

The Pantomime Tiberius Iulius Apolaustus

William J. Slater

THIS ARTIST is known¹ only from three inscriptions, which Louis Robert collected and emended in two articles.² The inscriptions, which will be treated separately below, are all remarkably similar in format and record his victories and honors in many cities of Asia Minor and Greece in the last years of the second century. The name Apolaustus is common for pantomimes in Italy during the first and second centuries, and six are listed in Leppin's prosopography of the Italian performers, some of whom came from the East.³ But our Apolaustus never claims to have performed in the prestigious games of Italy, and none of the Italian artists of that name are recorded to have performed outside Italy. Otherwise only a lone reference to an Apolaustus in the fourth or fifth century is recorded in

¹ The following will be cited by abbreviations or author's name alone: IAG=L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche* (Rome 1953); DEININGER=J. Deininger, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit* (=Vestigia 6 [Munich 1965]); FAYER=C. Fayer, *Il Culto della Dea Roma* (Pescara 1976); FRIESEN=S. J. Friesen, *Twice Neokoros: Ephesus Asia and the Cult of the Flavian Imperial Family* (=EPRO 116 [Leiden 1993]); HABICHT=C. Habicht, *Inschriften des Asklepieions: Altertümer von Pergamon VIII.3* (Berlin 1969); MAGIE=D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton 1950); MELLOR=R. Mellor, *ΘΕΑ ΡΩΜΗ: The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World* (Göttingen 1975); OMS=L. Robert, *Opera Minora Selecta I-VII* (Amsterdam 1969-); ROBERT, "Pantomimen"=L. Robert, "Pantomimen im griechischen Orient," *Hermes* 65 (1930) 106-22=OMS I 654-70; STEPHANES=I. E. Stephanes, *ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΑΚΟΙ ΤΕΧΝΙΤΑΙ* (Heraklion 1988).

² L. Robert, "Inscriptions de l'antiquité et du Bas-Empire à Corinthe: compte rendu de Corinth VIII 3," *REG* 79 (1966) 733-79, esp. 756ff=OMS VI 551-88, esp. 574ff with further reference to his often cited "Pantomimen."

³ H. Leppin, *Histrionen* (Bonn 1992) 204-11, though it is not easy to separate them clearly.

Alexandria.⁴ It is certain that the most famous of the Italian Apolausti (Leppin no.5) performed at the same time as our Apolaustus. In this essay I seek to clarify the competitions that Apolaustus actually won and to examine the introduction of pantomime competitions in the East; this will involve looking into the vexed issue of Pergamene festivals and their nomenclature. Finally, I explore how the three lists are composed.

The Delphic Inscription

This was published as *FdD* III.1 551 by É. Bourguet in 1929: “piédestal de marbre blanc, cassé en haut à droite ... haut. 0.88; larg. 0.42. L’inscription est gravée dans un creux, tout autour un cadre mouluré, la dernière ligne est écrite sur la moulure.” Only the ends of the first thirteen lines are missing therefore on the pedestal and the end of the inscription is preserved, but Bourguet concluded: “au-dessus du piédestal conservé devait se trouver une plaque qui portait la statue et sur la tranche de laquelle on lisait ἡ πόλις τῶν Δελφῶν” He remarks that one is surprised that Delphi is not among the cities named as having honored Apolaustus as citizen, but this too could stand above the pedestal, though the inscription could also be complete as it stands. I have removed Bourguet’s supplements where they are unwarranted by the evidence.

- Τιβ. Ἰούλιον Ἀπόλαυστον τ[ραγικῆς ἐν-]
 ρύθμου κινήσεως ὑποκριτῆ[ν?
 κην ἱερωνίκην μόνον καὶ π[ρῶτον τῶν]
 ἀπ’ αἰῶνος ἀνθρώπων νικήσ[αντα τὸν]
 5 πρῶτως ἀχθέντα ἐν Περγάμῳ ἱερ[ὸν ἀγῶνα]
 οἰκουμενικὸν ἰσελαστικὸν Ὀλύμπια Ἀσκλη-]
 πεία Κομόδεια Σεβαστὰ κοινὰ [Ἀσίας]
 τὸ ἴδιον ἄθλημα ὁμοίως νικήσαντα]
 καὶ τὸν κατὰ πάντων καὶ αὐτὸ[ν ἱερὸν]
 10 ἰσελαστικόν· βουλευτὴν Μαγ[νήτων]
 τῶπρὸς τῷ Μαϊάνδρῳ Ἀθηναί[ων]
 Περγαμῆνων Τραλλιανῶν Λαδικέ-]
 ῶν Μιλησίων Νικομηδέων Νεικαέ[ων]
 Καισαρέων⁵ Νεικοπολειτῶν τῶπρὸς

⁴ O. Weinreich, *Epigrammstudien I. Epigram und Pantomimus nebst einem Kapitel über einige nicht-epigraphische Denkmäler zur Geschichte des Pantomimus* (=SBHeid 1944 [1948] VIII.1) 92ff.

⁵ On Caesarea Germanica cf. *SEG* XL 1141.

- 15 τῷ Ἀκτίῳ Μυτιληναίων Ἱεροκαιοσα-
ρέαν Μαγνήτων τῶν πρὸς τῷ Σιπύλῳ
Κυμαίων Σεπτηνῶν Θηβαίων τῶν
ἑπταπύλων Πλαταιῶν Χαϊρωνέων Μεσ-
σηνίων καὶ ἐν ὅσαις πόλεσιν ἀνδριάντων
20 ἀναστάσεσιν ἐτιμήθη· Ἐφέσῳ Ἀθήναις Περ-
γάμῳ Μαγνησίᾳ Λαοδικεῖᾳ Β Μιλήτῳ Ἱε-
ροκαιοσαρεῖᾳ Γ Θυατίροις Β Κορίνθῳ Νει-
κοπόλει Πάτραις Σάρδεσιν Μεσσήνῃ Νύσῃ
Κύμῃ Θήβαις Πλαταιαῖς Σέτταις Β· πολί-
25 τὴν Ἀντιοχέαν τῶν πρὸς Δάφνην Ἐφε-
σίῳ Ζβυρναίων Κυζικηνῶν Τρωαδέ-
ων Σαρδιανῶν καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν πό-
λεων ἐν ὅσαις ἐπεδήμησεν ἐπαρχείαις⁶
διὰ τε τὴν τῆς τέχνης ἀκρίβειαν καὶ τὴν
30 τοῦ βίου κόσμ[ιον ἀνασ]τροφήν

2: περιόδον[ι]/κην Bourguet; Πυθιον[ι]/κην maluit Robert.

6: Ὀλύμ[πεια] Πεια Bourguet; Ὀλύμ[πια] Ἀσκλη[πεια] Robert.

9: αὐτὸ[ν τὸν] Bourguet; αὐτὸ[ν] ἱερὸν Robert.

The order is: an introduction followed by (1) lines 3–10: signal honors; (2) lines 10–19: councillorships with genitive plural of ethnic; (3) lines 19–24: statues with dative of city; (4) lines 24–28: citizenships with genitive plural of ethnic; (5) lines 29–30: reasons for the honors, quoted from the official decree.

As Bourguet observed, the reference to the honors at Delphi is missing here, and he concluded that they must have stood in a lost beginning: we shall see that at Delphi he was honored with a councillorship, and therefore citizenship. They will appear on the later Ephesian inscription. We could supplement above the pedestal therefore: "the city of Delphi honors its councillor."

Robert had another solution. In the second line Bourguet's proposal, "period-victor," is impossible, for Apolaustus had won no such number of sacred games; other possibilities such as *sebastonikes*, *paradoxonikes*, and *Ephesionikes* are too long and unsuitable at this point; *aktionikes* would fit, but he had not won an Actian victory but a special crown. Robert considered "victor in the Pythian games" most likely, and indeed the Delphic honors are, as we saw, not otherwise mentioned in the body of the inscription. By this reading, there would be reference to a Delphic victory. But I believe Robert's suggestion to be impossible for a number of reasons. It would be

⁶ The meanings other than "province" are surveyed at SEG XL 1110.

anomalous for *pythionikes* to be the only reference to Delphic honors listed in the body of the inscription, when the official Delphic honors, especially the important councillorship, are absent from their place. One would expect either all the Delphic honors to be present or none. Secondly, one would be surprised to see such a glorious victory, the highest for thumelic artists, relegated *at Delphi* in terms of space to one word behind a long-winded account of victory in the Asklepia at Pergamum. Thirdly, what is indicated by the word *pythionikes* is that Apolaustus had won a sacred competition and pantomime competitions do not appear, with one alleged exception to be treated below, at any of the four great festivals of Greece, nor do they appear even at the Aktia of Nicopolis, where we might expect to see it first introduced, for Apolaustus at Nicopolis won only a special silver crown, not a competition. Lastly there is what seems to me an insuperable objection, that this victory would have to be treated at some length on the Ephesus inscription, which we shall deal with later, and there is no room for a long account of it there or indeed for any account at all. There are therefore very strong reasons to reject the view that Apolaustus could ever have won a Delphic victory.

The Magnesia Inscription

Robert of course knew better than anyone that pantomimes did not normally win major festivals, and it is possible to deduce his reasoning here. He cites several pages later from the market-place of Magnesia-on-the-Meander an inscription preserved in two fragments; these are said by the editor to be two fragments of the same base, and the lines are the same length:

I. Magnesia 192 fr. B:⁷

:..... ἐ]νρόθμ[...]
] ποίησιν τειμ[η-]
 θέντα] καὶ πολειτεί[αις]

⁷ Kern *ad loc.* says: "wohl aus der ersten Regierungszeit des Antoninus Pius, als er im J. 138 die Totenfeier ... für Hadrian angeordnet hatte," which I cannot understand. The inscription cannot be dated earlier than Commodus and the career does not begin before the 160s. He also saw a reference to a Romaia festival, which is not acceptable. I know of no later autopsy, for the stones were buried and I cannot locate a squeeze.

