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Abstract

This dissertation is a cultural history of the Greek dramatic festivals under the Roman Empire, primarily from literary and epigraphic sources. I argue against the idea that Greek culture was in decline during the Roman period, demonstrating that dramatic performance culture flourished at this time. New tragedies, comedies, and satyr-plays were composed and performed at Greek festivals through the second century CE, while re-performances of classical drama lasted into the third century CE. Alongside contemporary drama, Greeks continued to stage re-productions of classical tragedy and comedy. This shared cultural and literary knowledge contributed to the construction and perpetuation of Greek identity in the provinces.

The first chapter addresses how the imperial framework impacted Greek festival culture. The panhellenic festivals were vastly expanded in number and spatial extent, and standardization increased over time. Chapter 2 examines the dynamic of localism and globalism at the festivals, by focusing on the traveling performers. Pulled away from their hometowns to compete and win victories across the Empire, performers were, in turn, drawn back to their hometowns to be granted civic honors and to collect stipends. Driven by these forces, the professional association of actors and poets, the Technitai of Dionysus, pressured festival organizers and emperors to expand the festival network. Chapter 3 turns to the dynamic of localism and globalism in theater audiences. Theater audiences in the Roman period were heterogeneous, and used the theater as a space to negotiate complex hierarchies. Chapter 4 argues that benefactors invested in festivals in order to create financial and social benefits for themselves and their families. Chapter 5 defines the relationship between old and new, tradition and innovation, at the festivals. The last two chapters take up paratheatrical entertainment, Chapter 6 on the introduction of mime and
pantomime to the prize-winning competitions, and Chapter 7 on paratheatrical entertainment as popular culture.

Two appendices seek to make the evidence accessible. Appendix 1 provides a site-by-site catalog of the evidence for the Greek dramatic festivals in the Eastern Roman Empire. Appendix 2 collects the known paratheatrical entertainers from antiquity.
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Introduction

Performance culture in every part of the imperial Greek world flourished under the Empire. This dissertation focuses on the Greek dramatic festivals in the Roman Empire. The study of Greek dramatic performance in the context of the festivals is crucial to understanding Greek popular culture under the Roman Empire. At festivals, rhapsodes recited Homer for huge audiences, and actors performed Euripides, Menander, and newly composed tragedies, comedies, and satyr-plays. Only an elite few would have had access to Greek literature in school, where Homer, Euripides, and Menander also formed the basis of the curriculum.\(^1\) It was at the festivals that most of the population acquired knowledge of this core Greek literary canon. The Roman period was as much an age of poetry as of prose, but for most of the population, the knowledge of poetry was through performance rather than text.\(^2\) This shared cultural and literary knowledge contributed to the construction and perpetuation of Greek identity in the provinces. Being Greek involved celebrating festivals properly.

Scholarship on entertainment in the Roman period has focused overwhelmingly on spectacles such as gladiatorial combat, wild beast fights, *naumachiae*, and circus

---

\(^1\) For the role of Greek *paideia* in the construction of elite ethnic identity in the Roman period, see the collection of essays Borg (2004). For Menander as a schooltext, see Nervegna (2013).

\(^2\) Poetry in the Second Sophistic is a growing area of scholarship, primarily still focused on poetic texts rather than performance: Bowie (1989) attempted to break down the dichotomy between poetry and prose by collecting evidence for the composition of poetry by sophists; Nisbet (2003) covers Greek epigram in the Roman period; Skenteri (2005) compiles epigraphic evidence for poetry relating to Herodes Atticus; Baumbach and Bär (2007) focuses on the epic poet Quintus Smyrnaeus; Whitmarsh (2013) includes a section on poetry in his collection of essays on the literature of the Second Sophistic. Whitmarsh is currently leading an AHRC-funded research project, "Greek Epic of the Roman Empire: a Cultural History." At a conference at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden, "The Many Facets of the Second Sophistic" (October 23-25, 2015), papers by Anna Peterson, Emily Kneebone, Francesca Modini, and myself focused on poetry in the Second Sophistic. The papers from this conference will be published by *Studia Graeca Upsaliensia* (to be submitted Fall 2016).
entertainments. Yet there were far more theaters than amphitheaters in the Roman Empire (Ill. 1), and dramatic festivals are documented in most areas of the Greek-speaking world (Ill. 2). The role of the theater in Greek and Roman society in the imperial period has been drastically underestimated and misunderstood. Greek culture was not in decline in the imperial period. It was thriving. The greatest impact of Empire on the Greek festivals was not in the introduction of Roman spectacles to the provinces, but in the expansion of the festival network.

Ill. 1. Map of the public theaters in Italy and the Eastern Roman Empire, after Sear (2006).

