

Inscripfen von Magnesia 192 Revisited

William J. Slater

IN AN EARLIER ISSUE of this journal I dealt with this inscription,¹ whose interest resides in its apparent recording of the first pantomime contests in the east. Having been informed by a vigilant referee of the probable existence of a squeeze from the previous century, I was able in an addendum to confirm that the stone could not in fact refer to Isthmian and Pythian pantomime contests, as Kern and Louis Robert had postulated. That was all that was important for my argument there. But an invitation to speak at Hamburg allowed me to visit Berlin in October 1996 and to go over the squeezes of the two fragments with the eagle-eyed Dr Klaus Hallof, who presides over the *IG* archives in Unter den Linden. It was immediately apparent that Robert's persuasive emendation of Kern's ΠΟΙΗΣΙΝ to ΥΠΟΚΡΙΣΙΝ was also not possible, for Kern's reading is clear.² At that point, it seemed to me that the whole inscription was about a poet and not about a pantomime.

Dr Hallof, however, was more patient than I, especially because it seemed to him from the squeezes that the two fragments joined, as I had already speculated. In November, he responded to my offprint by sending two extraordinarily careful transcriptions of the bottom and top of the two fragments, which is the basis for figure 1 (p. 196). It was evident that the supplement [Λουκί]/ου 'Ουήρου, previously unquestioned, was impossibly long for the space, and my colleague Claude Eilers immediately suggested the palmary [θε]/ου. At

¹ "The Pantomime Tiberius Iulius Apolaustus," *GRBS* 36 (1995) 266–71. I seize the opportunity to correct two misprints: at p.270 read 163 for 164 for the marriage of Verus; and at p.275 read 180 for 183 for the accession of Commodus. There is an unnoticed piece of evidence that the *koina* of Asia were penteteric in the late first century in *IG* V.1 658.

² As I have no experience in reading squeezes, it is perhaps worth noting that even an amateur can see the letters.

10 -
 ΥΠΟΤΑΚΥΡΙΩΝΑΝ
 ΝΟΥΚΑΙΚΟΜΟΔΟΥΚΑ
 ΟΥΟΥΗΡΟΥΚΑΙ
 ΣΤΕΙΝΗΣΔΙΑΡΥΟΜ
 ΡΑΤΙΚΗΝΠΟΙΗΣΙΝΤΕΙΜ
 ΚΑΙΠΟΛΕΙΤΕΙΑ
 ΚΑΙΑΝΔΡΙΑΝΑΝΑΣΤΑ
 ΣΕΣΙΝΥΠΤΟΕ

10 -
 ΥΠΟΤΑΚΥΡΙΩΝΑΝΤΩΝΕΙ
 ΝΟΥΚΑΙΚΟΜΟΔΟΥΚΑΙΘΕ
 ΟΥΟΥΗΡΟΥΚΑΙΘΕΑΣΦΑΥ
 ΣΤΕΙΝΗΣΔΙΑΤΗΝΕΝΡΥΟΜΟΝ
 ΤΡΑΤΙΚΗΝΠΟΙΗΣΙΝΤΕΙΜΗ
 ΘΕΝΤΑΔΕΚΑΙΠΟΛΕΙΤΕΙΑΙΣ
 ΚΑΙΑΝΔΡΙΑΝΑΝΑΣΤΑ
 ΣΕΣΙΝΥΠΤΟΕ

Figure 1 (Courtesy David Meadows).

this point the inscription took on new interest, for a reference to *divus Verus* solved the problem of the date.

In order to simplify a reconstruction, both transcripts were scanned and brought together on a computer screen. By copying the missing letters from the transcript, we were able to reconstruct the inscription in a more than usually convincing fashion.³ A crucial part of this exercise was to assure ourselves that the *sigma*, which is clearly visible at the top of fragment B above the *theta* of ἐ]νρυθμ[(line 11) and had not been recorded by Kern, fitted exactly into θ[εα]ς [Φανσ]/ (line 10) at the bottom of fragment A. As Hallof had carefully refrained from joining his two transcriptions, the resulting match seemed to Hallof and me to assure the postulated join. Because the length of lines and the nature of this join are so important for the ensuing deductions, the editor has allowed us to include the facsimile opposite, for the squeezes are not of sufficient quality to make it worthwhile to photograph them.