καὶ ἀνδριάντων ἀνασ[τά-]
 σεσιν ὑπὸ Ἐφεσίων Τρω[α-]
 δέων Ἀντιοχέων τῶν πρ[ὸς]
 Δάφνην Βηρυτίων Κα[ισα-]
 ρέων

Obviously the suggestion ὑ]πόκρισιν (Robert) for ποίησιν seems justified on the basis of the reading *enrhythmos*, which can only refer to dancing; it is therefore probable, though by no means certain, that we are dealing with a pantomime, as Robert concluded, though not Apolaustus. We note that citizenships and statues are in the reverse order to those listed by Apolaustus, and that councillorships and other magistracies, the highest honors, may have been missing altogether.

- fr. A: .μω γεγραμ[μένους ἀγω-] (lege τοὺς ὑπο]γεγραμ[μένους]
 νας] Εὐσέβεια ἐ[ν Ποτιό-]
 λοις Σεβαστὰ ἐν Νε[από-]
 λει Ἐφέσηα τὰ πρῶτα[(ἱερὰ) suppl. Moretti)
 5 Λευκοφρύνηα Ἴσθ[(Λευκοφρύνηα Robert)
 θια ἀρεσανταδρ[.]α[(δ[ήμω] Ῥωμαίων Robert)⁸
 Ῥωμαίων καὶ τειμηθέ[ντα]
 ὑπὸ τῶν κυρίων Ἀν[τωνεί-]
 νου καὶ Κομόδου κα[ὶ Λουκί-]
 10 ου Οὐήρου καὶ [...Φαυ-] ([θεᾶς] vel [νέας]?)
 στείνης δ[
 .]αγκ[

Robert⁹ assumed that the fragments were on different sides of the same statue base and that A is the "Vorderseite"; I cannot discover the evidence for this. Presumably, the fact that the end of fr. B looks like the end of the inscription guarantees the order A, B. Although some lines with the name of the victor must be missing from the beginning of fr. A, I should hazard a guess that very little is missing between the fragments, as we could easily fill the gap as follows:

⁸ Robert's correction is approved by Mellor 180. For this technical phrase as *placere*, cf. the agonistic inscription IGR I 442.11 (=E. Miranda, *Iscrizioni Greche d'Italia: Napoli* I [Rome 1990] 47.10) for a piper. But the line as restored by Robert is too short by about four letters, and in any case we need to add a connective particle such as: ἀρέσαντα δὲ [κ]αὶ δῆμω] Ῥωμαίων.

⁹ "Pantomimen" 117, perhaps a mistake of the German translator. He does not claim to have seen the stone.

- A11 Φαυστείνης δ[ιά τε τὴν τῆς]
 B1+A12 τρ]αγ(ι)κ[ῆς ἐ]νρύθμ[ου κι-]
 B2 νήσεως ὑπο]κρισιν τει[μη-]
 θέντα] καὶ κτλ.

At first view, the list of the “undermentioned contests” looks surprisingly short and matches badly the honors awarded on the other fragment, and together they fall into the pattern of no known agonistic inscription. But this can be easily explained by the fact that the victor is a pantomime, and unlike others attested by epigraphy, performed with distinction both in Italy and in Asia. As a result he lists first the Italian and Greek sacred festival *competitions* he has won,¹⁰ just as Apolaustus did, these being especially important for a pantomime at this time, as we shall see; then after public performance in Rome, come the favors of the imperial family, as is found commonly with the Latin pantomime inscriptions (rightly Robert, “Pantomimen” 1-18) but not elsewhere in their Greek counterparts.¹¹ After the break we then find honors awarded by a few Greek cities “<because of> his tragic rhythmic movement,” *i.e.*, citing from the official honorific decrees of the cities; he would have performed with distinction in these cities but precisely not in competitions and “sacred” festivals like other athletes or performers. The order of the inscription—competition prizes, performance at Rome, imperial favors, citizenships and statues—therefore makes sense in view of the unique career of the artist, who after a very successful career in Italy has continued his success in Asia as far as this victory in Magnesia. The arrangement of honors, with the exception of the councillorships and with allowance for the Italian stay, is not dissimilar to that of Apolaustus.

¹⁰ For “undermentioned contests” early in a victory inscription, *cf. I.Sardis* 79 (*IAG* 84) for M. A. Demonstratus Damas the pancratiast and boxer of the early third century; there it emphasizes the “sacred contests.”

¹¹ But commonly enough in other disciplines, *e.g.*, a pancratiast of Magnesia, after listing his victories, claims to have been honored by Hadrian with Roman citizenship (*IAG* no. 71). A citharode of Rhodes won the *periodos* but also was honored by Claudius with Roman citizenship (*Clara Rhodos* II 49) and as chief priest of the Sebastoi at Rome and Naples. W. Blümel and H. Malay, “Inscriptions from the Aydin Museum,” *EpigAnat* 21 (1993) 133 no. 5, publish a victor inscription from the time of Severus, which records special honors, then imperial favors, followed by victories in “undermentioned contests,” roughly the opposite order to our inscription.

In line B5 Kern's supplement, Ἴσο[μια Πυ]θία, was accepted by Robert, who did not hesitate to emend the following nonsense into ἀρέσαντα δ[ήμω] Ῥωμαίων: the readings at this point on the right are clearly far from certain. Nevertheless, this inscription was presumably his reason for suggesting the supplement *Pythioniken* in the Delphic inscription, and he evidently did not consider the possibility of Magnesian Isthmia.¹² But here too there are difficulties and uncertainties. If the victories are in order of importance—Eusebeia, Sebasta, Epheseia, Leukophryneia, Isthmia, Pythia—the position of the prestigious Isthmian and Pythian¹³ sacred contests is anomalous, being not only at the end of all the victories but even after the contest of the Epheseia and the relatively insignificant imperial Leukophryneia, which he has probably just won. Secondly, the Magnesia victory, as the most recent, should come at the end of the list, not in the middle, and perhaps ought to have an epithet. We could read rather Λευκοφρόνηα Ἴσο[πυ]θία, which is a standing epithet of the Leukophryneia in the Hellenistic inscriptions, even if it leaves the line at the limit of brevity.¹⁴ Other possibilities exist, as the grammatical construction of lines 4–7 must remain uncertain, but in any event it provides no clear evidence that the Delphic Pythia were open to pantomime competitions.

It would be useful to know when pantomimes appear at the very old competitions of the Epheseia at Ephesus, if this is indeed the competition meant here, and the Leukophryneia at Magnesia. Although the Leukophryneia are seldom attested in Imperial times, a promising clue would appear to be that the

¹² Pythia are recorded for the third century from Magnesia in an inscription from Megara: *IG VII 49 (IAG 88)*; cf. Kern's testimonia no. XIV.

¹³ There existed other Pythian and Isthmian contests, e.g., the later Mariana at Ephesus. But at this time only the two best known can be meant. One alternative among many is to link the words to some unknown Magnesian revival.

¹⁴ See Kern's index to *I. Magnesia s.v. "isopythion."* There were Augusteia Isopythia and Augusteia Pythia in Theateira in the third century (*TAM V.2 1018* with Herrmann's note), and at the end of the second century we find a flute-player boasting of isopythian victories in Sardis and Hierapolis: Blümel and Malay (*supra* n.11) 132 no.4 lines 13f. There are many other imperial examples of similar grandiose emphasis, e.g., Κομμόδεια ἰσοκαπετώλια ἐν πατρίδι for a Bithynian (?) in Delphi (*IAG* no. 87). All inscriptions outside Magnesia give the spelling as Leukophryneia. See also the Addendum to n.80 *infra*.

Epheseia victory looks to be 'first', and Moretti¹⁵ reasonably concluded that this could only be when the Epheseia became 'sacred'; he therefore suggested supplementing Ἐφέσια τὰ πρῶτα [ἱερά]; on that assumption he dated the victory *ca* 170. A recent inscription¹⁶ requires that the date of the first sacred festival would have to be put back to 166 and, as it does not mention that it is the 'first', preferably earlier still, for usually a victor can be expected to announce a victory in the 'first sacred' contest, as Apolaustus is alleged to do here. This takes the 'first sacred' contest Epheseia to a date *ca* 165, which conflicts with Lucian's testimony that pantomime competitions were not yet introduced in Asia (*Salt.* 32). Further, if the pantomime had an established career in Rome, before coming to Magnesia in the time of Commodus, the victory at the 'first' Epheseia in 166 or earlier would somewhat awkwardly need to be placed prior to the Roman career. Indeed, if the M. Ulpius Damas (Catullinus) who is chief priest of Asia and agonothete of the great sacred Epheseia is, as is probable, the same person honored by Hadrian elsewhere, we would be able to move the sacredness of the Epheseia even earlier, and attribute it to Hadrian.¹⁷ These considerations all inspire doubt about Moretti's supplement.

