

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA

**IMPERIAL CULT IN EPHESUS:
EXPRESSIONS OF INFERIORITY, SUPERIORITY, OR ISOPOLITY?**

ETHNICITY AND EMPIRE IN ANCIENT ROME SEMINAR PAPER

SUBMITTED TO

DR. JULIE LANGFORD

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

BY

ERIN M. IOSA

TAMPA, FLORIDA

DECEMBER 7, 2010

The founding of the Roman imperial cult is a fascinating story of greed, flattery, and outright lies. First begun under the emperor Augustus the imperial cult was used to show allegiance with Rome but gradually became the cause for steep competition amongst the eastern provinces. Before becoming a competition for distinction, the imperial cult manifested itself on Greek coins with the term *neokoros*. Originally, the term was applied to the priest of the imperial cult but eventually the term became known as a title for favored eastern cities as well as bragging rights amongst Greeks. The imperial cult temples appear to show reverence for Rome and the Emperor, but what they really show is the competition between Greek cities for the title *neokoros*. By putting the term *neokoros* on coinage Ephesus was able to promote their city as being favored by Rome while also holding onto their Greek heritage.

Before being able to understand what the neokorite coins mean there is a need to examine some aspects of Roman and Greek society. Some history of the imperial cult depicted on coins is necessary from the time of Augustus onward but this paper will focus mainly on the Ephesian coins of the third century A.D. This paper discusses the founding myths of Ephesus depicted on coinage. It will also explain what the imperial cult temples are, how they came to be and how they morphed into what we know of them today. An examination of the Greek mindset and ideas of identity regarding Rome are discussed. Finally, the paper will discuss the purpose of the neokorite temples depicted on Ephesian coins, what they mean in terms of emperor worship and Greek identity and competition with other Greek cities, with emphasis on Pergamum and Smyrna. Through studying neokorite

Ephesian coins, Ephesus' ideas of their relationship with Rome and the surrounding Greek cities become clear.

Coins: Images of Propaganda

When specifically looking at Ephesian coins there are reoccurring themes, including the depictions of bees and the Ephesian Artemis, as well as images that center on the roman emperor, such as imperial cult temples or the inscription *neokoros* (SNG von Aulock 37, 34, Figure 1 and BMC 185, 69, Figure 2). The bee founding myth story is very important to the people of Ephesus as indicated by the exuberant usage of bees on coins. The founding myth of the bees has a few origins, but the most prominent story told is of the Athenians founding Ionia.¹ The story states that before the Athenians went out searching for a new country they prayed for guidance in finding a land worthy to call a sister city. Furthermore, when they set out on their quest the Athenians were led to the site of Ephesus by the muses appearing in the form of bees.

Another major part of the Ephesian founding myth is Artemis. Although many ancients knew the story of Artemis and Apollo being born in Ortygia, the Ephesians attributed the birthplace of the twins to the city of Ephesus.² The practice of incorporating a god or goddess into a city's founding myth is not uncommon and is seen in many eastern cities including Smyrna, Mytilene, and Hierapolis. Although

¹ Barbara Burrell, The Australian Centre for Ancient Numismatic Studies. <http://learn.mq.edu.au/webct/RelativeResourceManager/15043963001/Public%20Files/about.htm> (accessed November 3, 2010).

² Simon Price, *Local Mythologies in the Greek East* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 116.

the Artemis founding myth story went against all known logic, the story of Ephesus as the birthplace of Artemis was upheld throughout the city as truth because of the long-held tradition of the myth in Ephesus.³

Artemis was worshiped all over Asia Minor. However, it was in Ephesus, in the first century A.D., when the worship of Artemis exploded onto the streets. A riot against the Apostle Paul and his disciples occurred when belief spread through the city that the images of Artemis were going to be stripped from the city and her temple torn down.⁴ Because of the belief that Artemis was born on the temple site, or that she dropped out of heaven there, the people drove Paul and his men out of the city claiming that their longstanding tradition of worshipping Artemis would never cease. The importance of Artemis is later evidenced in the Severan coins from Ephesus. The sheer volume and “unusual degree to which Artemis designs predominate among coinage of Ephesus reflects the extraordinary importance of [her].”⁵ Since almost the beginning of minting in Ephesus, Artemis is seen on their coinage, an unmovable and unchanging image that stresses the city’s devotion to her.