Kern gives the dimensions as: two fragments of a 0.545 deep marble base. A: 0.45 high and 0.26 wide; B: 0.63 high and 0.45 wide. They were found at the southwest corner of the agora. All of the supplements are those of Kern, save those mentioned below.

- A:
- ὕ]πογεγραμ[μένους ἀγω-]
 νας Εὐσέβεια ἐ]ν Ποτιό-]
 λοις Σεβαστὰ ἐν Νε[από-]
 λει Ἐφέσηα τὰ πρῶτα ἰ[ερά]
- 5 Λευκοφρυήνηα ἰσο[πύ-]
 θια ἀρέσαντα διὰ ἀγώ[νων]
 Ῥωμαίων καὶ τειμηθέ[ντα]
 ὑπὸ τῶν κυρίων Ἄν[τ]ω[νεί-]
 νου καὶ Κομόδου κα[ὶ θε-]
- 10 οὔ Οὐήρου καὶ θ[εα]ς [Φαν-]
 στείνης δ[ιὰ τὴν ἐ]νρυθμ[ον]
 τραγικ[ὴν] ποίησιν τειμη[η-]
 θέντα δ]ὲ καὶ πολειτεία[ις]
 κ]αὶ ἀνδριάντων ἀνασ[τά-]
- B: 15 σεσῖν ὑπὸ Ἐφεσίων Τρω[α-]
 δέων Ἄντιοχέων τῶν πρ[ὸς]

³ Only the letter *phi* is missing, and Hallof provided a sample.

Δάφνην Βηρυτίων Κα[ισα-]
ρέων *vac.*

4: [ιερά] suppl. Moretti.

5: Λευκοφρόνηνα legit Hallof; -ύνηα Kern; -ύνηα Robert. ἰσο[πύ]θια Slater; Ἰσθ[μια Πύ]θια Kern, quod spatio nimis longum est.

6: legit, suppl. Hallof; Ἀρεσανταδρ[ι]ά[νεια Kern; ἀρέσαντα δήμ[φ] Robert

9: suppl. Eilers; [Λουκι-] Kern

11, 12: coniuxit, suppl. Slater

In line 5, there is room for two or three letters only, and the supplement seems certain. In line 6 Hallof considered also ἀγω[νας] possible. I have not found a parallel for either phrase in agonistic inscriptions, though the term ἀρέσας, usually with the dative, is very commonly used of performing artists, including dancers.⁴ But I should not consider the expression to be impossible Greek for “popular in Roman contests”; in any case Robert’s suggestion, though giving excellent sense, cannot be reconciled with the traces⁵ and is much too short for the lacuna. In line 7 the expression τιμηθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν κυρίων now recurs in an inscription of Tralles recording the victories of an unknown artist.⁶

It is now clear that all Robert’s suggestions⁷ are mistaken. On the other hand, his attention to this text was justified. Now we gain a secure dating, as Verus is now dead, while Marcus is not. This means that only the younger Faustina can be meant in lines 10f; and as she too is dead, the date is therefore after summer 176. We can date the inscription between then and 180. Marcus and Commodus left Asia in autumn 176 for Athens.⁸ Commodus is joint emperor as of 177. The inscription refers

⁴ E.g. *I.Stratonicea* 691: μισθωσάμενοι καὶ αὐτοὶ ὄρχηστὴν ἐπὶ ἡμέρας Σ / ὄν ἀρέσαντα π[ᾶσιν] ἐτείμησαν ἀργυρίῳ διὰ θεα[(θεά[τρον edd.), i.e., “in the theater, in front of the spectators,” and a good parallel for our passage.

⁵ At my request Hallof has checked the squeeze and feels certain that the transcription represents faithfully the traces on the squeeze. One wonders if the variation from the usual formulae may be due to latinisms.

⁶ W. Blümel and H. Malay, “Inscriptions from Aydın Museum,” *EpigAnat* 21 (1993) 134, dated in *AE* (1993) 1528 to 199–200.