Verus died in 169 and the younger Faustina in 176; I take Antoninus to be Marcus.¹⁸ Perhaps Verus' marriage at Ephesus in 164 would seem a good time for a professional to move from

¹⁵ The Leucophryneia continue to be sacred and important in the Magnesia, but outside Magnesia the Leucophryneia are mentioned only three times: *IG* XII.1 73b (Rhodes), *I. Didyma* 97, and the only imperial mention is in an inscription now in Çannakale but of unknown provenance, *Bull. épigr.* 1972. 366—I have not seen the original Turkish publication. Presumably the *megala Epheseia* are meant; lesser Epheseia were held in the intervening years. Moretti's supplement is in *IAG* 213, but I have been able to find no parallel for the phrase τὰ πρῶτα ἱερά in victor inscriptions, although τὰ πρῶτα can come before (e.g. *IG* XIV 612) or after the festival it describes.

¹⁶ They are "sacred" and "eiselastic" in the 516th pentaeteris of the Epheseia, when T. Claudius Epigonus won as citharode (*I. Eph.* 1106, where no agonothete is named). If Robert (*OMS* II 1138) was right to date the 517th close to 170, when Photion son of Karpion won the mens' wrestling, the Epheseia were sacred and eiselastic by 166 at the very latest.

¹⁷ See *I. Eph.* 2064, 2067 and *MAMA* VI 60, discussed by M. D. Campanile, *I sacerdoti del koinon d'Asia* (Pisa 1994) no. 112. Though the great Epheseia are not—or at least not always—the *koina Asias* at Ephesus, as *I. Eph.* 1123 proves (where a victor wins both), yet the supplement [κοινά] is attractive.

¹⁸ As in *IGR* IV 1201 (Thyateira [*TAM* V.2 912]), 1519 (Sardis); so too Robert, "Pantomimen" 121 = *OMS* I 669.

Italy. Verus is in fact alleged, like Trajan, to have taken artists with him from Rome to Syria, an 'owls to Athens' operation.¹⁹ But against such a possibility, we should remember the other trips of Faustina or Commodus to the East. It is best to date the Magnesia inscription in the 180s and leave undecided at what time before that pantomime competitions were attached to the festivals. We shall return to the question later.

The Pergamum Competition

In the Delphic inscription, if we set aside the reading *pythioniken*, we need to find a sacred competition that Apolaustus had actually won and which would fit the traces on the stone. The only remaining solution of any probability is Ἀσιονίκτην, i.e., victor in the Κοινὰ Ἀσίας. We shall show in this section that this is the competition he had won. By contrast, had he indeed won a Delphic competition, he would certainly later at Ephesus have boasted of it at greater length than in one word: he did not. The first victory that he claims occupies lines 4 to 10 and was the event of which he was clearly most proud. In fact one realizes that it was in all probability the only event he had ever won at this point, because the many other honors he had won did not allow him to claim a competitive victory.²⁰ When he does later win another competition in Thebes, he boasts of it for six lines, as we shall see. The reason is easy to discern: there simply were no pantomime competitions for him to win, or so few as to make it extremely difficult. As a pantomime in the time of Commodus he was excluded from the regular genres of festival competitions. This is why he proclaims with such energy that the competition at Pergamum was the very first that had ever been held for pantomimes and it was held while Commodus was alive. This is why he announces that it was in his "own discipline"—a locution unique in the victor inscriptions unless I am mistaken.²¹ We can now say confidently that

¹⁹ Fronto *Princ. Hist.* 20 van den Hout: *histrionem ex urbe in Syriam accisse*; cf. *SHA, Verus* 8, 10–11 for the *bellum histrionicum* and his import of Syrian artists to Rome.

²⁰ Winning a brand new contest was not regarded as highly as winning an established one: see e.g. *IGR* I 153.15: μηδὲ καινὸν ἀγῶνα νεικήσας as a boast.

²¹ For ἄθλημα as a games category, cf. *IG* V.1 20.4 from second-century Sparta: εἰ δ' ἐπὶ τι ἄθλημα εἰς ἀπογράφαιτο; cf. *I.Olympia* 56.14ff with Dittenberger's note.

in the 180s a pantomime competition at a festival was rare enough in the Greek East to be a source of particular pride even to a famous and much honored artist.

In the Roman West such competitions were known earlier from Campania, precisely at the Eusebeia and Sebasta. It is commonly agreed that sacred contests of pantomimes in Asia began with Marcus and Verus on the basis of Lucian's remarks (*Salt.*), which was probably written in Antioch *ca* 165.²² But in fact this is only the date after which they were allowed and we have no certain example of such contests until Commodus and our Asklepieia, even if we do not set aside the Magnesia inscription treated above, almost twenty years later.

"Similarly [*i.e.*, like gladiatorial events], pantomimes and mimes, which had long existed on the fringes of Greek festivals, first became part of Greek competitions within imperial [*i.e.*, connected with the imperial cult] festivals."²³ The Sebasta or Kaisareia or even Balbilleia²⁴ are games primarily to honor the imperial family, and certainly the *koina Asias*. Is the Asklepieia an imperial festival in this sense? The Epheseia, let alone the Leukophryneia, are not strictly imperial festivals, for they were sacred long before emperors granted this privilege, nor is the Asklepieia, even if it became sacred because of an imperial grant. The competition in which Apolaustus won at Pergamum was the prestigious Olympeia Asklepieia, which was also *hiera*,

²² C. P. Jones, *Culture and Society in Lucian* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1986) 70 n.7, following Robert and D. S. Robertson.

²³ S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge 1984) 89 with n.58, which reads: "Robert, *OMS* 1.654 and 671. Later evidence has not altered this picture." Cf. also A. Cameron, *Circus Factions* (Oxford 1976) 206: "Gladiatorial and wild beast shows were never part of the agonistic festivals. They were normally provided separately by priests of the imperial cult, at both provincial and municipal level [Robert, *Gladiateurs* 271; Liebeschütz, *Historia* 8 (1959) 123]. From early [scarcely! WJS] in the second century pantomimes did compete in the festivals [Robert, "Pantomimen" 119f] but theatrical shows (which normally meant the mime and pantomime) were also given separately. Like gladiators and wild beast shows, they were too popular to be limited to quinquennial festivals. Not surprisingly it was often the same philanthropic or ambitious citizens who provided both. Thus we find gladiatorial and beast shows mentioned in the same inscriptions as theatrical displays...." The first sentence here needs qualification.

²⁴ At Smyrna the Balbilleia is the festival of the *koinon* of Asia: H. Engemann and D. Knibbe, *ÖJh* 52 (1978-80) 35 no. 39 (*I.Eph.* 1123.8)—an agonistic inscription with a victory in the *koina Asias Balbilleia* at Smyrna—with Robert's comments in *Bull. épigr.* 1981.414.

oikoumenika, and *eiselastika*.²⁵ It was obviously not in origin an imperial festival, but in honor of the god of the sanctuary. Yet the addition of Commodus would indicate that the emperor is now honored with Asclepius. The answer lies in the words *sebasta* and *koina Asias*.

First we should trace the metamorphoses of the competition, and epigraphy allows us to demonstrate its changing nomenclature: it may be considered an exemplary warning against assumption of consistency in festival names, and I apologize for setting it out in some detail. We are after all not dealing with an arbitrary selection of titles but with a selection, for various reasons, from a changing title. The many inscriptions show that the Asklepieia festival was famous in the second century and probably not before. Competitions with which it may be connected are mentioned earlier, but its importance probably goes along with the massive rebuilding of the sanctuary of Asclepius from the end of the first century.²⁶

(1) In Hellenistic times the "Soteria and Herakleia" are attested, where "Soteria" refers to Asclepius. Around the middle of the first century, a private festival was founded in the sanctuary of Asclepius by Demetrius Milates for the imperial family, called the *Sebastoi Soteres*.²⁷ But all other references to an Asclepius festival are probably second century and need have no connection with these earlier ones.

(2) (Hiera) Asklepieia, referred to by Aelius Aristides (*Or.* 25, p.210 Keil) as: τὰ ἄθλα τῶν ἱερῶν Ἀσκληπιείων with their agonotheite. A stadium victor at Ephesus ca 170 has won in the Asklepieia at Pergamum (*I.Eph.* 1611) and also in the—obviously different—Augusteia at Pergamum. Likewise a *dolichodromos* Aniketos of Mitylene also wins the Asklepieia in Pergamum twice (*IG XII.2* 388). The agonotheses are "of Soter Asklepios."

²⁵ For this last honor, a gift of emperors but a burden to cities, see in general *Bull. épigr.* 1961.221; add the bibliography in P. Herrmann, "Fragment einer Senatsrede Marc Aurels aus Milet," *IstMitt* 38 (1988) 309–13 at n.1, dealing with the decree of Marcus establishing the Didymeia as eiselastic and (probably) also as Kommodeia in 177 (*SEG XXXVIII* 1212); add now the honorary decree of Teos for Antiochus III, republished in *SEG XLI* 1003 c/d 46–50.

²⁶ The inscriptions are collected by Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Paris 1937) 67f. I have updated his list and added others.

²⁷ Robert, *Documents d'Asie Mineur*² (=BEFAR 239 bis [Paris 1987]) 475 with n.18, also noted that the altar of Zeus Soter was in the agora at Pergamum. The important inscriptions (Habicht nos. 3, 36) are commented on by Robert, *Bull. épigr.* 1971.538, 543.

(3) (Megala Sebasta) Asclepieia. Habicht²⁸ notes the mention in the second century of the "summer Asclepieia," and in the same century Alexander, a Pythian piper "of the *neokoros* Alexander," is honored by Cl. Pisoninus Diiphilus the agonothete of Soter Asklepius as *hieron* of [i.e., presumably, dedicated to] Soter Asklepius" who has won the "Megala sebasta Asclepieia."

