<sup>6</sup> *IE* 427.

<sup>7</sup> For the figure of 58 major monuments, buildings, walls, and streets visible in the city at the beginning of the second century A.D., (which excludes the archaic nekropoleis in the Upper Agora, and at the corner of the Embolos and the Marble Street), see my survey of the topography of the city published in *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos: The Foundation Myths of a Roman City*, London 1991: "The Procession of Statues and the Plan of Ephesos in A.D. 104." The nine projects which were built, dedicated, or repaired by men alone were: the Upper Agora, *IE* 3004, paved by Timon; the Prytaneion, 462, stoas etc. paid for by the prytanis, 528, repairs done perhaps by Flavius Montanus, 1024, repairs done by the prytanis Dionysodoros; the Hydrekdochion of Laecanius Bassus, 695, built by Laecanius Bassus; The Pollio Monument, 405, 406, built by Proculus; The Varius Baths, 500, built by Varius; The Mazaeus-Mithridates Gate, 3006, built by Mazaeus and Mithridates; the West Gate of the Agora, 3005, access way paid for by Ischyriion; the Theatre, 2033, tunnel paid for by Hieron Aristogiton, 2037, tunnel paid for by Flavius Montanus; the Palaestra, 427, built by Tiberius Claudius Aristio. This list does not mean that these were the only projects paid for by men in my original survey; the list only includes those buildings for which we have explicit epigraphical

the men named paid for the projects from private funds, as signified by the use of the Greek or Latin formula which was standard at Ephesos during the early imperial period.<sup>8</sup> To put this seemingly small number of projects undertaken by men individually or in groups into perspective, it should be recognized that we only have explicit epigraphic evidence for who dedicated, built, or repaired the buildings, monuments, streets, or walls of the city visible at the beginning of the second century A.D. in sixteen instances out of the 58 entries in the survey, including those which were repaired, or added to many times, such as the Prytaneion, or the Theatre.<sup>9</sup>

From this evidence, it would appear that male benefactors paid for the construction or repair of most of the buildings which made Ephesos one of the most impressive urban centers in the Roman empire, and received the public credit and honour for those projects which the inscriptions carved into these buildings were intended to bring. What has been ignored thus far is that male benefactors were not the only ones who claimed public credit or honour for the urban transformation of Ephesos. As we shall see, in the building inscriptions of the city, some women were represented as playing roles in the transformation of the city. At first, these women were depicted as the wives and daughters of male builders, as well as priestesses. By the middle of the third century A.D., however, women could be represented as builders in their own right, outside the symbolic context of the family or priestly office. During the third century A.D., when public building in the city slowed, but never stopped, the polis rewarded the women whose personal wealth was used for major public building projects in the city with exactly the same kinds of public inscriptions which it bestowed upon the male benefactors of Ephesos for their building projects, and these inscriptions were displayed in some of the most visible and public locations of the city. The polis of Ephesos did not differentiate between the building projects of men and women in the public inscriptions of the city by the middle of the third century A.D. At a time when the polis struggled even to maintain the public buildings of the city, and was reluctant to embark upon new projects, the opportunities for individual women to appear as public builders increased. Thus, the changes in the various

---

evidence that the projects were paid for by men, and were represented as such in the inscriptions of the city at the beginning of the second century A.D. The importance of this distinction will become clearer later in the article.

<sup>8</sup> The standard formula to show that private wealth was used to perform public tasks, either ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων in Greek after the verb of dedication, construction, or repair, (or *ex pecunia sua* in Latin after the same), is found in the cases of the Prytaneion, *IE* 1024.5-6; the access way created from the stoa to the Lower Agora, 3005.16; and the Theatre renovations, 2033.3 and 2037.4 (restored).