⁷ “Pantomimen in griechischen Orient,” *Hermes* 65 (1930) 106–22 (= *Opera Minora Selecta* I–VII [Amsterdam 1969- : hereafter ‘OMS’]) at I 654–70.

⁸ H. Halfmann, *Itinera principum* (Stuttgart 1986) 210–13, who is skeptical about Verus’ stay in Ephesus on his return in 166, arguing from *IEph* 672, 3080 (cf. G. Alföldi and H. Halfmann, “Iunius Maximus und die Victoria Parthica,” *ZPE* [1979] 210). But there were Epinikia in Ephesus then for his returning army.

therefore without a doubt to the first known pantomime competitions in the east, if indeed a pantomime is the honorand.

Against this welcome certainty we have to set two puzzles. Nowhere in poetry or literature is there a reference to "tragic enrhythmic poetry." A pantomime is never commended for poetry or even composition but for movement, acting, imitation, and precision; and poetry is never called tragic enrhythmic. As "tragic enrhythmic" is used at this time of the *kinesis* or *hypokrisis* of pantomimes,⁹ and only of them, it seems at least reasonably probable that we are dealing with a pantomime after all, as Kern and then Robert supposed, especially in view of the imperial company this artist keeps, and his unusual lack of festival victories. But "poetry" is so unusual that caution is necessary. Why he chose to use this unique description¹⁰ of his profession remains baffling, though there was certainly a reluctance to use the obvious but unsophisticated ὄρχησις; and "creation" might give a better idea of the intended meaning of ποιήσις. Perhaps he orchestrated the music for the *fabulae salticae* needed by the chorus and orchestra, to whose accompaniment he or someone else danced. This was usually the work of a *musicarius* (*ILS* 5252, 5239). In any case, the correct designation would have stood earlier in the lost part of the inscription, which may yet be found by the present excavators.

The second and older puzzle arises from Moretti's supplement of ἰ[ερά], which fits the space well; [κοινά] is too long, and nothing else suggests itself. This seems to put his victory in the first (sacred) Epheseia at some point before this inscription, and we wish to know its date. It is, I believe, now possible to be more precise. The Epheseia at this point were dated according to penteteric periods, and Robert¹¹ showed convincingly that Photion son of Karpion, who was still in the 517th penteteris of the Epheseia a young man with few adult victories (though he

⁹ *AnnAraboSyriennes* 23 (1973) 37–84 no. 10 (*Bull. épigr.* 1976.686: Aelius Paris of Apamea, reign of Hadrian); *FdD* III.1 551 (Apolauustus), III.2 105; *IEph* 2070 (Apolauustus); *I. Magnesia* 165 (T. Cl. Myrismos); *SEG* I 529 (P. Ael. Crispus from Syrian Apamea), XXXI 1072 (Crispus of Alexandria); *TAM* V 1016 (Thyateira: Ulpus Augustianus Paris); the literary evidence is collected by Robert (*supra* n.7) 658ff.

¹⁰ *Plut. Mor.* 748A–D, the closest I can find, is not really parallel.

¹¹ *OMS* II 1138–41. The deduction has been approved by all subsequent writers, including Moretti, *Iscrizioni agonistiche grece* (Rome 1953) no.73, though he wrongly objected to the penteteric numbering, and the editors of *IEph* 1605.

would later be an Olympic victor), had been about eighteen years old when he won the Epinicia at Ephesus; and that these Epinicia could only be celebrations for Verus' Parthian victory in 165/166. Photion was therefore about 22 years old in 170, and so the 517th penteteris of the Epheseia is not far from 170. Moreover, we know that the games were sacred at least in the 516th Epheseis.¹² The sacredness of the Megala Epheseia therefore cannot really be dated later than 166. The festival certainly had had its promoter. Robert showed that the devout Ti. Iulius Reginus,¹³ who became eternal agonothete of the festival by providing a foundation for its support, had probably been responsible for the antiquarian research that traced the origins of the penteteris back to prehistoric times. He was already eternal agonothete *ca* 154 at the 513th Epheseis, the first epigraphical evidence of its penteteric number,¹⁴ though the festival had been much earlier alleged to be prehistoric (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.25). He was still eternal agonothete *ca* 174 (*IEph* 1130). Robert thought that Reginus was a likely candidate behind the move to upgrade the Epheseia during the twenty years he was agonothete and financial sponsor, and the antiquarian research would have been part of his proposal for recognition of its ancient status. From *ca* 154 to 174 therefore we know the name of the agonothete of the Epheseia, Reginus, who left his money to Artemis at the beginning of the period.