(4) Olympia Asklepieia *eiselastika*. Aurelius Athenaeus of Tyana and Ephesus won the *Olympia Asklepieia hiera eiselas-tika* πρώτος καὶ μόνος ἀνθρώπων ca 200; if he was a [*rhet*]-*or*—and it is difficult to find another supplement—it is surprising that he can be a *periodonikes*.²⁹ But he would have benefited from the alterations to the festival program in honor of Commodus, though he retrospectively chose not to mention him. He also won the Augusteia so that we can be absolutely certain that our competition was not the Augusteia at that time either.³⁰ This is clearly the same festival that Apolaustus won. After 180 the people of Tralles honor the trumpeter T. Flavius Philagrus of Laodicea and Tralles who won the Olympia Asklepieia in Pergamum:³¹ he must have won just before they became Commodean, for he wins other Commodeia festivals, so that we are left with the as yet unanswerable puzzle why the title Olympeia is missing from the apparently exhaustive titulature of Apolaustus' festival.

(5) Asklepieia Kommodeia: won twice by the citharode C. Antonius Septimius Poplius of Pergamum before the time of

²⁸ *Asklepieion* 8 n.21, referring to Boehringer, *AA* (1966) 457: "die Deutung des Inschrift ist fehlerhaft." Robert, *Bull. épigr.* 1969.484, made corrections, comparing our Apolaustus inscription, and takes *sebasta* with what precedes.

²⁹ *I.Eph.* II 4114. He also wins in the Diiphileia Traianeia at Pergamum.

³⁰ *FdD* II.iv.476 also shows that the Augusteia were still performed at Pergamum along with the Traianeia ca 200, so that all three major competitions were functioning separately at that time. Robert, "Études d'épigraphie grecque," *RPhil* (1927) 136=*OMS* II 1102, gives a selective and now necessarily outdated list of Augusteia inscriptions, where Delphi inv. 3805 is the victory list of Septimius Aurelianus of Nicomedia, discussed in *CRAI* (1970) 22=*OMS* V 663 n.7.

³¹ *I.Tralles* 135, where the Olympia Asklepieia in Pergamum are listed together with the Deia Kommodeia celebrated for the first time in Laodicea; Stephanos no. 2479; cf. Robert, *OMS* II 1135 and (*supra* n.26) 424f.

Septimius Severus.³² He had also won the Augusteia thrice and the Traianeia.

(6) Olympia Asklepieia Kommodeia: M. Aur. Ptolemaeus of Argos, a period-victor poet, is recorded in a Delphic inscription³³ as being the "first" to win at Pergamum in the Olympia Asklepieia Kommodeia and also at Sparta in Olympia Kommodeia; he was obviously at this competition at the same time as Apolaustus. The "first" then can only mean that Commodus 'founded' a new competition. When? Presumably by decree when he was sole emperor after 183, rather than in 175 when he went to Syria, or on his accession in 177 as at Miletus. The name Olympia may be due to the title given the emperor Hadrian in 128,³⁴ for Zeus Olympius does not seem to be a state cult.

(7) Olympeia: Aur. Metrodorus of Cyzicus won the pentathlon at the Olympeia in Pergamum as well as the Olympeia in Pisa.³⁵ The title "Olympeia" by itself might seem to suit a period after Hadrian's title giving in 128; but his other victories suggest a date in the 170s and the same appellation is found on a victor's inscription from Ancyra,³⁶ which lists victories in the Olympia and the Traianeia at Pergamum in the time of Commodus. Also on the coins of Pergamum, but not before Cara-

³² *I.Smyrna* 659 (*IGR* IV 1432; Stephanes no. 2121). Note that *IGR* puts a comma in the middle by mistake and that he has won also the Traianeia and the Augusteia, once again proving the existence of all three festivals at this date.

³³ *FdD* III.i.89; for more on him see *Bull. épigr.* 1988.125; A. J. Spawforth, "A Severan Statue Group and an Olympic Festival at Sparta," *BSA* 81 (1986) 327ff, who deals with the Spartan festival in detail.

³⁴ So Moretti, *IAG* 198; cf. Robert (*supra* n.26) 69ff.

³⁵ *IGR* IV 161, noted already by Moretti, *IAG* 198. As the victor won the Epinikia in Rome, he should be placed in the 170s, for these were celebrated in December 176; cf. *IAG* 247.

³⁶ S. Mitchell, *AnatSt* 27 (1977) 63-103 no. 8 (*Bull. épigr.* 1978.489). Robert (*OMS* II 1133=*RPhil* [1930] 33) corrected *BCH* (1904) 82 no. 5 (*I.Tralles* 136) to remove the anomalous festival of the Olympia Augusteia by punctuating between the words:

15 ... Ὀλύμπια ἐν Σμύρνῃ
καὶ ἰ Ὀλύμπια Αὐγούστει-
α ἐν Περγάμῳ ...

We can refer both the Olympia and Augusteia to Pergamum. The date is *ca* 195.

calla, appears the contest "Olympeia";³⁷ the coins show the legend Olympeia with *tris neokoron*, when the city was briefly thrice temple warden.³⁸ It would seem that this is our contest or a development of it, but the reason for the abbreviation of the name is not obvious.

(8) It may be that our competition was so superior to the others in Pergamum by 200 that it could be simply called *the* festival of Pergamum; that at least is the conclusion one would draw from the victories of an unnamed choral- and pythian-piper, who had won at the Augusteia and Traianeia as a choral piper but also simply as Πέργαμον πυθαύλας and Πέργαμον χοραύλας.³⁹ No other competition save the Asklepieia comes into consideration. Likewise the competition can be described simply as τὸ ἱερόν, as Moretti guessed, after its refoundation by Hadrian,⁴⁰ though the Traianeia and the Romaia/*koina* were sacred games.⁴¹

Amidst the many puzzles thrown up by this changing nomenclature, we have seen that the Asklepieia of the second century were at least once called *sebasta* and that an even earlier festival of Asclepius included the imperial family. But Robert did not address the central problem of what we are to do with the final words *sebasta koina Asias* in the inscription. He seems if anything to have considered this a separate festival, in that he refers shortly thereafter to another of the "three great festivals

³⁷ Moretti, *IAG* 168, 198 with further references, esp. H. von Fritze, *Münzen von Pergamon* (= *AbhBerl* [1910]) Anhang, Abh. I 81ff, who took the Augusteia wrongly as an Augustan festival and the Olympeia as a separate Caracallan festival, for the earliest numismatic attestation is from his reign. He explained the later emphasis on the name on Pergamene coins under Elagabalus, Valerian, and Gallienus by the rivalry with Ephesus, which got a fourth neokorate under Elagabalus and created its own Olympia.

³⁸ So Habicht 18 with further references. Caracalla sought a cure in the Asklepeion in 214/215.

³⁹ *FdD* III.iv.476. But a simple claim to be thrice (sacred) victor at Pergamum (*SEG* XLI 1407.15) cannot be interpreted in the same way.

⁴⁰ *IAG* 197, citing *I.Olympia* 237 for P. Aelius Artemas ca 140. The granting of sacred games, probably the Hadriana Olympia, and associated tax freedom for Smyrna by Hadrian is noted in *IGR* IV 1437. 37 (*I.Smyrna* 697.38 with useful commentary by G. Petzl).

⁴¹ *IGR* IV 336.6 shows that the Traianeia Diphileia were founded expressly as a second sacred competition by Trajan; see the bibliography listed by Petzl (*supra* n.40), and for the competition esp. Robert, *Monnaies antiques en Troade* (Paris 1966) 46–50; the first can only be the *koina*. Hadrian will then have created the third in the Asklepieia.

of Pergamum, the Augusteia⁴² or Sebasta,⁴³ and elsewhere he omits these final three words from the title; yet later (in 1969) he took *sebasta* with what precedes.⁴³

Indeed there was an important festival at Pergamum, as at other places, called originally (at least before *ca* 16) the Romaia Sebasta, celebrated in its initial phase by the *koinon* of Asia.⁴⁴ Just when it ceased to be the Romaia Sebasta and became known as the *koina Asias* at Pergamum is not a simple question; it is not impossible that the two designations may have co-existed in the first century.⁴⁵ However that may be, Wörrle is the latest of many (e.g. Robert, *Bull. épigr.* 1977.430) to equate these Romaia Sebasta not only with the Pergamene *koina Asias* but also with the later Augusteia,⁴⁶ and Robert had earlier suggested that the Balbilleia when celebrated at Pergamum were

⁴² The crown was of pine along with its cones: *Bull. épigr.* 1958.554.2; Robert, "Deux Concours grecs à Rome," *CRAI* (1970) 22=OMS V 663; the name has nothing to do with honoring Augustus.

⁴³ *Supra* n.26: 68, but see *supra* n.28. Robert often promised an exhaustive study of festivals, and it seems that he became more and more aware of the inconsistent and confusing nature of our evidence.

⁴⁴ *IJR* IV 1064 (*I. Cos* 104; *IAG* 60), which records the Romaia Sebasta, held by the *koinon* of Asia in Pergamum in the time of Augustus. They were founded in 29 B.C. according to Dio 51.20.9, but may be an extension of older *Moukieia*; for the origins of the *koinon* of Asia, now illustrated by recent inscriptions, see Campanile's introduction (*supra* n.17). The last datable mention of this festival is to the 12th, i.e., in 16 A.D. (*IJR* IV 454, but see on this controversy n.49 *infra*), where the honorand, C. Iulius Sacerdos is said to be "gymnasiarch of the 12th Romaia Sebasta of the five gymnasia in Pergamum," and priest of Tiberius.