<sup>9</sup> Projects for which we have explicit inscriptional evidence about the identities of the dedicators, builders, or repairers include:

- The Street Fountain, *IE* 424A, Aristio and Laterane.
- The Upper Agora, 3004, Timon.
- The Basilika of the Upper Agora, 404, Pollio, Bassa, and children.
- The Chalcidicum of the Basilika, 410, demos.
- The Prytaneion, 462, prytanis or Herennius; 528, Montanus ?; 1024, Dionysodoros.
- The Hydrekdochion of Laecanius Bassus, 695, Bassus.
- The Pollio Monument/ Fountain of Domitian, 405, 406, Proculus; 415, 416, polis; 419, demos.
- The Embolos, 3008, polis. The Fountain of Trajan, 424, Aristio and Laterane.
- The Baths of Varius, 500, Varius. The Doric Stoa, 3003, unidentified man and Claudia Metrodora.
- The Mazaeus and Mithridates Gate, 3006, Mazaeus and Mithridates.
- The West Gate of the Agora, 3005, Ischyron.
- The Theatre, 2033, Aristogiton; 2034, polis; 2035, demos (restored); 2037, Montanus (restored); 2038, polis.
- The Palaestra, 427, Aristio.
- The Stadium, 411, Orpex and Marina.

semantic, institutional, and physical contexts in which women could appear as public builders at Ephesos reflect fundamental changes within the polis itself.

The representation of women in public building projects at Ephesos during the early Roman empire took two forms. In the first, which was the more common, from the reign of the emperor Augustus until the late second century A.D., women were portrayed in inscriptions throughout the city as taking part in the construction,<sup>10</sup> dedication,<sup>11</sup> and restoration of buildings,<sup>12</sup> explicitly as the wives, and daughters, of male builders or Asia itself.<sup>13</sup> The unstated assumption of most scholars regarding these "joint dedications" has been that the husband or the father mentioned in the inscription actually paid the money for the public project. The editors of the corpus of inscriptions from Ephesos, for instance, in the case of inscription no. 424, entitled the inscription, "Tib. Claudius Aristio erbaut das Nymphaeum Traiani," despite the fact that they (the editors) clearly restore the name of Iulia Lydia Laterane in line 2, as having dedicated the Nymphaeum Traiani "along with" Tiberius Claudius Aristio. Even if it is argued that such a title constitutes a space-saving device, it is a device which gives a fundamentally deceptive impression about the contents of the inscription, and, unfortunately, is characteristic of the presentation of other inscriptions involving joint dedications.<sup>14</sup> The implicit message of such a presentation is that men provided the funds for the various projects, and therefore should be seen as the primary dedicants.

In other cases, the editors of the Ephesos corpus have suggested that men and women were represented as dedicating some buildings together because the men involved were Asiarchs. In their

<sup>10</sup> Construction of buildings, or furnishing some architectural feature at Ephesos was usually expressed in inscriptions by some form of κατασκευάζω followed by some form of the standard verb of dedication, ἀνατίθημι. For this formula in the case of the Nymphaeum Traiani, see *IE* 424.2 κ[ατεσκευάσεν ὄχ]ετοῦ ... ἀνέθηκεν; the gymnasium next to the stadium, 438.9 κατ[ασκ]ευάσα[ς] ἀνέθηκεν; the southern wall of the Agora, 3003.2.2 κατασκευάσας ἀνέθηκεν; 3853.6 τὴν κατασκευήν.

<sup>11</sup> The standard verb employed in Ephesian inscriptions for dedicating a building was ἀνατίθημι. Forms of this verb, usually near the end of the inscription, well after the name of the dedicator, can be found in: *IE* 404, (restored) the Augustan Basilika; 424.2, Nymphaeum Traiani; 429.2, the Temple on the Embolos; 431, (restored) from the Vedius Gymnasium; 438.9, Gymnasium by the Stadium; 455, (restored) Latrine; 460.2 (partial restoration), Bouleuterion; 3003.2.2, Wall of Agora; 3092.2, Aqueduct of Pollio. Forms of καθιερῶ were also utilized (e.g. in the building inscription of the Stadium, no. 411.5).

<sup>12</sup> No doubt due to the varied nature of the projects undertaken, there was no standard verb of architectural repair at Ephesos. For repair of a stoa wall using the verb ἀνατίθημι, see *IE* 430.24-27.