But the sacred eiselastic status of the Great Epheseia first appears on *IEph* 2067, a statue base for M. Ulp. Damas [Catullinus], chief priest and agonothete of the great sacred [eiselastic] Epheseia set up by P. [Vedius], his wife [Fl.] Papiana, and their

¹² Robert (*supra* n.11) 1138–41 on the basis of *IEph* 1605. His discussion in *Documents d'Asie Mineure* (Paris 1987) 170, is regrettably so distorted by misreadings and wrong references as to reduce its value. The four inscriptions referred to there are now: *IEph* 1604–05, 1130, 1106.

¹³ Robert (*supra* n.12) 170, following M. Lämmer, *Olympien und Hadrianeen in Ephesos* (diss. Cologne 1967): *non vidi*. Reginus is twice asiarch (M. D. Campanile, *I Sacerdoti del koionon d'Asia* [Pisa 1994] no. 71a), kept gladiators, and was notable for leaving all his worldly goods to Artemis on his death (*IEph* 692), as did in part the son of Vedius Antonius Phaedrus Sabinianus, on whom see below. It is only a supposition that he funded the Epheseia after his death; he could have done so earlier, so as to be "eternal agonothete."

¹⁴ *IEph* 1105 A, from Engelmann-Knibbe, *ÖJh* 52 (1980) 35 no. 40, a copy of a fragment from a 1898 excavation. The editors of *IEph*, like Engelmann-Knibbe, give $\phi\gamma\iota'$ with the second letter dotted as the number and interpret 153; we would expect $\phi\gamma'$, but *IEph* 1130 also has $\phi\eta\iota'$ for $\phi\eta\iota'$.

son Antoninus. Vedius is the senator M. Cl. P. Vedius Antoninus Phaedrus Sabinianus, founder of the Vedius gymnasium.¹⁵ His father, M. Cl. P. Vedius Antoninus Sabinus is known for his correspondence with the emperor Pius between 140 and 150, and he offered Verus hospitality during his visits in 162. But this Damas is dated to the era of Hadrian.¹⁶ As Reginus, however, was eternal agonothete *ca* 154–174, Damas must have been agonothete of the sacred eiselastic Epheseia *ca* 150 or 146 or earlier, which indeed suits his dates. Had they been the first sacred games, he would have said so; in which case, the first is earlier still. Reginus therefore may be responsible for the antiquarian numbering of the Epheseia, but not necessarily for the sacred and eiselastic status of the festival. As these privileges are not mentioned in the grand decree of the Dionysiac Artists for P. Ael. Alcibiades¹⁷ *ca* 142, it is a not entirely safe assumption that the Epheseia were or became again sacred and eiselastic in the reign of Pius, who must have authorized both. We can suspect then that Vedius, with his imperial contacts, was the promoter. At Miletus the Didymeia were specifically authorized by the Senate and Marcus, after receiving an embassy, to become eiselastic Kommodeia in 177 to celebrate Commodus'

¹⁵ Details in J. Keil, "Vedii Antonini (3)," *RE Suppl.* 8A (1955) 566f; stemma in *IEph* VII.1 88f, with criticism by Halfmann (*supra* n.8) 135 n.510, and *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum* (Göttingen 1979) nos. 84–84a. Campanile (*supra* n.13: 113–16 with genealogical table XIV) is a useful guide through the morass of the relationships of this powerful family. Note the caution about the stemma in O. Salomies, *Adoptive and Pseudonymous Nomenclature in the Roman Empire* (= *CommLitt* 97 [Helsinki 1992]) 42; for chief-priests P. Herz, "Asiarchen und Archiereiai. Zum Provinzialkult der Provinz Asia" *Tyche* 7 (1992) 93–115, is fundamental.