⁴⁵ So emphatically Fayer 124, who points out that the first mention of the *koinon Asias* at Pergamum—but notably not said to be penteteric—is before 60, and the worship of the "goddess Rome and Augustus" can be traced until the time of Trajan; see on this also Friesen 80: "by the end of the first century CE it [*sc.* the title of high priest of Asia] had replaced the earlier title 'high priest of Rome and Augustus' for the cult at Pergamum." M. L. Caldelli, *L'Agon Capitolinus* (Rome 1993) 156, writes that the *koina Asias* were substituted in the first century for the *megala Sebasta Romaia* "con i medesimi intenti," citing as the earliest example the inscription for Ti. Claudius Patrobius in 60 (*IAG* 65). Yet the precise term "Romaia Sebasta" as a festival title is not on our present evidence found after 16, and it is as well to note with Mellor (51 n.90) that at Smyrna the two competitors were independent of each other.

⁴⁶ M. Wörrle, "Neue Inschriftenfund aus Aizanoi I," *Chiron* 22 (1992) 337-76 at 368ff, with an important judgement (359) on the relationship between *koina* and the chief priests. He does not at this point offer a further justification for his view.

also the *koina Asias*, as on occasion they were at Smyrna.⁴⁷ We would then have four names for this particular festival at Pergamum.

The Augusteia only appear at Pergamum, as in other cities, *ca* 170 and they are either new or the renaming of older festivals, especially the *Sebasta*.⁴⁸ But at Pergamum the *Sebasta* are not attested after 16,⁴⁹ where they are called the Ῥωμαῖα σεβαστὰ τὰ τιθέμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῆς Ἀσίας ἐν Περγᾶμῳ.⁵⁰ Instead, as Magie (1295ff n.57) and Deininger (54f) had already pointed out, as a result doubtless of the spreading worship of the imperial house, we find thereafter the designation of *koinon* or later *koina Asias* at Pergamum and elsewhere in Asia, though that title in turn is difficult to discover at Pergamum after *ca* 170. It would appear therefore to be a reasonable assumption that the original festival was called the *Sebasta Romaia*, which soon after the death of Augustus became simply *koina Asias* at Pergamum, with or without additional epithets such as *Barbilleia*, and then *Augusteia* towards the end of the Antonine era—though it is wise to remain cautious in proposing such a simple development. There is indeed an unnoticed difficulty with this assump-

⁴⁷ Robert, *Bull. épigr.* 1981.414, 1974.455 P. Frisch ("Nemeseia und Barbilleia in Smyrna," *ZPE* 15 [1974] 162), referring to an inscription from the Troad from the later second century: "il est clair aujourd'hui que les Barbilleia furent célébrés un temps aussi à Smyrne et à Pergame. L'inscription nouvelle d'Éphèse enseignait que c'est au titre de *koina Asias* que le fête fut célébrée à Smyrne, et donc aussi sans doute à Pergame." See *supra* n.24.

⁴⁸ So Robert, *Bull. épigr.* 1970.136 (instead of *Bull.* read *R.Ph.* at *OMS V* 165); *CRAI* (1970) 22 n.7=*OMS V* 663 n.7.

⁴⁹ Habicht 165, following Magie 1297 n.57, argued persuasively for an annual celebration of the *Romaia Sebasta*, which would put the twelfth celebration (*AM* [1907] 321 n. 50 [*IGR IV* 454]) in 18 B.C. rather than 16 A.D. But this seems now, despite the difficulties, invalidated by the *Lex Portorii Asiae*. Friesen (116) raised the same difficulties without citing Habicht. Certainly, when the quadrennial *Traianeia* was founded, it was specifically on the same lines as the previous festival of *Romaia Sebasta* or *Koina*. But a further and unemphasized complexity is that *IGR IV* 498 refers to the μέγαρα Ῥωμαῖα Σεβαστὰ at Pergamum, suggesting a major quadrennial festival as well as minor annual festivals. Fayer (114–24, esp. 114 n.20) opts for quadrennial periodicity without answering Habicht's objections. See n.51 *infra*.

⁵⁰ This is the often published inscription for an unknown pentathlete from Cos; Moretti (*IAG* no. 60) dates it *ca* 5 A.D.; *IGR IV* 1064; most recently republished without commentary in *Iscrizioni di Cos* (Rome 1993) EV218.

tion, which remains unresolved. Although the *koina Asias* were quadrennial,⁵¹ the Augusteia were biennial.⁵²

To return to our inscription, we have to admit that, even if we were then to concede that the Augusteia were sometimes the *koina Asias* at Pergamum—and I know of no direct evidence for this, though it is *prima facie* likely enough—the *sebasta koina Asias* in this inscription cannot be the Augusteia, for after *ca* 170, as we saw, the proper name for this festival is always the Augusteia, never Sebasta.⁵³ On the other hand, the word “sebasta” had even been used as an epithet earlier for Pergamene Asklepieia, and not just for innumerable festivals for the imperial house, *e.g.* the Σεβαστὰ Βαλβιλλεῖα *ca* 100 at Ephesus.⁵⁴ It begins to seem inevitable that the Asklepieia here, or whatever their full title is, were also the games of the *koinon* of Asia.

The final proof that the *koina* are indeed the Asklepieia is given by the grammar and wording of the inscription, which manifestly records only one festival and two related victories in that festival, the pantomime competition and the *kata panton* general competition.⁵⁵ This double victory is of course extremely common; indeed a *kata/dia panton* victory seems

⁵¹ See *supra* n.48; *IAG* 65 for Ti. Claudius Patrobius reveals that before 60 the *koina Asias* were quadrennial at Sardis and Laodicea; at Smyrna they are quadrennial *ca* 90 (*IGR* I 445.8f [Miranda (*supra* n.8) I 50.8f]) and so should be also at Pergamum, confirmed by *IGR* IV 454 and the parallel of the Traianeia and at Ephesus; the *Lex Portorii Asiae* (*SEG* XXXIX 1180.128ff), though fragmentary at this point, seems to claim thirty days' tax exemption for the quinquennial (*Romaia Sebasta*) at Pergamum after 8 or 12 A.D. Besides Fayer's arguments (*supra* n.49), see P. Herrmann, “Milet unter Augustus,” *IstMitt* 44 (1994) 203ff at 218 n.69.

⁵² Moretti, *IAG* 221, citing his no. 79 (*IGR* I 153.29; *IGUR* 240.59) for M. Aur. Demetrius the pancratiast, who fought professionally for only six years but won the Augusteia three times.

⁵³ For the Augusteia see Robert *supra* n.48. The date 150 is given by Wörrle (*supra* 46); I have not found an example before 170.

⁵⁴ Founded *ca* 88 (*I.Eph.* 1122). There are Sebasteia Asklepeia and Kaisareia Asklepeia at Epidaurus in the second century; *IG* IV.1² 101 with von Gaertringen's note, IV 475 with B. Puech, *REA* 85 (1983) 17–21, esp. 17 n.2. These imply a regular festival with additional competitions, which may have been originally independent in honor of the imperial cult.

⁵⁵ Moretti, *IAG* 217ff, citing the earlier studies of Mie; E. J. Jory, “A pais komoidos and the dia panton,” *BICS* 14 (1967) 84ff, is criticized by Robert, *Bull. épigr.* 1968.254, who demands that we separate the imperial examples from the Boeotian *epinikia*. But there seems now general agreement on the statements I make in the text.

always in Imperial times a sign that the competitor, always a musical or dramatic artist, has won another regular victory in the same festival. The "general" competition was certainly a separate competition, and not a prize awarded for the most outstanding competitor at the end of the competition, because we have at least one Hellenistic record of someone who won only the "general" event and none of the other events.⁵⁶ The boast here is that both of the victories entitled Apolaustus to an *eiselasis*. But the inscription also proves that the "general" victory allowed pantomime competitions. There are no other examples in Greek lands of a pantomime "general" victory, but there is a surprising number in Italy.⁵⁷ Presumably this is another sign of Roman influence and further proof that one could not be a "general" victor without being in an accepted competitive discipline. Our inscription proves then that the Asklepieia could on occasion be the *koima Asias*, and it should not really be surprising that the festival of the savior god should be assimilated to that of the emperors, especially because there was a definite tendency after Hadrian to syncretism in the sanctuary;⁵⁸ but in view of the changing titulature, it would seem unwise to assume that all festivals held always to a regular schedule (so too Mellor 176).

The first datable mention of the Augusteia is on an inscription from *ca* 174,⁵⁹ and on present evidence we must consider it to have been a separate competition from the Asklepieia, which acquired the names Kommodeia Sebasta during the reign of Commodus (180–192). At this time the Asklepieia must have been rearranged to allow a new pantomime and poetic competition, so that victors could claim to be the first to win in

⁵⁶ *IG* VII 3195 (Hellenistic Orchomenos). The vexed problem of the *dia panton* requires further study. Important is the *hierourgiai* connected with the *dia pantos agon* in the honors listed for Aelius Alcibiades in *SEG* IV 418, reprinted in A. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dramatic Festivals of Athens*² (Oxford 1988) 319 and discussed by Moretti, *IAG* 217.

⁵⁷ *ILS* 5184 (M. Ulpius Apolaustus), 5190 (L. A. Apolaustus Memphis); *CIL* XIV 4254 (*TGrF* p.327 [Memphius]), 5189 (L. A. Apolaustus), 5194 (M. A. Agilius Septentrio). Of these the most puzzling is *CIL* XIV 4254, where the pantomime lists the titles with which he has won with twice "dia panton" included.