<sup>13</sup> *IE* 404, Ofillia Bassa as the wife (γυναῖκί) of Sextilius Pollio in the Basilika inscription of A.D. 4 to 14; 3092.2, Ofillia Bassa as the wife (γυναῖκί) of Sextilius Pollio in the Aqueduct inscription of A.D. 4 to 14; 411.2, Stertina Marina as the daughter (θυγατρί) of Stertinius Orpex in the Stadium inscription from the reign of Nero; 3003.2.2, Claudia Metrodora as the wife (γυναῖκί) of a man whose name is missing in the inscription of the southern wall of the Agora during the reign of Nero; 424, Iulia Lydia Laterane as the wife (restored) of Tib. Claudius Aristio, and the daughter (θυγατρί) of Asia in the dedication of the Nymphaeum Traiani; 424A.1, Iulia Lydia Laterane as the daughter (θυγατρί) of Asia in the Street Fountain dedication from the reign of Trajan; 470.5, Flavia as the wife (restored) of T. Flavius in a building inscription of the Trajanic period; 429.2, wife (name missing) and Varilla, daughter (θυγατρί) of P. Quintilius Valens Varius in the inscription from the Temple on the Embolos during the reign of Hadrian; 455, wife (restored, name missing) and Varilla, daughter (θυγατρί) of Varius, inscription from the Baths of Varius during the Hadrianic period; 430.17-19, Scaptia Firmilla, as the wife (γυναῖκί) of Claudius Verulanus in the wall repairs inscription from the Verulanus Stoa, after A.D. 130/131; 438.10, Flavia Papiane as the wife (γυναῖκί) of Vedius in the Gymnasium inscription, from A.D. 140 to 160; 460.2, Flavia Papiane as the wife (restored) of Vedius in the Bouleuterion inscription, from the mid-second century A.D.; 3853.2 Stratonike as the wife (γυναῖκί) of a man whose name is missing in the building inscription from Kireli, at the end of the second century A.D.

<sup>14</sup> *IE* 411; 424A; 430; 438; but not 460; 3092.

view, since wives merely shared the title of this office with their husbands, it was natural for the women to share the dedication inscriptions as well.<sup>15</sup> This argument is offered, despite the fact that the office of the Asiarch, shared or otherwise, (and strong arguments have recently been put forward to show that women could hold this priesthood alone),<sup>16</sup> is not mentioned in at least eight of the joint dedications.<sup>17</sup>

A more satisfactory explanation for the appearance of these joint dedications may be found in the realm of the practical considerations which no doubt lay behind the rhetoric of inscriptions honoring public builders. In this regard, a fragmentary inscription from the late second century A.D. at least, inscribed probably on an epistyle or frieze block, from the village of Titeiphyta (modern Kireli) outside of Ephesos is suggestive.<sup>18</sup> The inscription relates that, together with his wife Stratonike, and his brother M. Antonius Granicus, an anonymous honorand had given 1000 denarii for some unknown purpose. Since the honorand had already spent much money on the construction of village-buildings (lines 4-7), and the inscription belongs to a monumental context, I would argue that the 1000 denarii was part of a joint dedication of some sort of architectural feature, and that this inscription shows a husband, a wife, and a brother banding together to defray the costs.

Unfortunately, in joint dedications at Ephesos, we are never told who made what financial contribution to the project in what proportion. Indeed, at Ephesos, outside of dedications involving public subscriptions,<sup>19</sup> dedicators of public buildings seldom advertised how much money they had spent on their dedications.<sup>20</sup> The convention in the city was not to reveal how much such public projects cost.

Therefore, although it is impossible to prove at the moment, it is no less plausible to assume that the joint dedications reflected the necessities of the expense involved in dedicating public buildings rather than that women appear in these inscriptions only because they shared the titles of the offices with their husbands. The joint inscriptions themselves disprove the latter explanation.

The suggestion that practical considerations may lie behind some of the joint dedications (which may be tested in the light of new discoveries at Ephesos) does not exclude the interesting hypothesis proposed by R. van Bremen about the representation of women in the public life of cities in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor.<sup>21</sup> van Bremen argued that even in cases where women clearly were in control of their own resources, they were frequently represented within the symbolic context of the family, despite the fact of their prominence in all areas of public life in the

<sup>15</sup> See the comments after *IE* 470 for this argument.

<sup>16</sup> See the arguments of R. Kearsley, "Asiarchs, Archiereis, and the Archiereiai of Asia," *GRBS* 27, 1986, 183-92.

<sup>17</sup> 404; 411; 455 (heavily restored); 460 (restored); 470 (partially restored); 3003 (partially restored); 3092; 3853.

<sup>18</sup> *IE* 3853.1-3; for commentary on the inscription see H. Pleket, "Nine Greek Inscriptions from the Cayster-Valley in Lydia," *Talanta* 2, 1970, 76-78.