¹⁶ *MAMA* VI 60; *IEph* 2064, 2067; Campanile (*supra* n.13) no. 112. As secretary of the boule, he puts up a statue of the chief-priest Vedius, who has beautified the city, likely under Pius. Vedius in turn honors him when he becomes chief priest and agonothete, so that a date towards 150 is permissible.

¹⁷ *IEph* 22, 42; A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dramatic Festivals of Athens*² (Oxford 1988) 319 no. 15. Arguments *e silentio* in regard to "sacred," "eiselastic," and similar festival privileges are dangerous, but this is precisely a decree that goes out of its way to be extravagant in these matters, as one expects of the Artists. There is a good example of the problem in *IEph* 4114 for Aur. Athenaios of Tyana, who has won "the sacred eiselastic Artemisia, the Epheseia, Barbilleia, and Adrianeia"—all Ephesian games *ca* 200. Why are the epithets missing from the other games? and why does he then go on to recount a victory in the sacred eiselastic Olympia Asklepeia of Pergamum?

accession to the imperial throne.¹⁸ The same happened earlier with the Epheseia. It is perhaps worth mentioning that *ca* 163 much official attention was being paid to the extension of the cult of Artemis and the Artemisia (*IEph* 24: edict of the procos. E. Popillius Carus Peto). On the other hand, we cannot be sure—in the time of Claudius, and even perhaps under Augustus—that the “sacred victors,” who were illegally claiming free maintenance at the expense of Artemis, did not include victors besides those in the Artemisia.¹⁹

If the first sacred Epheseia are to be dated to the reign of Pius or earlier, then it seems now quite impossible that our artist could have won a competition in 150 or probably earlier at Ephesus and also after 176 at Magnesia, and nothing in between. Moreover, any date before 150 contradicts completely Lucian’s statement (Slater [*supra* n.1] 272) of *ca* 163–165 that there were no pantomime contests in the east. Nor does our artist claim to perform for anyone before Verus and Marcus. There is the possibility, which I raise only to dismiss, that “the first” means not that his particular festival was the first, but that the original festival of the Epheseia was the first festival of Ephesus. For a claim formulated in this highly misleading way, we have an exact parallel in *I.Smyrna* 635, where in the middle of the third century, the *koina Asias* are so called, and this is confirmed by coins (Petzl *ad I.Smyrna* 635). But, apart from other considerations, one will not expect such a designation of an Ephesian festival at Magnesia.

Therefore the only solution out of this impasse is to punctuate after Epheseia and read together “the first sacred isopythic Leukophryena.” This grandiose description signals the Magnesian victory, which is principally commemorated by the inscription, and which might well include, like the later Commodeia, new competitions for mime and pantomime to suit the tastes of the Romans and, just possibly, visiting members of the

¹⁸ P. Herrmann, “Fragment einer Senatsrede Marc Aurels aus Milet,” *IstMitt* 38 (1988) 309–13, improving on his “Eine Kaiserurkunde der Zeit Marc Aurels aus Milet,” *IstMitt* 25 (1975) 150.

¹⁹ *IEph* 17: edict of Paullus Fabius Persicus. There had been a ruling of Vedius Pollio on this issue earlier, in the time of Augustus (on him see R. Syme, *Roman Papers*, ed. E. Badian II [Oxford 1979] 518ff), and Vedius had even then limited the cost of the “penteteric contest” to 4,500 denarii. This suggests that even then Ephesian sacred victors by Republican criteria were being supported by temple revenues, and that too much was being spent on the Great Artemisia.

imperial family. The victory list now runs smoothly: after the Italian victories there is no need to elaborate Epheseia <in Ephesus>, but there is a reason to exalt this special celebration of the much less important Leukophryena, which is why we are told that it is isopythic, as it had been promoted 400 years earlier. We have seen the same antiquarianism operating in Ephesus. We knew from the decree of the Artists for Alcibiades²⁰ that the Epheseia was the festival at which this very powerful group assembled, and of the close relations of their association with the imperial family in the 140s. What could be more appropriate than that this ancient festival, on which the chief priests Vedius and Reginus lavished such care as agonothetes, and whose panegyriarchs suddenly thought it worthwhile to record their office,²¹ was eventually to be the first known festival to include the new tragic ballet? It would seem that the Artists of Dionysus may have been involved.