The last major theme that appears on Ephesian coins is the neokorite temple. However, there is often no temple depicted on the coin. In its place, the term *neokoros* is often listed on the reverse (BMC 276, 86, Figure 3). In the time of

³ Simon Price, “Local Mythologies in the Greek East” in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnett (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 119.

⁴ Acts 19: 23-41 (New Living Translation).

⁵ Volker Heuchert, “The Chronological Development of Roman Provincial Coin Iconography,” in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnett (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 49.

Augustus the term *neokoros* was interpreted as the title “temple warden”, and was assigned to the chief priest of an imperial cult temple.⁶ As time passed from Augustus down to the Severan dynasty the term morphed from the honored name of a single priest to an expression of grandeur for a city. After this shift, cities began to collect imperial cult temples and titles associated with them, displaying their honor on buildings, road signs and coinage. While there are many coins that show one, two or four temples, there are no Ephesian coins from the Severan dynasty that show three temples depicted on the reverse. This was likely a stylistic choice, however, because the back of the coin will often say “three times neokoros” (BMC 292, 89, Figure 4).

Before taking a more detailed look at the neokorite temples on provincial coins of Ephesus, the specific style in which the coins are minted and what is being implied with the images located on them must first be discussed. Ephesian coins from the Severan dynasty most always depict a Roman emperor on the obverse with Ephesian imagery on the reverse. Christopher Howgego calls this type of coin an “imperial/local modal” coin and states that it mixes the Hellenic past with the Roman present.⁷ This type of combination on coins begs the question who is minting the coins and what is their message to Rome and Ephesus.

⁶ Koester, et al., “Ephesos Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture,” (Valley Forge, PA., Trinity Press International, 1995), 229.

⁷ Christopher Howgego, “Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces,” in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnett (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 15.

Those with authority to mint provincial coinage and where that authority came from must be considered. The first thing to account for is that the local populace of Ephesus had little input as to the image selection or production of coins. Therefore, we are left with local elites and Rome itself, in the form of magistrates, making decisions about minting. With the beginning of imperial Rome came the implementation of Roman magistrates who oversaw matters of the empire in the provinces. In turn, these magistrates worked with local governments to keep peace within the empire. One of the duties of a magistrate was to oversee the minting of provincial coinage, actively overseen by a representative of Rome.⁸ Since the coins were minted under the watchful eye of Rome, we can consider the images from a Roman standpoint, at the most, a sign of flattery. If coin propaganda was ever viewed as malicious toward the empire, Rome could swiftly revoke the city's minting privilege.⁹

Another argument about minting coins in the provinces is that Rome was, in fact, not overbearing in regards to coin production. Huechert believes that Rome gave Ephesus the freedom to print images on coins without running every detail through the Roman machine.¹⁰ Rather than Roman magistrates, local members of the elite controlled coin production and used it to promote both themselves and

⁸ George Williamson, "Aspects of Identity," in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnett (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 26.

⁹ Peter Weiss, "The Cities and Their Money," in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnett (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 58.

¹⁰ Volker Heuchert, "The Chronological Development of Roman Provincial Coin Iconography," in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnett (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 44.

their city.¹¹ Local Greek officials had a large stake in minting coins and had the most to lose if the Roman government was disrupted through the process.¹² Therefore it was imperative for the local magistrates to strive to keep both Rome and Ephesus happy with the images they printed on coins, producing the fine balance between Roman and provincial imagery.