<sup>19</sup> E.g. the fishery toll-house inscription from A.D. 54 to 59, *IE* 20, in which very exact figures are given for contributions from over 50 individuals and families for various architectural features of the building.

<sup>20</sup> Unlike, for instance, at Oinoanda, where C. Iulius Demosthenes openly reminded his fellow citizens how much he had spent on beautifying their city. See M. Wörrle, *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien*, München 1988, 4-5; line 10 f. of the inscription.

<sup>21</sup> R. van Bremen, "Women and Wealth," in *Images of Women in Antiquity*, ed. A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt, London 1983, 223-42.

Greek cities of Asia Minor in particular.<sup>22</sup> The explanation of this phenomenon, namely, that as the difference between public and private life disappeared in these cities, and the male benefactor began to treat the city as a kind of extended family, there was social and economic room for women to operate within the enlarged family of the city, constitutes the most plausible hypothesis about the great number of joint dedications on very major buildings which appear at Ephesos during the early Roman empire.

What this hypothesis does not quite account for, however, is the small number of inscriptions from the city during the first three centuries of the Roman empire in which women appear clearly outside of such a collapsed model of public and private life, as priestesses involved in building projects during the same period as the joint inscriptions, but also later as individual heirs, whose revenues were used for repairs of buildings, especially during the third century A.D.

The earliest dated inscription from the group of building dedications of priestesses also represents the priestess as acting within the framework of family relations and wealth. From an inscription set up during, or perhaps shortly after the reign of Nero, we learn that Tryphosa, the priestess of Artemis, dedicated to Artemis, to the Emperors, and to the demos of the Ephesians, a starting block and five statues with altars, "from her own funds...according to the promise of her father."<sup>23</sup> Apparently, when Tryphosa was a candidate for the priesthood, her father promised to pay for the starting block, and the statues with the altars.

This example clearly reveals that priestesses drew upon family wealth to fulfill the obligations of their public offices. But several inscriptions from the city from the first through the fourth centuries A.D. also show that priestesses spent their own funds for various projects, and were represented as having done so outside of the symbolic network of family relations.

In A.D. 89/90 the priestess of Artemis, Helvidia Paula (or Pauleina) dedicated some kind of building or architectural feature from her own funds during the proconsulate of M. Fulvius Gillo.<sup>24</sup>

- 1 [Ἀρτέμιδι Ἐφεσία καὶ τῇ πρῶτῃ τῶν [Σεβαστῶν νεω]κ[όρ]ω Ἐφε[σίω]ν πόλει  
 'Ε]λβιδία Ποπλίου θυγά[τ]ηρ Παῦ[λ]α ἱέρηα Ἀρτέμιδ[ος]  
 2 [ἐπὶ ἀνθυπάτου Μάρκου Φ]ουλουίου [Γ]ίλλωνος ἐκ τῶν ἰδί[ων] ἀνέθηκ[εν] γραμμα-  
 τεύοντος ----] ου Τατιανοῦ ἀσιάρχου  
 3 Τ. Φ[λάουιος---

- 1 "To Ephesian Artemis and to the first neokorate polis of the Emperors, the polis of the Ephe-  
 sians, Helvidia Paula, the daughter of Publius, priestess of Artemis,  
 2 in the proconsulate of Marcus Flavius Gillo, from her own funds dedicated (it), while ----  
 os Tatianus the Asiarch was secretary,  
 3 [ - - - - - ]T. F[lavius---]"

There are no formal concessions to gender in the order and presentation of the Helvidia inscription which has:

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 234-37.

<sup>23</sup> *IE* 1139; in an inscription from sometime before the first neokorate of Ephesos (987), where we discover that Vipsania Olympias, the priestess of Artemis, gave 5000 denarii for the repair of a basilika (lines 22-24), there is no explicit evidence that family funds have been expended.

<sup>24</sup> *IE* 492; for a parallel inscription, perhaps involving the same priestess, see 492a.

1. names of the dedicatees first in the dative (Artemis, polis),
2. name of the dedicator in the nominative (Helvidia),
3. date of the project by proconsulate (Gillo),
4. source of funds in the genitive after the preposition (private),
5. verb of dedication or construction,
6. date of the project by the local secretary in the genitive (Tatianus).