⁵⁸ Mellor (46 n.115) gives evidence for joint Asklepios/Roma worship. On "einer alle Einzelgötter in sich aufnehmenden Allgottheit" see the fine remarks of Habicht 12.

⁵⁹ *I.Eph.* 1130, set up *ca* 174 after the death of T. Iul. Reginus between 170 and 174; cf. *I.Eph.* 1096.

it. Commodus is alleged to have sponsored mimes and pantomimes in Antioch (Malalas, in Robert, "Pantomimen" 121), and the attachment of Kommodeia to new or old festivals is frequent; in fact Apolaustus won another of them.⁶⁰ Mitchell⁶¹ gives examples, sometimes associated with the founding of a new temple and so games; he speculates that the Commodeion at Mazaca Caesarea may have been of this kind.

It will be clear from this lengthy but necessary discussion that here we must read together "Olympeia Asklepieia Komodeia Sebasta *koina Asias*."⁶² The addition of *koina Asias* is surprising but explicable.⁶³ These games were organized among a number of cities of Asia, especially by Smyrna, Ephesus, and Pergamum and given by the chief priest of the Imperial cult. But on some occasions they were given additional names such as Balbilleia and/or combined with already existing festivals, as Moretti recognized.⁶⁴ This is an example. It now becomes clear that as a result of this one victory, or two if we count the overall competition, Apolaustus won the title of "sacred victor" and "asionikes," as well as gaining the coveted distinction of a formal triumphal entrance. We knew that mimes shortly afterwards could claim to be "asionikes"⁶⁵ and it is likely that the program

⁶⁰ In Sparta and, as we shall see, in Thebes. Moretti's index in *IAG* lists Kommodeia at Antioch, Nicaea, Tarsus (an *isolumpia oikumenika Kommodeia*), and the name is also attached to earlier festivals like the Didymeia at Ephesus, which then become the Didymeia Kommodeia, or the Hadrianeia Komodeia at Ephesus. But they appear at Cyzicus, Caesarea Mazaca, and many other places too.

⁶¹ *Supra* n.36 [*SEG* XXVII 843]) and *Anatolia* (Oxford 1993) I 221.

⁶² Cf. "Pythia Sebasta" in the honors for Aelius Alcibiades (*SEG* IV 418) and many similar examples.

⁶³ For these games see the basic article of Moretti, "Κοινὰ Ἀσίας," *RivFil* 32 (1954) 276ff (reprinted with additions in Moretti [n.64 *infra*]); Deininger 54ff; H. Engemann and D. Knibbe, *EpigAnat* 8 (1986) 28-31; and Friesen's chapter, "Games and Festivals of the Cult," 114-41. On Moretti's specific suggestion for the total organization of the games, many will share the skepticism of Habicht 165 n.6. The first city to hold *koina Asias* competitions was Smyrna, many years after the first provincial cult in Pergamum.

⁶⁴ In his "Note alla parte secunda," in *Tra Epigrafia e Storia* (Rome 1990) 266; cf. Frisch (*supra* n.47) 162; Miranda (*supra* n.8: 82) remarks: "La celebrazione di questi concorsi [*i.e.*, the Balbilleia of Ephesus] ... era collegata in maniera non del tutto chiara con quella dei *koina d'Asia*."

⁶⁵ The earliest is Flavius Alexander Oxeadas *biologos* (*I.Tralles* 110), who had probably won there. The other competitions he claims to have won will not have been more than money prizes. For the title cf. Habicht, *Asklepieion ad* no. 119. In Rome mimes had won festival 'palms' much earlier (*Ov. Tr.* 2.506), thereby doubtless provoking partisan *rixae* like Petron. *Sat.* 45.7.

of the *koina Asias* could diverge from the regular festivals by including official disciplines more suited to Roman tastes, but excluded from the prize events of Greek sacred games. The *koina* included not only the gladiatorial events,⁶⁶ which, though most important, obviously could not be an event in sacred games, but also—probably from an early period—mimes, and now pantomimes; yet we have apart from the Apolaustus and the Magnesia inscriptions no other evidence for pantomime as a Greek sacred competition. It becomes equally likely that for regular Greek festivals to include these competitions, the addition would be greatly facilitated if the festival could be equated on that occasion with the *koina*, or have the *koina* attached to it. The pantomimes were able thereby to enter into the formal sacred competitions, as it were, by the back door.

The Ephesus Inscription

I.Eph. 2070+1071 were found on the front and the narrow left side of a statue base in the theater and are presented as follows.

- A. [Τιβ. Ἰούλιον Ἀπόλαυστον, τραγικῆς ἐνρύθμου κινήσεως ὑποκριτῆν]

.....

[βουλευτὴν Ἐφεσίων [Δε]λφῶν Μαγνητῶν [τῶν πρὸς] τῷ Μαιάνδρῳ Τραλλιανῶν Μει- [λησίων] Λαοδικέων Νεικομηδέων Νει- [καέων] Καισαρέων Μυτιληναίων Μαγνητῶν [τῶν] πρὸς τῷ Σιπύλῳ Ἱεροκαισαρέων Νει- [κο]πολιτῶν τῶν πρὸς τῷ Ἀκτίῳ Θηβαίων [Π]λαταιέων Χαιρωναίων Μεσσηνίων τειμηθέντα καὶ ἀνδριάντων ἀναστάσε- σιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, ἐν Ἀθήναις, ἐν Περγάμῳ, ἐν Δελφοῖς, ἐν Κορίνθῳ, ἐν Λακεδαιμόνι, ἐν Πάτραις, ἐν Νεικοπόλει, ἐν Μαγνησίᾳ, ἐν Μει- λήτῳ, ἐν Τράλλεσιν, ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ β', ἐν Σάρ- δεσι, ἐν Ἱεροκαισαρείᾳ, ἐν Νύσῃ, ἐν Μεσσή- νῃ, ἐν Θήβαις, ἐν Πλαταιαῖς, στεφθέντα δὲ καὶ ἀργυρέῳ στεφάνῳ Ἀκτιακῶ ἐν Νεικοπό- λει τειμῆς χάριν καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν πό- λέων πολεῖτην, ἐν αἷς ἐπεδήμησεν ἐπι-

⁶⁶ Robert, "Archaiologos," *REG* 49 (1936) 235ff, esp. 247 (=OMS I 683); Deiningner 46 n.7, 47 n.11 (citing the important passages from Galen), 160. The Gytheion Kaisareia (n.74 *infra*) have mimes in the time of Tiberius.

δεικνόμενος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τέχνην μετὰ ἀκρε[ι-
βείας καὶ τὴν τοῦ βίου κόσμιον ἀναστροφήν·
τὴν τειμὴν ἀνέστησεν Τ. Φλ.
Κλειτοσθένης ὁ ἀσιάρχης
καθὼς ἐν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δη-
μῷ ὑπέσχετο παρ' ἑαυτοῦ

- B. [about six lines are missing]
ἀγῶνα καὶ αὐτὸν εἰσελαστικόν
καὶ νικήσαντα ὁμοίως μο-
νον καὶ πρῶτον τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶ-
νος τὸν πρῶτως ἀχθέντα ἀγῶ-
να ἱερὸν ἐν Θήβαις τῆς τραγι-
κῆς κεινήσεως [[Κοιμώδεια]]
Διονύσεια Ἡράκλεια

It is obvious that we are missing at the beginning of B precisely the description of the Pergamum victory, as follows:

[Τιβ. Ἰούλιον Ἀπόλαυστον]
[τραγικῆς ἐνρῦθμου κινήσεως]
[ὑποκριτὴν Ἀσιονίκην ἱερονίκην]
[μόνον καὶ πρῶτον τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος]
[ἀνθρώπων νικήσαντα τὸν πρῶτως]
[ἀχθέντα ἐν Περγάμῳ ἱερὸν]
ἀγῶνα καὶ αὐτὸν εἰσελαστικόν κτλ.

If six lines are missing, then there is no room for another victory, certainly not the important record of a Delphic victory, which would entitle Apolaustus to claim to be a *pythionikes* and *hieronikes*. We observe that the two fragments of the inscription have been printed in reverse order. It began as before with the primary sacred competitions, of which Apolaustus was so proud. These were carved on the narrow side, which was the front. The broad side began with the list of the places of which he was a councillor, which are on the Delphic decree as: βουλευτὴν Μαγνήτων/ τῷπρὸς τῷ Μαιάνδρῳ Ἀθηναίων/ Περγαμῶν Τραλλιανῶν, so that we are justified in querying the supplement offered: [βουλευτὴν Ἐφεσ]ίων [Δε]λφῶν Μαγνήτων. As Delphi comes early, it would be reasonable to assume that the Ephesus decree follows the Delphic decree, and therefore all the honors of the Delphic decree could be reproduced here, especially near the beginning. We should therefore rather read: Περγαμῶν Ἀθηνα]ίων [Δε]λφῶν Μαγνήτων so that the important cities of Pergamum and Athens will not be omitted.

If we return to the beginning, we can see that Apolaustus has won a second prestigious sacred competition, not at Delphi, but at Thebes, on which he expatiates at length. It too was sponsored by Commodus and it too was the first of its kind. The Dionysia Herakleia was an old festival that combined two even older ones, but it had been refashioned under Commodus to include pantomimes, in what we may view as the increased Romanization of the festival competitions. We therefore have further evidence that the Ephesus decree is later than the Delphic, for otherwise this Theban victory would have been mentioned in the Delphic decree; perhaps Apolaustus won at Thebes on the return trip from Delphi back to Asia. But, though a Theban victory was undoubtedly important, it could never be compared to a Delphic victory, if such had ever existed. The evidence is incontrovertible that there never was a Delphic victory.