Identity Crisis: The Roman Emperor and Artemis Ephesia

It is necessary to discuss for a moment the relationship between Rome and Greece under the empire. The relationship between the two was more complicated than conqueror and conquered. Before the Roman conquest of Greece, the two cultures had a perpetual love/hate relationship. Rome loved Greece for its higher learning and classical style, yet was afraid what it would do to the Roman politico-social hierarchy. In fact, a backlash to Greece resulted from the increasing importance Greek culture gained in the Roman political scene.¹³ Because Greece lacked good Roman morals and eventually transposed their decadent ways into Roman culture, Rome detested them. In turn, Greeks considered Romans barbarians because of their thirst for blood in conquest. Gradually, the two societies integrated; what is noticeable is the way in which it happened. Rome allowed for some

¹¹ Simon Price, *Local Mythologies in the Greek East* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 116.

¹² George Williamson, "Aspects of Identity," in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnett (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 20.

¹³ C.B. Champion, *Cultural Politics in Polybius's Histories* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 2004), 60-61.

independence in the eastern provinces through continuing local governing practices, unlike its actions in the west showing a small amount of favoritism to their Greek counterparts.¹⁴ Rome also allowed the Greek provinces to mint local images on their coins showing either a sign of respect for the provinces or displaying their political prowess.

When looking at the reverses of the Ephesian coins, it is evident that they focus on civic images, mainly Artemis Ephesia. This shows, in terms of identity, the Ephesians took much pride in their local government. Heuchert says, “The predominance of traditional religious images on the reverses indicates that worship of the ancestral gods was the key element of civic identity.”¹⁵ Therefore, ancestral gods in the Roman east predominated the religious minds of Ephesians and others in Asia Minor. To be Ephesian was to worship Artemis of Ephesus over all other gods, including the Roman Emperor.

As Roman rule spread, Roman identity spread with it, yet moved at a slow pace showing that Rome was not in the business of making mini-Romes and model Roman citizens. Instead of forcing Roman ways upon them, it let the inhabitants of Asia Minor adopt Roman culture and identity at their own free will.¹⁶ As the empire widened, more cities felt the benefits of looking and acting Roman, clearly showing like identity and allegiance to Rome. This shift happens in Ephesus before the

¹⁴ George Williamson, “Aspects of Identity,” in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnet (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 23.

¹⁵ Volker Heuchert, “The Chronological Development of Roman Provincial Coin Iconography,” in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnet (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 48.

¹⁶ Volker Heuchert, “The Chronological Development of Roman Provincial Coin Iconography,” in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnet (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 44.

implementation of the Principate, which is seen through the listing of the Second Triumvirate on the obverse (ACANS/AHDC Col. 22, Figure 5).

From the Second Triumvirate to the third century A.D., it is important to note that identity became whatever a person wanted to be. One could switch from one identity to another without issue and they did so frequently.¹⁷ A poignant example of this is seen in the Syrian born emperor Septimius Severus, patriarch of the Severan Dynasty. Although he was obviously a native of Egypt and his wife Syrian, he easily depicted himself as Roman in appearance and was respected as such.

As the empire granted blanket citizenship within its borders and moved closer to the crisis of the third century, formal identity disappeared and citizens of the empire could choose the identity that best served their interest. By choosing to identify with whomever they deemed advantageous meant that local magistrates could play a deceptive political game.

There are two different views as to what the coins say politically. The first is strictly about showing allegiance to Rome through emperor worship.¹⁸ The second is the abundance of images of Artemis Ephesia, portraying the power of Ephesus. The image of the emperor on the obverse clearly shows a statement of reverence for, or affiliation with, Rome and the Emperor (BMC 292, 89, Figure 4). While some see this as an outward expression of Roman domination of Greeks, others see it

¹⁷ George Williamson, "Aspects of Identity," in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnet (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 25.

¹⁸ Volker Heuchert, "The Chronological Development of Roman Provincial Coin Iconography," in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnet (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 30.

simply as a reflection of accepted political discourse.¹⁹ While it is interesting to look at emperor worship, it is important to keep in mind that Greeks were used to worshipping living people and had been doing so for centuries. Although this practice was unheard of in Rome and the west, worshipping the living emperor in Ephesus was not so far apart from the norm, that they did so willingly and with little apprehension. Therefore, the idea of imperial cult and emperor worship is not completely alien to the people of Ephesus; however, there clearly was some type of admission of supremacy that took place on the Ephesian coins when the placement of the emperor on the obverse is observed. What is less clear is what the reverse of the coins say due to the many different depictions of Artemis and the way she is portrayed in regards to the emperor.