This order is closely paralleled by an inscription from an architrave, dated precisely to A.D. 114/115, which was found on the Embolos, east of the Nymphaeum Traiani.<sup>25</sup>

- 1 [[Ἀρτέμιδι Ἐφεσία κ]]αὶ Αὐτοκράτορι Νέρουα Τραιανῶ Καίσαρι Ἀρίστῳ Σεβαστῶ  
Γερμανικῶ Δακικῶ
- 2 [ἡ ν]εωκόρος Ἐφεσίων πόλις τὸ πρόπυλον ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων κατεσκεύασεν, γραμμα-  
τεύοντος τοῦ δήμου Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου
- 3 Λουκκειανοῦ

- 1 "To Ephesian Artemis and to Emperor Nerva Trajan Caesar Optimus Augustus Germanicus Dacicus,
- 2 the neokorate polis of the Ephesians built the propylon from private funds, while the secretary of the demos was Tiberius Claudius
- 3 Lucceianus."

In the propylon inscription we have,

1. the names of the dedicatees first in the dative (Artemis and Trajan),
2. the name of the dedicator in the nominative (the polis),
3. the name of the project itself in the accusative (propylon),
4. the source of funds in the genitive after the preposition (private),
5. the verb of construction,
6. the date of the project by the local secretariat in the genitive (Lucceianus).

Wherever the two inscriptions were originally set up, the only difference between the formal presentation of the two building projects in Greek was the substitution of the type of project for the proconsular dating at point 3 in the propylon inscription. It seems implausible to attribute this substitution to any desire to distinguish a project undertaken by a woman from one constructed by the polis. Comparison of the two inscriptions reveals that no qualifications were made on account of gender. Helvidia and the polis are publicly represented as acting in essentially the same way.<sup>26</sup>

After this, a short series of inscriptions pertaining to repairs in the Theatre, and the square in front of the Celsus Library, show that the polis itself could represent the building projects of a woman in the city during the third century A.D. largely outside the context of family relations or priestly office, indeed, in exactly the same way that it represented the undertakings of male benefactors, in some of the most important architectural and visual contexts in the city.

The first of these inscriptions, which was inscribed on the south analemma of the Theatre, near the exit gate to the first diazoma, relates that the polis repaired "the awnings and the stoa" from

<sup>25</sup> *IE* 422; see also F. Miltner, *JÖAI* 44, 1959, Beib. 346f.; *AE*, 1961, 194; 1967, 468. The building inscription of Helvidia Paula or Pauleina was found built into the subterranean canal of the Theatre Gymnasium. Where it was originally displayed in the city is unknown.

<sup>26</sup> There are two inscriptions from outside of Ephesos in which priestesses apparently were involved in building projects. In *IE* 3233, an inscription found between Mehmetler and Üzümler, Aurelia Apollonia gave the small sum of 150 denarii for the colonnade of Artemis; in 3239, an inscription from a statue base from Büyük Kale, two priestesses of Artemis built two stoas.



the revenues of Iulia Potentilla, probably after previous work done on the same awnings between A.D. 200 to 210.<sup>27</sup> Since Iulia Pantime Potentilla was the daughter of the Asiarch, prytanis, and secretary of the demos, Iulius Artemas, who had been sent out as an ambassador to Marcus and Commodus, probably between A.D. 177 to 180,<sup>28</sup> it is certain (minimally) that the repairs to the awning of the Theatre paid for by Potentilla's revenues were undertaken after she had bequeathed at least part of her estate to the polis, and probable that these repairs were carried out at the latest during the first half of the third century A.D.

This dating of the awning repairs inscription (*IE* 2041) may be supported by the evidence of a second inscription, found built into a wall near the entrance to the north parados of the skene building. In this inscription, we are informed that the polis repaired the pronaos of the Nemeseion "from the revenues of Iulia Potentilla while M. Aurunceius Mithridates was secretary."<sup>29</sup> From another inscription, we learn that Aurunceius Mithridates was secretary of the demos of Ephesos during the reign of Gordian III (A.D. 238 to 244).<sup>30</sup> Thus, at the very least, the polis still must have been in control of some of Iulia Potentilla's revenues by A.D. 238 to 244 at the latest.