The Corinth Inscription

Robert in his review of the inscriptions published in *Corinth* VIII.3 demonstrated brilliantly that two small fragments published separately were from the same inscription, and that it was similar to the two Apolaustus inscriptions already known.

fr. 693:]ανι[
]εια Γ θυι[
]ταιαις[
]νευμ[

fr. 370:]υ
]νδεων
]ις 'Εφέσω·
]ν· Λαοδικεία·
]β· Σάρδεσιν·
]εια· Σέττα[ι]ς β·
]ει· 'Ακτιακῶ στε
]ων πρὸς Δάφνην
]ιων· Πατρέων
]ων ἐν ὄσαις ἐπε
ἀκρ]εῖβειαν, καὶ τὴν
]ην δὲ καὶ τει
]εν Χαλκίδι τει
]οισι Σικυῶν

We can in view of the fixed structure we have established combine the two:⁶⁷

]υ

? 'Αλαβα]νδέων

τειμηθέντα δὲ ἀνδριάντων ἀναστάσειν ?Αθήνα]ις· Εφέσω·
]ανι[?Τράλλεσι]ν· Λαοδικεία

5 Β·Μειλήτω· Ιεροκαίσαρ]εία Γ· Θυ[ατείροις] Β· Σάρδεσιν
 . . . ?Θήβαις Πλα]ταιαῖς [?Χαιρων]εία· Σέττα[ι]ς Β·
 στεφθέντα δὲ τειμῆς χάριν ἐν Νεικοπόλ]ει Ἀκτιακῶ στε
 φάνω ἄργυρέω· πολίτην δὲ Ἀντιοχέων τ]ῶν πρὸς Δάφνην
 ?Ζμυρναίων ?Κυζικηνῶν ?Σαρδιανῶν Εφεσ]ίων· Πατρέων

10 ?Τρωαδέων καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν πόλε]ων ἐν ὅσαις ἐπε
 δήμησεν ἐπαρχείαις διὰ τε τὴν ἀκρ]εῖβειαν καὶ τὴν
 τοῦ βίου κόσμιον ἀναστροφήν. (βουλεύτ]ην δὲ καὶ τει
 μηθέντα] ἐν Χαλκίδι τει
 μηθέντα]οισι Σικυῶν)

The clue to fitting the pieces together is the B before Sardis in the list of honorary statues. If we look at the other inscriptions, Apolaustus had two statues at three places: Laodicea, Saittae, and Thyateira. But this B cannot refer to Laodicea or Saittae and so must be preceded by Thyateira; the rest follows, for the beginning of Thyateira is preserved in the other fragment. It can also be seen from the different carving of the last three lines that someone felt obliged to add to the finished inscription a number of honors accorded to Apolaustus when he was still in the neighborhood of Corinth. He had been appointed a councillor of Sicyon and Chalcis almost certainly after the honors at Corinth had been decreed. The fragment begins only after the point where the list of honorary statues started. We are missing the first half with special honors and councillorships. But it is possible to calculate that the list of statues was shorter than in the other two inscriptions.

The most interesting puzzle is in line 2. As a genitive it must represent the last, or one of the last, of the cities of which Apolaustus was councillor. Only a few Carian and Lycian cities, whose names end in -nda will fit the clear traces, and no city mentioned on the two previous inscriptions will; of these the

⁶⁷ For Robert's review see *supra* n.2; I have only seen the excellent photographs in the Corinth publication. Professor Stroud tells me that no more fragments have been discovered; and I thank him for the information. There is, however, much unexcavated land between the two findspots. I have added for the sake of example a number of supplements, which would be removed in any conservative publication.

most distinguished and geographically closest to Ephesus is Alabanda, a city not otherwise mentioned. There seems, however, just enough room after it for the words we expect: *τεμμηθέντα ἀνδριάντων ἀναστάσεις*, and it seems certain that this councillorship was the last in the list of such honors.

The Lists

We now have three fragmentary lists, which is more than we have for most people in antiquity. This gives us a chance to see how these things were composed. We saw that the Delphic must come before the Ephesian inscription, because the latter has the extra victory at Thebes and the Actian crown, and the Delphic councillorship and statue are listed in Ephesus. The Ephesus inscription also adds honors at Sparta and Tralles. Against this one might argue that the Ephesus list omits the two statues in Thyateira, but also the statues and councillorships in Cyme and Saitai. How do we account for these omissions?

Here are the three lists, as far as we have been able to reconstitute them:

(Parallels have been shown in boxes; *: missing in one of the first two lists; =: sequence of two reversed)

	DELPHI	EPHESUS	CORINTH
A:	Pergamum	[Pergamum] Thebes	
B:	<i>bouletes</i>	[<i>bouletes</i>]	
	Magn. Mean.	[?Athens, ?Pergamum]	
	Athens	*Delphi	
	Pergamum	Magn. Mean.	
	Tralles	Tralles	
	Laodicea=	Miletus=	
	Miletus=	Laodicea=	
	Nicomedia	Nicomedia	
	Nicaea	Nicaea	
	Caesarea	Caesarea	

Nicopolis/Actium	Mitylene	
Mytilene	Magn. Sip.	
Hierocaesarea	Hierocaesarea	
Magn. Sip.	Nicopolis/Actium	
*Cyme		
*Saittai ⁶⁸		
Thebes	Thebes	
Platea	Platea	
Chaeronea	Chaeronea	[Chalcis
Messene	Messene	Sicyon]
C: statue		
Ephesus	Ephesus	?
Athens	Athens	Ephesus
Pergamum	Pergamum	?
Magnesia	*Delphi	?
Laodicea 2	Corinth	Laodicea?
Miletus	*Lacedaemon	[?Miletus]
Hierocaesarea 3	Patrae	Hierocaesarea 3
*Thyateira 2	Nicopolis	Thyateira 2
Corinth	Magnesia	Sardis
Nicopolis	Miletus	?
Patrae	*Tralles	Platea
Sardis	Laodicea 2	[...eia?]
Messene=	Sardis	Saittai 2
Nysa=	Hierocaesarea	Action crown
*Cyme	Nysa=	
Thebes	Messene	

⁶⁸For the variations in the spelling of this place cf. C. Habicht, "New Evidence on the Province of Asia," *JRS* 65 (1975) 74; Hermann *ad TAM* V 1.

Platea	Thebes
*Saittai 2	Platea
	Actian crown

D: *polites*

Antioch	[many]	Antioch
Ephesus		?
Smyrna		?
Cyzicus		
Troas		?
Sardis		Patras

All these lists are *prima facie* likely to be selections from a larger dossier. Here this can be proven. The citizenships are stated to be selections, and probably the statues and perhaps even the councillorships are too; of all the sections, only the two victories are likely to represent the full picture. In that case, we should acknowledge that even under Commodus pantomime 'sacred' competitions were a great and desirable rarity. If we ignore mason's errors (e.g., the three statues at Hierocaea being reduced to only one on the Ephesus list) we can make some deductions.

(1) The important things come first. The lists of councillorships begins with Athens, Delphi, Pergamum; the important cities of Ephesus and Smyrna are missing.

(2) After these the list is composed of blocks, of which the most coherent are the old Greek cities of Platea, Chaeronea, Messene, and even "seven-gated" Thebes, an interesting testimony to archaism. This is after all the time of the Second Sophistic and these cities still exercise their fascination for someone who dances the old tragedies.⁶⁹ But even the 'Roman' cities of Greece cluster together: Corinth, Sparta—perhaps surprisingly—Patras, and Nicopolis; despite its pretensions Sparta is thought to be Roman.

(3) In fact, these lists are evidently the work of the business manager. Cyme and Saittai in the Delphic inscription have dis-

⁶⁹ I assume he did, but there were doubtless other kinds, e.g. the pantomime Crispos ("Curly") from Alexandria, who claims to have won "the first crown," died in Heraclea Pontica ca 200 and left a pretentious epitaph in Sotadaeans, not an obvious indication of tragedy: SEG XXXI 1072.

appeared from the Ephesus inscription and have apparently fallen out between two blocks of councillorships. But precisely these two cities are missing from the list of *statues* of the Ephesus inscription, which is far less organized and where there are no blocks. That can only mean that the councillorships and statues were in the original source listed together under the city. When the selection was made, the entire city with its various honors was omitted. Perhaps the strangely varied spelling of Saittai helped to throw the reader off. The manager kept a list of places grouped as he saw fit with the honors checked after each as (a) councillor, (b) statue, (c) citizen. He then wrote out a selection, which became ever more careless as he went from the important to the unimportant and handed over these to the stonemason, perhaps along with precise sketches or casts for the accompanying statue. As for the Corinth inscription, it does record Chalcis, Sicyon, and ?Alabanda, missing in the others; but this does not allow us to say if it is pre-Delphi or post Delphi.

Pantomimes in Festivals

At first sight Greek professional artists appear to have resisted the inclusion of the pantomimes in sacred festivals. Equally their imperial sponsors, especially the donors of *munera*, were happy to facilitate their admission, citing no doubt the examples of Campania. In fact, the relations between the two groups were sometimes cordial enough. To cite only two examples, the list of artists of Dionysus preserved from Hellenistic Egypt includes a dancer.⁷⁰ More importantly, it is the artists' union that is involved in honors for the pantomime Augustianus, who had performed—though not won—in imperial Epinikia at Thyateira probably in 165; and we find the two groups cooperating elsewhere.⁷¹ However it was achieved, our evidence is suf-

⁷⁰ *OGIS* 51. This could be an Egyptian peculiarity associated with cult, but cf. *IG XI* 133 (Delos, 170 B.C.).