As mentioned above, the reverse almost always shows some type of civic pride, usually in the form of a founding myth or inscriptions stating the greatness of the city. Like the importance of the placement of the emperor on the obverse, by indicating a local dating system on the reverse, Ephesus placed itself on the same par as Rome.²⁰ We also see that Artemis and other local gods take precedence on the reverse with only a handful of the Severan coins of Ephesus showing an emperor on the reverse. About ten percent of Ephesian coinage from this time period depicts an

¹⁹ George Williamson, "Aspects of Identity," in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnet (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 19.

²⁰ Christopher Howgego, "Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces," in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnet (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 9.

Emperor on the reverse and in 100% of those cases it is always with the statue of Artemis in the background, but she is usually of equal size to the Emperor.²¹

There are a few examples of this type of coinage. Figure 4 (BMC 292, 89) shows Caracalla and Geta, both on horseback hailing the statue of Artemis who is depicted between the two. Figure 6 (SNG von Aulock, 7876) and Figure 7 (SNG Copenhagen, 465) show two children seated playing a game of *astragaloï*, an ancient version of dice played with the anklebones of sheep. In both instances, the boys are seated with the depiction of Artemis Ephesia between them. These three coins all show the significance of Artemis in regards to the Roman Emperor. It is easy to look at these images and say that Ephesus was making a statement of superiority, but that is not the case. These coins show a relationship between Ephesus and Rome by placing Artemis and the Emperor on the same plane; Ephesus is showing that the relationship between it and Rome is in fact isopolitical.

Like the abundant use of Artemis, there is also a theme centered on the title *neokoros* as well as the depiction of an imperial cult temple. At first glance it is apparent that it is an imperial cult temple, but within the temple is a statue, not of the emperor, but of Ephesian Artemis (SNG Copenhagen 397, Figure 8). This makes it very clear with whom Ephesus identifies with. By incorporating Artemis into the imperial cult, Ephesus put her on par with the Emperor and celebrated Artemis Ephesia more than the Emperor. The eminence of Ephesus is clearly printed on

²¹ These percentages are strictly from the research I have done. Nowhere have I found a source that can back these numbers up. The sources for my study come from the WildWinds.com website where I observed that about ten percent of the coins in question had an emperor on the reverse. I cannot definitively say that coins from Ephesus never depict the emperor on the reverse without the image of Artemis, but from my study this is the information I have found.

Ephesian coins. Of the three major cities in Asia Minor-Ephesus, Smyrna, and Pergamum- the amount of inscriptions on buildings and coins celebrating the city, Ephesus clearly has the most iconography even though all three cities rivaled each other in wealth, splendor and intellectual eminence.²² Although they believed they shared political right with Rome, Ephesians were well aware that they were not the only ones that regarded the city so highly.

Many ancient cities aligned themselves with one another. Ephesus' alliance Hierapolis was home to the god Apollo, Artemis' twin brother. Although the alliance was probably first set in motion because of their sibling patron gods, there is great evidence that the two aligned because of the overwhelming power Ephesus possessed.²³ While Artemis Ephesia was worshiped in Hierapolis, she is also found depicted throughout the whole of Asia Minor. Her image brought great pride to Ephesus.²⁴

Ephesian coins show two conflicting images, which appear on different sides of the same coin. This doublespeak shows that the Ephesians were no new comers to playing politics and they did so frequently on their coinage. Ephesus and other cities of Asia Minor were used to being under the rule of outsiders, starting with the Persians, then Alexander the Great and finally the Roman Empire. Being a subject under another's rule was not something new to Ephesus and the act of putting such strong imperial images on coins shows that they were keen on appeasing their

²² S. Dmitriev, *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 1, 19.