It is worth observing that nowhere between Alexandria Troas and Caesarea, not even in Antioch, was there apparently a festival for an influential artist to win, save at Ephesus and Magnesia. One assumes that the "Roman games" were not Asian or Magnesian Romaia, for no festivals of that name were still being given.²² The alternative would be the *certamina* among the great pantomimes that caused such trouble for law and order in the theaters of the capital, and which represented the ultimate crown for any artist.

Otherwise his Asian victories and honors are all on the route for those heading for Antioch, where his imperial contacts will have assured him of suitable honors. At a guess, our artist will

²⁰ Cf. SEG XLI 945 (*I.Nysa* 22); cf. *IEph* 22. From before 50 B.C. there were annual Ephesian Dionysia conducted by a priest of Rome (*IEph* 9), which suggests that the close contact between the Artists and the imperial cult at Ephesus had a long history.

²¹ The sophist Flavius Damianus (*PIR*² F253), son-in-law of Vedius A. Ph. Sabinianus, was panegyriarch of the Epheseia at the return of Verus' troops from Parthia in 166 (*IEph* 672). Junius Maximus (*IEph* 811) is panegyriarch about the same time. Both Vedii had been panegyriarchs of the Epheseia (and Pasithea also: *IEph* 728). For the debate about the dedication of the gymnasium (160/161 or 146/148), see most recently S. Dillon, *JRA* 9 (1996) 269. It seems possible that the Vedius gymnasium should be connected with the Epheseia.

²² I rule out the idea that ἀρέσαντα διὰ ἀγώγων Ῥωμαίων could be an additional phrase referring to the Magnesian festival itself, so that this would be a reference to the mimes and pantomimes and such classified usually as *akroamata* and *paramisthomata* and tacked on to the end of Greek festivals.

have come to the east with the imperial family in 175, travelled to Syria, and won the Epheseia and Leukophryena in the year 176 or later. Both Marcus and Commodus were in Asia in August 176, though we have evidence only for visits to Smyrna and Miletus; but this should be sufficient to allow for visits to Ephesus and Magnesia,²³ and as we know, the following year was a good occasion for Asian cities to ask for an upgrade of their festivals.²⁴ Ulpian Augustianus (known as Paris: *TAM* V 1016, with Herrman *ad loc.*) ornamented—συγκοσμήσαντα—victory celebrations in Thyateira for the “undefeated emperors,” the best guess being for Marcus and Verus probably in 165/166. A visit of Marcus and Commodus in 176 was not likely to be without similar celebration. At any rate, we now have some better evidence for associating the presence of emperors in the east with the appearance of pantomime contests at Greek festivals.²⁵

MCMASTER UNIVERSITY

February, 1997

²³ Coins of Magnesia do show Marcus and Verus with the victorious Artemis: S. Schultz, *Die Münzprägung von Magnesia am Mäander* (Hildesheim 1975) no. 130. Artemis Leukophryene has the epithet Nikephoros in the second century B.C. in the inscriptions of Magnesia.

²⁴ *TAM* V 1018 records how Perelius Aurelius Alexander, a periodonikos, engineered from Elagabalus the upgrade of the Augusteia (Pythia) to a sacred eiselastic isopythic oikoumenic contest.

²⁵ Thanks are due to David Meadows for computer work using Photoshop, Claude Eilers for discussion, and most of all Klaus Hallof, whose kindness and generosity are even more impressive than his acute eyesight and draftsmanship.

Addendum: H. Engelmann, “Eine Victoria Caesaris und das Parthermonument (*IvE* 721),” *ZPE* 113 (1996) 91, writes that the Great Epinikia in Ephesus were penteteric; this was specifically denied by L. Robert, *Documents de l'Asie Mineure méridionale* (Geneva/Paris 1966) 91, who also pointed out (*Bull. épigr.* 1977 417) that ὑπέρ was used in the technical sense postulated by Engelmann.