⁷¹ M. Iulius Alexandros, secretary of the synod: *IGR IV* 1272 (*TAM V.2* 1016 with Herrmann's comments), interpreted by W. H. Buckler, "The Angora Resolution of the Stage Guild," *JHS* 44 (1924) 158–61 at 161, approved by Robert ("Pantomimen," 109=*OMS I* 657) as probably to be equated with the secretary of the synod in an Ankyra decree from 128: *SEG VI* 59.50; cf. Pickard-Cambridge (*supra* n.56) 318f; Alexander, son of Sopatros, thrice chief priest, and a *sebastonikes* citharode. He appears also at Sardis (*I.Sardis I* 13.4;

ficient to show that by at least 180 and probably not much earlier, the barrier to inclusion in the sacred festivals of the East had been broken down.

The advantages of the status of "sacred victor" were most attractive, including most significantly freedom from local taxation, and in Ephesus there was a special association with specific honors for the "sacred victors."⁷² Festivals in Asia brought with them thorny financial problems about freedom from customs and market duties. If the great festival of the Asklepieia was also the important tax-free *koina Asias*, and Pergamum and its port enjoyed thereby tax-free customs status, then this was a matter of financial significance; after all, "all of Asia" was said to visit the Pergamene sanctuary (Philostr. VA 4.34, cited by Habicht, 6 n.1).

Apolaustus was sponsored by a well-known asiarch of Ephesus.⁷³ Performers like him were undoubtedly as important to representatives of the imperial cult as they were to the emperor. Though mimes are recorded at imperial Greek festivals as early as the time of Tiberius, none⁷⁴ of the many surviving

Stephanes nos. 100, 120). But the objection must be that the dates 165 and 128 are too far apart from the equation. In the time of Trajan an inscription from Gerasa (C. Kraeling, *Gerasa* [New Haven 1938] no. 138) shows the artists' guild (ἀγωνιζόμενοι) and the mimes and pantomimes (θεατρίζοντες) cooperating, as Robert has shown with effective parallels (*OMS* I 735–38).

⁷² Cf. *SEG* XL 103 with Pleket's note. For a list of associations of "sacred victors" see Robert, *Hellenica* VII (Paris 1949) 123; for the importance of tax-freedom for festivals cf. Herrmann (*supra* n.51) 214 n.50; P. Gauthier, *Nouvelles Inscriptions de Sardes* 2 (Geneva 1989) no. 3 on a letter of Antiochus III granting exemption from taxes during the Laodikeia in 213 B.C.; M. Wörrle, *Stadt und Fest in kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien* (Munich 1988) 210 nn.155, 158 with further literature.

⁷³ T. Fl. Clitosthenes is not easily dated, for there were three generations of the same name. Friesen (198) dates the last to 180–220.

⁷⁴ In the time of Tiberius, "mime doors" are constructed at a Kaisareia at Gytheion, *SEG* XI 922–23 (V. Ehrenberg and A. H. M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*² [Oxford 1955] no. 102). The fragmentary *I.Stratonicea* (=IK 21.1) 199.3 (Panamara) refers to a *munus* given at the Panamareia by an unknown couple in the two gymnasia: they put on a visiting dancer and τὰλλα ἀκροάματα πάντα. The editor remarks that "dieses Priesterehepaar muss ausser dem Priesteramt in Panamara auch die Priesterschaft der Kaiser innegehabt haben, denn sie haben *kunegia* (also "venationes") gegeben, ein sehr teures Schauspiel, welches nur von den *archieis* gegeben wurde." This is circular reasoning, and one could as well argue that because they did not provide gladiators, they could not be chief priests of the emperor. At *I.Stratonicea* no. 691 the priest of Hecate at Lagina,

inscriptions name pantomimes directly as part of the *munera* of the asiarchs and chief priests, though gladiatorial contests and beast-hunts sponsored by them are frequently named. It is odd but typical that Julius Demosthenes' foundation in 124 mentions mimes but not dancers, and they are at best included in the hired *acroamata* and *paramisthomata* at the end, where the amounts available would not possibly have attracted major artists.⁷⁵ By the time of Commodus, the pantomime competition was not an addition, an appendix, or part of a separate festival, e.g. Ἀσκληπεΐα καὶ Καισάρεια, but an integral part of an earlier sacred festival.

As a final note, as Greek inscriptions in the West tend to be overlooked, I draw attention to a tantalizing fragment of an elegant imperial inscription, IG XIV 2474, now prominently displayed in the new museum of Arles and clearly broken on all sides, though the inscription is most likely complete on the left:

]Δ.ΚΟΝΣΤ[
]ΟΡΧΗΣΤ[
]ΒΡΑΒΕΙΟΥ[

on which Lebègue commented "quae ad pantomimi praemia pertinere videntur." It is interesting to observe that the language is Greek, unusual for Arles at this time; one thinks of the Greek inscriptions concerning the Dionysiac artists from Nîmes.⁷⁶ Robert drew attention⁷⁷ many times to the *brabeion* as

who could be at the same time priest of the imperial house, hires a dancer for seven days and rewards him with a money prize in the theater. On the other hand, *theoriai* ("spectacles") are donated by chief priests: *I. Didyma* 279 with commentary and esp. Robert, *OMS* I 610, who demonstrates that under Hadrian mimes and pantomimes especially would be considered thereby "spectacles," as opposed to agonistic events. Josephus' description (*AJ* 19) of the fourth day of the Palatine Games where Gaius was assassinated already refers to the pantomimes and mimes there as *theoria(i)*; cf. Dio 53.2.1 for later times.

⁷⁵ Wörrle (*supra* n.72) 251ff, esp. 253 with a survey of many relevant inscriptions and literature; for gladiators and *theoriai* together see e.g. *I. Didyma* 279, where the spectacles last ten days; *I. Eph.* 4354; and the list in L. Robert, *Les Gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec* (Paris 1940) 257.

⁷⁶ At the time of her death, P. Ghiron Bistagne was preparing these for publication with commentary; cf. her "Les artistes dionysiaques de Nîmes à l'époque impériale," in *Realia: Mélanges sur les Réalités du Théâtre antique* (= *Cahiers du GITA* 6 [1990/91 (Montpellier 1991)]) 57-78.

⁷⁷ Many references in *Bull. épigr.* 1977.236 with additions in *CRAI* (1982) 229 (= *OMS* V 791).

the probable name for the large metal crown found in many representations and inscriptions, beginning in the later second century; it is now best illustrated by the mosaic of Gafsa in Tunisia, where it is shown in a gymnasium setting.⁷⁸ A gold *brabeion* as a prize could even in the mid-third century be singled out for special mention.⁷⁹ It is therefore legitimate, on the basis of this Arles inscription, to observe that the advent of the pantomime as victor in Greek festivals coincides with the appearance of this strange metal 'crown'.⁸⁰

McMASTER UNIVERSITY

March, 1996

⁷⁸ This important document has been treated by M. Khanoussi, most recently in "Jeux athlétiques et pugilat en Afrique romaine," in C. Landes, ed., *Le Stade Romain et ses Spectacles* (Lattes 1994) 63–67 with references to the previous studies of Duval and others. The implication for the existence of Greek games and institutions in North Africa are considerable, but are still hindered by the non-publication of relevant inscriptions.

⁷⁹ In the long list of honors for the herald Valerius Eclectus of Sinope (*IG* II/III² 3169–70), he wins "first and only" at the "thousand-year games" in Rome celebrated by the emperor Philip in 248: Robert, *OMS* VI 713.

⁸⁰ This article was given as a talk at the Center for Hellenic Studies and at the University of Michigan. I am grateful for the discussion on these occasions, especially to David Potter. In addition to a trenchant referee for this journal, I also wish to thank the following scholars. C. P. Jones has run his critical eye over an earlier draft. Angelos Chaniotis has given me the benefit of his unparalleled knowledge of festival inscriptions and saved me from error. Claude Eilers and Jonathan Edmondson have pointed out many inconsistencies and obscurities. No scholar can venture into this very difficult field without help, and I am accordingly grateful for their encouragement, while gladly assuming all responsibility for errors and remaining omissions. My colleague Dr Sheila Dillon endured with equanimity my persistent questions about the placement of inscriptions on imperial pedestals in Asia and Greece, and even more helpfully was able to illustrate her answers.

Addendum to n.80: In answer to my query Dr Klaus Hallof of the Berlin Akademie writes promptly on 9.4.1996: "Ich habe die Abklatsche IMagn. 192 a un b geprüft und kann Ihnen folgendes mitteilen: 1. v.5 fin. ist zwischen ΙΞΘ und ΙΞΟ nicht zu entscheiden. Der Stein ist rechts stark verwittert. Ich glaube aber, daß ΙΞΘ[MIA ΠΥ]– zu lang ist, wenn man mit v.3 NE[ΑΠΟ]– vergleicht.... 2. Bei dieser Gelegenheit ist festzustellen, daß die Ergänzung von L. Robert zu v.6 falsch ist. Ich ... schlage vor, διὰ ἀγώ[ων] (vel etiam διὰ ἀγώ[νας], was ich aber für schlechter halte) zu lesen." On the basis of Dr Hallof's drawing, I believe that my suggestion ΙΞΟ[ΠΥ]/ΘΙΑ is inevitable. Needless to say, I am extremely indebted to Dr Hallof for his generosity and his precision, and to the referee who urged me to consult him; I was not aware that a squeeze of this inscription existed in Berlin, and am very happy to have my ignorance rectified by such fine scholars.