²³ Simon Price, *Local Mythologies in the Greek East* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 121.

²⁴ Simon Price, *Local Mythologies in the Greek East* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 121.

newfound ruler. While eastern provincial coins did tend to focus more on their own ancestral gods, such as Artemis of Ephesus, rather than on Rome,²⁵ the coins show knowledge and acceptance of being subjects of Rome yet honor and value local heritage more.

Imperial Cult and the Art of Competition

Although the imperial cult began as a sign of reverence to the current emperor it quickly became a sign of preference from the Greek perspective. Imperial temples began with the first emperor Augustus and continued through to the end of the third century A.D. when there was a shift away from temples and a move toward festivals and games.²⁶ Ephesus' rival cities Smyrna and Pergamum were both granted imperial cults before it, a major blow to the Ephesian mindset.²⁷ Not to be outdone, Ephesus applied for and finally received its first temple under Claudius. This temple is cause for speculation because it was portrayed in numismatic evidence as an imperial cult temple to Claudius, although it was more likely a cult temple to Artemis.²⁸ If it really was a temple to Artemis then it was not an imperial cult temple and therefore wouldn't warrant the title *neokoria*. This brings about the

²⁵ Christopher Howgego, "Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces," in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnett (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 2.

²⁶ Volker Heuchert, "The Chronological Development of Roman Provincial Coin Iconography," in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnett (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 50.

²⁷ S. Dmitriev, *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 20-22.

²⁸ S. Dmitriev, *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 20, 22.

question, why would Ephesus print on the coins a title of which they had not been granted? Competition with Smyrna and Pergamum was at the root of the deception.

Imperial cult temples in the east were not for emperor worship at all. The purpose of the temples was to compete with other cities to become the First City of Asia, *ΠΡΩΤΩΝ ΑΣΙΑΣ*, the title that incidentally appeared on Ephesus' coins after gaining four neokorite temples.²⁹ Ephesus' journey to acquiring four *neokoria* is deceptive to say the least. Bypassing the controversial temple of Claudius, the first official imperial *neokoria* comes from Domitian, yet the coins from that period were marked as "twice neokoros," *ΔΙΣ ΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ*. A third temple was granted under the reign of Hadrian after which coins still recorded the title of Ephesus as "twice neokoros." An explanation for this could be that, under Hadrian, there was recognition that the first temple from the time of Claudius was actually dedicated to Artemis Ephesia and therefore unworthy of the title *neokoria*.

In another controversial move, Caracalla granted a *neokoria* to Artemis of Ephesus and called it the only *neokoria* to Artemis.³⁰ Caracalla went out of his way to please the people of Ephesus, honoring Artemis Ephesia by portraying her on equal footing with the Roman Emperor. By showing Artemis as equal to the emperor he elevated the city's patron goddess, and in turn Ephesus itself, to equal status with Rome. Being the only emperor who did this, it is safe to say that Caracalla was the only emperor who saw Ephesus in this manner and the sentiment should not be

²⁹ Simon Price, *Local Mythologies in the Greek East* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 123.

³⁰ S. Dmitriev, *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 22.

transferred to previous or successive emperors. Granting the title to Artemis, Caracalla played the political role by not letting Ephesus 'honor' him with a cult temple showed his humbleness, something he was not known for. After this honor of a *neokoria* to Artemis, Ephesus called itself on its coinage "three times neokoros," *TPIC NEOKOPQN* (BMC 292, 89, Figure 4). The last of the Ephesian neokoros titles under the emperor Elagabalus was later revoked, however, Ephesus still took pride in its fourth title and began calling itself "First in Asia".³¹ This is a deceptive title considering most of the temples awarded to Ephesus had a stigma attached to them.