That these revenues comprised part, or the whole of an estate, bequeathed to the polis by Potentilla, and used probably during the first half of the third century for these projects, perhaps after her death, is strongly supported by an inscription which was found under a column capital, near the south Gate of the lower (Tetragonos) Agora.<sup>31</sup> In this inscription we discover that the polis paved the area in front of the Auditorium and the Celsus Library "from the revenues of the inheritance of Iulia Potentilla."<sup>32</sup>

Whether Iulia Potentilla was alive when any of these public projects were carried out or not, it cannot be claimed that her financial support for these projects was framed within the symbolic context of family relations or values. Although we do learn that the paving of the area in front of the Celsus Library was done from an inheritance, in the building inscriptions Potentilla is not presented as the mother, wife, or sister of any man. Rather we find Potentilla's name and her wealth advertized as contributing to the maintenance of some of the most prominent and visible buildings and spaces in the city, in association with the very embodiment of the corporate identity of the city, the polis. Two of her building inscriptions, *IE* 2041, for the repair work done on the Theatre, and 3009, for the paving of the Auditorium Square, were displayed in some of the most visible locations in the city: on the south analemma of the Theatre in the first case, and probably in the vicinity of the South Gate of the Lower Agora in the second instance, where the Embolos met the Marble Street.

It cannot be claimed that these building inscriptions represented Potentilla as acting within the religious framework of her office as priestess of Artemis, a framework and an office we only find out about in a completely separate inscription, which had nothing to do with the building inscriptions.<sup>33</sup> Most significantly, although the polis which used her revenues for these projects presumably knew that Potentilla had been a priestess of Artemis, it did not choose to include this piece of information in any of the building inscriptions. From the point of view of the polis then, the fact

<sup>27</sup> For the Potentilla inscription see *IE* 2041.

<sup>28</sup> *IE* 983.

<sup>29</sup> *IE* 2042.

<sup>30</sup> *IE* 4336.8

<sup>31</sup> For the location of the inscription see J. Keil, *FiE* III, Wien 1923, no. 9, p. 101.

<sup>32</sup> *IE* 3009, line 5 ... ἐκ προ-Ι-σόδων κληρονομίας.

<sup>33</sup> *IE* 983.

that Potentilla had been a priestess of Artemis was not necessarily relevant to her presentation as a public builder.

Nor was the fact that Potentilla's name and funds were associated with repair work or street paving extraordinary in the context of third century A.D. building in the city. Outside of Potentilla's projects there are only nine public building projects epigraphically attested for the third century A.D.,<sup>34</sup> compared to at least eleven inscriptions for projects undertaken during the reign of the emperor Domitian (A.D. 81 to 96) alone.<sup>35</sup> Of the third century projects, several involved repairs to buildings,<sup>36</sup> and paving of streets.<sup>37</sup>

Thus, the period when the polis used Potentilla's revenues to repair the awning of the Theatre and the pronaos of the Nemeseion, and paved the area in front of the Auditorium and the Library of Celsus, was not a time when major temples or great fountains were built or paid for by individual benefactors in the city. Out of a total of twelve major building projects (the three of Potentilla, and nine others described in note 33) during the entire third century A.D. for which there is epigraphical evidence, at least five involved repairs to pre-existing buildings, and in the case of two others, presumably the re-paving of streets. The uses to which the polis of Ephesos put Potentilla's revenues were entirely consistent with the kinds of building projects which were taking place in the city during the third century A.D. At a time when there was less building in the cities of the eastern Roman empire generally,<sup>38</sup> and may have been less private money available for such projects, (or those people who were wealthy enough were less inclined to expend their wealth on major public buildings), the polis used inheritances such as Potentilla's, but also M. Fulvius Publicianus Nicephorus', between A.D. 222 to 235 or after,<sup>39</sup> to repair existing buildings, or add architectural features to extant building complexes. There is nothing exceptional about how the polis used Potentilla's wealth to repair buildings or pave streets during the third century A.D., how it represented her role in these projects, or where.