Because of the constant building of cult temples some historians felt Ephesus was attempting to show allegiance to Rome and possibly gain citizenship. Yet everyone within the empire gained blanket citizenship in A.D. 212 making the significance of Roman citizenship decline drastically, thus the later part of the argument does not hold up. Did the people of Ephesus still want to look Roman in their actions by honoring the Emperor through temples? Sherwin-White says that unlike the western empire showing allegiance through adopting new city names honoring the emperor, the east shows allegiance through the imperial cult.³² The west admired Rome because they had long been considered barbaric and treated as less than the Greeks. Therefore, acceptance by Rome came to mean a great deal more to the west than to the eastern provinces.³³ The east was less transfixed on the idea of becoming Roman because in their eyes they were already on an equal footing

³¹ S. Dmitriev, *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 22.

³² A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 412.

³³ A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 412.

and had been for centuries. The only circumstance that had changed was the ruling power over Greece, yet the city-states remained primarily independent. What Ephesus and other cities of Asia Minor cared about was the title of *neokoria* as it showed favor to their city and celebrated its greatness.³⁴

Ephesus became “four times neokoros” under Rome, more than any other city, an accomplishment to be truly proud of. Yet it is something that Ephesus could never have accomplished on its own, it needed Rome to become great in the eyes of its citizens as well as other Greek provinces.

Ephesus recognized the power of Rome on its coinage and understood the benefits of appeasing Rome. Yet the city put much more stock in its Hellenistic past with images of founding myths and their patron goddess Artemis Ephesia. Also, by depicting the Emperor in varying positions on the reverse alongside Artemis, while limited, the action shows a strong tie of partnership between the two cities. By the turn of the third century A.D., local elites believed that Ephesus shared some political rights with Rome and maintained a fine balance of propaganda output. By making a strong connection to the Emperor through collecting *neokoria* titles, Ephesus in turn magnifies its own power and splendor.

Rome truly believed, as it should, that it was the dominant power both politically and administratively in the period leading up to the Severans.³⁵ Moving into our period of interest there is evidence that both Rome and specific states,

³⁴ A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 402.

³⁵ S. Dmitriev, *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 81.

including Ephesus, entered into an unspoken agreement of power between them,³⁶ which was evidenced with the position of the emperors on the reverse. The sheer size of the empire required for some time the use of local magistrates to uphold local laws and report back to Rome, as well as oversee the minting of local coins and conduct both local festivals and games. The idea of partnership with Ephesus replaced the idea of conquest in the Roman east.³⁷

It is easy to fall on either side of the fence concerning the Ephesian coins of the Severan period; clearly scholars have been doing so for quite some time. I am not convinced that it is one or the other, superiority or inferiority on the part of the Greeks. Politically, Ephesus knew the ramifications of not appeasing Rome. They were apart of the empire and needed to show allegiance as such, which we see clearly through the emperor being depicted on the obverse. Yet, as willing as they were to conform to the new world order, Ephesus was still unwilling to give up their intrinsic Greek past. Although the neokorite temples seem to be the clear depiction of emperor worship, what they really showed was the greatness of their city through the title neokoros; a title that could only be gained with the blessing of the Emperor. By magnifying the imperial cult Ephesus showed the Emperor's endorsement of their city on their coins. Although Ephesus is in all accounts inferior to Rome, because of the size of the empire and the greatness of Ephesus, it gets away with identifying itself through its coinage as sharing in Rome's wealth of power.

³⁶ S. Dmitriev, *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 82.

³⁷ Christopher Howgego, "Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces," in *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, ed. Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnett (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 10.

References:



Figure 1: SNG von Aulock 37, 34
OB: E-F, bee with straight wings RE: Forepart of a stag right, palm tree left;
magistrate DHMAGORHS to right.



Figure 2: BMC 185, 69
OB: Artemis standing right shooting an arrow, quiver over shoulder, dog at her feet.
RE: Cock standing right, palm tied with wreath over shoulder; magistrate IASWN; all
within laurel wreath.



Figure 3 : BMC 276, 86

OB: ΑΥΤ ΚΜ ΑΥΠ ΑΝΤ ΩΝΕΙΝΟC. Head of Caracalla right, laurate. RE: ΤΡΙCΝΕ ΩΚΟ ΡΩΝ ΕΦΕCΙΩΝ (in exergue). Artemis, huntress right, seizing fallen stag by the horns. Bronze. Wt. .95.



Figure 4: BMC 292, 89

OB: ΑΥΤ ΚΑΙC ΜΑΥΡΑΝΤΩΝΕΙΝΟC ΚΑΙ ΠΟ CΕΠΓΕΤΑC ΝΕΟΙ ΗΛΙΟΙ (beneath). Busts face to face of Caracalla and Geta, laurate, each wearing cuirass and paludamentum. RE: ΕΦΕCΙΩΝ ΤΡΙC ΝΕΟΚΟΡΩΝ ΚΑΙ Τ ΗC ΑΡ ΤΕΜΙΔΟC (in exergue.) Cultus-statue of Ephesian Artemis between two horsemen (Caracalla and Geta) right and left, each holding sceptre, and raising right towards statue. Bronze. Wt. 1.5.



Figure 5: ACANS/AHDC Col. 22
 Second Triumvirate. 43 BCE. OB: Heads of Octavianus, Antonius and Lepidus. RE: ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΥΣΓΡΑΜ ΓΛΑΥΚΩΝ ΕΦΕ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΗΣ. Statue of Ephesian Artemis. Leaded bronze. Wt. 3.15 g; dia.mm.



Figure 6: SNG von Aulock 7876
 OB: Laureate head of Geta right RE: EFECIWN, Two chubby children seated on ground facing one another, involved in a game of knucklebones; in background between, cult figure of Artemis Ephesia facing, between crescent and star. Æ 16 mm. 2.46 gr.



Figure 7: SNG Copenhagen, 465
OB: ALEXA-NDROS AUG, laureate, draped bust right. RE: EFESIWN, Oracle scene:
Two children sitting side by side, with astragaloi, behind them Artemis, veiled and
with polos on head, standing facing.



Figure 8: SNG Copenhagen 397
OB: AV M AVP ANTWNEINOC CE, laureate, draped & cuirassed bust right. RE: DIC
NEWKORWN EFECCIWN, octostyle Temple of Artemis, statue within.

Bibliography:

- British Museum. Dept. of C., Medals, et al. *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Ionia*. Bologna, A. Forni, 1964.
- Burrell, Barbara. The Australian Centre for Ancient Numismatic Studies.
<http://learn.mq.edu.au/webct/RelativeResourceManager/15043963001/Public%20Files/about.htm> (accessed November 3, 2010).
- Burrell, Barbara. *Neokoroi: Greek cities and Roman emperors*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.
- Champion, C. B., *Cultural Politics in Polybius's Histories*. Berkley, University of California Press, 2004.
- Champion, C. B. *Roman Imperialism : Readings and Sources*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 2004.
- Dmitriev, S. *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Ferguson, W. S. *Greek Imperialism*. New York: Biblo and Tannen, 1963.
- Harl, K. W. *Civic Coins and Civic Politics in the Roman East, A.D. 180-275*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
- Heuchert, Volker. "The Chronological Development of Roman Provincial Coin Iconography." In *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, edited by Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnet, 29-56. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Howgego, C. J., V. Heuchert, et al. "Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces." In *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, edited by Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnet, 1-17. Oxford; New York, Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Koester, H., S. Harvard Divinity, et al. "Ephesos Metropolis of Asia : An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture." Valley Forge, Pa., Trinity Press International, 1995.
- Lee, A. D. *Information and Frontiers : Roman Foreign Relations in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, England; New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Price, Simon. "Local Mythologies in the Greek East." In *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, edited by Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnet, 115-125. Oxford; New York, Oxford University Press, 2005.

Price, S. R. F. *Rituals and Power : The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Sherwin-White, A.N., *The Roman Citizenship*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1973.

Weiss, Peter. "The Cities and Their Money," In *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, edited by Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnett, 57-68. Oxford; New York, Oxford University Press, 2005.

Williamson, George. "Aspects of Identity." In *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, edited by Christopher Howgego, Volker Heuchert, and Andrew Burnett, 19-27. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.