A final, famous example from the late fourth century A.D. shows that the Christianization of the wealthy upper class at Ephesos did not foreclose the possibility of women appearing as builders outside the context of the family. Scholastikia, the very wise Christian lady "provided the great sum of gold" for constructing the part of the baths of Varius along the Embolos that had fallen

<sup>34</sup> *IE* 2040, repairs to the awning of the Theatre, from c. A.D. 200 to 210; 435, Hydreion built, c. 209 to 212; 3001, east stoas of the Agora built, c. 209 to 217; 476, fragmentary building inscription from an architrave, from c. A.D. 218 to 222; 3071.20-22, street from Prytaneion paved, c. A.D. 222 to 235; 3086, propylon of the Harbour built, c. A.D. 222 to 235 or after; 3002, epistyle block from the Agora, from the first half of the third century A.D.; 437, renovations of the Prytaneion, from the first half of the third century A.D.; 621, restoration of the Augustan gymnasium, from the reign of Diocletian.

<sup>35</sup> *IE* 492 and 492A, fragmentary building inscription from A.D. 89/90; 2035 and 2036, analemms of the Theatre, in A.D. 92; 461, fragmentary building inscription from A.D. 92/93; 413 and 449, inscriptions from the Nymphaeum, 413 from July to September of A.D. 93, 419 later; 419A, building for water supply, A.D. 92/93 or after; 449, renovation of building under Domitian; 446, renovation of building under Domitian; 2034, skene of Theatre built under Domitian; 3005, passage from Agora to stoa, etc., under Domitian; 3008, Embolos paved, c. A.D. 94/95; possibly 480, fragmentary building inscription under Domitian, or up to the second neokorate.

<sup>36</sup> *IE* 2040, repairs to the awning of the Theatre; 621, restoration of the Augustan gymnasium; 437, renovations in the Prytaneion.

<sup>37</sup> *IE* 3071, street from Prytaneion paved.

<sup>38</sup> See F. Millar, *The Roman Empire and its Neighbours*, London 1967, 243.

<sup>39</sup> *IE* 3086, the polis built the propylon of the Harbour "from the inheritance of Marcus Fulvius Publicianus Nicephorus the Asiarch."

down.<sup>40</sup> No scholar has suggested that Scholastikia's gold, which she openly flaunted in the Baths of Varius, another very public venue in the city, came from any other source than her own pocket.

Thus we should not insist that women at Ephesos only participated or appeared symbolically in the very important area of public building at Ephesos as wives, sisters, daughters, or priestesses. It gradually became possible for a limited number of wealthy women such as Potentilla, the daughter of an Asiarch who had met the Emperor, to operate in exactly the same way as male benefactors, and to be represented as such in some of the most visible places in the city. Indeed, if we step outside the area of public building, we find women making distributions to the polis,<sup>41</sup> dedicating altars and statues,<sup>42</sup> and putting up inscriptions throughout the second century.<sup>43</sup> Women at Ephesos took part not only in some of the most important religious and political structures in the city as priestesses, prytaneis, gymnasiarchs, and Asiarchs,<sup>44</sup> but in some of the most ancient and prestigious religious and political structures of national Greek relations as well. Several women went to the Olympic games as official theoroi of the city from after the second neokorate of the city until the mid-third century A.D.<sup>45</sup> The presence of women at the Olympic games as theoroi of the city symbolizes the possibilities open to at least some women at the beginning of the second century A.D. These few women were more than the dutiful wives or daughters of male benefactors. They reflected the self-image of a polis in which certain women by the third century A.D. were represented as architects of the great urban stage itself.

Oxford

G.M. Rogers

---

<sup>40</sup> *IE* 453.

<sup>41</sup> *IE* 997, during or after the Flavian period.

<sup>42</sup> *IE* 1266, from the time of Antoninus Pius.

<sup>43</sup> E.g. *IE* 4107, at the time of Marcus.

<sup>44</sup> For priestesses see *IE* 980; 981; 982; 983; 984; 985; 986; 987; 988; 989; 989A; 990; 992; 996; 997; 998; 999; 999A; for women prytaneis, 980; 985; gymnasiarchs, 985; and Asiarchs, see Kearsley, cited above, pp. 187-92

<sup>45</sup> *IE* 891, Claudia Basilo, from the late second century A.D.; 892, Claudia Caninia Severa, from the mid-third century A.D.; 893, Marcellina, after the second neokorate; 894, Paula Aratiane, from the mid-second century A.D.; 895, Secunda Papiane, at the time of Iulia Domna, Septimius Severus, and Caracalla; 896, a woman theoros from the late second century A.D.