---

Ill. 2. Map of the Greek dramatic festivals in the Roman Empire. Discussion of the evidence for the festivals at each site may be found in Appendix 1.
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Attica 1.1 Athens
Peloponnese 2.1 Epidaurus / 2.2 Corinth and Isthmia / 2.3 Argos / 2.4 Olympia / 2.5 Sparta
Phoci 3.1 Delphi
Locris 4.1 Opous
Boiotia 5.1 Orchomenos / 5.2 Thebes / 5.3 Thespiae
Epirus 6.1 Nicopolis
Cyclades 7.1 Paros
Dodecanese 8.1 Rhodes
Crete 9.1 Crete (city unknown)
Mysia 10.1 Cyzicus
Aeolis 11.1 Pergamum
Ionia 12.1 Ephesus / 12.2 Magnesia on the Maeander / 12.3 Priene / 12.4 Smyrna / 12.5 Didyma
Lydia 13.1 Philadelphia / 13.2 Sardis
Caria 14.1 Aphrodisias / 14.2 Stratonikeia / 14.3 Tralles / 14.4 Kaunos
Lycia 15.1 Oenoanda
Pamphylia 16.1 Side
Cilicia 17.1 Hierapolis
Phrygia 18.1 Laodicea on the Lykos
Galatia 19.1 Ankyra / 19.2 Claudiconium
Bithynia 20.1 Prusias ad Hypium
Pontus 21.1 Neocaesarea
Syria 22.1 Antioch on the Orontes
This dissertation is a cultural history of the Greek dramatic festivals from the age of Augustus to their eventual decline in the mid-third century CE. Because of the survival of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, all three tragedians writing in the fifth century BCE in Athens, classical scholars have equated "Greek drama" with "fifth century Athenian drama." After the fifth century, dramatic festivals spread throughout the Greek world, throughout mainland Greece, the Peloponnese, the Greek islands, to the West, to Sicily and Southern Italy, and to the East, to the Greek cities of Egypt, Asia Minor, Syria, and along the Black Sea coast. As a result, many more Greek plays were written and performed outside of Athens and after the fifth century than had been staged at the classical Athenian Dionysia.

Only two fragments of Greek tragedy written in the Roman imperial period have survived. Not a single line of comedy or satyr-play from this period has come down to us. One of the two surviving fragments, part of a speech of Medea, was written by a Roman, Cn. Pompeius Macer, probably as a literary exercise and not for performance.4 The other fragment was authored by Serapion, a friend of Plutarch, who appears as a character in his dialogue Why the Pythia does not give oracles in verse.5 Serapion was an elite, and like Macer, his work was almost certainly not meant for festival performance. Composition of tragedies and comedies by elites, as literary exercises, was an important aspect of elite education and culture, but it tells us little about the public performance culture of the Roman era.

It is because of the loss of the texts of imperial Greek drama that scholars have neglected this rich and vibrant period of literary and performance history, but there is much yet to explore. Many documentary sources survive in the form of inscriptions. Weaving together the epigraphic and literary evidence brings out complementary perspectives on the festivals and the social

4 TrGF Vol. 1, no. 180, fr. 1.
5 TrGF Vol. 1, no. 185, fr. 1.
groups involved in them. Festivals benefited elite benefactors and festival organizers, and largely sub-elite performers and spectators in different ways. It was negotiation between these groups which kept the festivals alive as venues for dramatic performances for so long.

Literary authors, such as Plutarch, Philostratus, Strabo, Cassius Dio, and Athenaeus, were well-educated elites, whose writing is highly rhetorical. These prose authors all comment upon festival culture and poetic performance, often distancing themselves from both the performers and spectators in order to assert their own higher social status. Lists of victors and honorific inscriptions for performers, inscribed on stone and publicly displayed by cities, advertise the status of the local festival, and the connection of the festival and the city to famous performers. Decrees by the professional association of actors, imperial correspondence with this association, and epitaphs of performers and poets reveal the perspective of the performers, and their own attempts at asserting social status and their place in the oikoumene. Inscribed theater seats attest to the hierarchies and display of status among the theater audience.

We have epigraphic evidence of dramatic festivals in over 30 cities in the Roman Empire (Appendix 1). The epigraphic evidence clusters in Boiotia and Asia Minor, probably due more to the epigraphic habit than a concentration of dramatic festivals in these regions. We are seeing only the tip of the iceberg. There is a strong bias towards recording festivals of the highest status, the panhellenic festivals. There were many more local festivals, which have left only the faintest trace in the epigraphic record. Victors boast of winning at the major festivals, which they list by name, and also at contests which are not of high enough status to name individually. When one victor, Philoxenos of Side, boasts of winning at contests with 1,000-drachma prizes 85 times, and Bassus of Miletus claims to have won at unnamed 5-year contests 260 times, we are seeing hints of the scale of the network of local Greek festivals, the names and programs of which are most
often unknown.\textsuperscript{6} Many of these local festivals may not have had the funds to erect monuments of their victors, or publicly inscribed documents detailing the prizes or other budgetary concerns, as we find in wealthy cities like Aphrodisias, or the monuments and documents may simply have been lost. The panhellenic festivals are better represented in the epigraphic record, because it was these festivals which victors most wanted to advertise their connection to.

Due to an over-reliance on literary sources, which distort the image of contemporary drama due to elite anti-theatrical posturing, scholars have drastically underestimated the level and scale of dramatic production in the Roman period. Fantham questions the existence of the performance of Greek comedy in Rome and Southern Italy in the Roman period.\textsuperscript{7} Beacham writes that new plays were not composed under the Empire, and that there were only occasionally re-performances of classical drama.

By the end of the first century BC, the composition of new plays for the theatre had virtually ceased, as alternative forms of scenic entertainment gradually displaced scripted comedy and tragedy. The theatre itself, however, thrived, and steadily increased in popularity and importance. Old plays were occasionally revived, while mime and pantomime (often in spectacular and lavish stagings) attracted huge and enthusiastic audiences. Throughout the Empire vast, new, permanent theatres were constructed, as the opportunities for different types of performance burgeoned, and public demand for entertainment encouraged prudent politicians and rules as well as ambitious patrons to provide generous sponsorship and support.\textsuperscript{8} Beacham is not alone in doubting the existence of imperial Greek dramatic composition and performance. Writing on Lucian's relationship to classical tragedy, Schmitz writes, "Does this mean that tragedies were only perceived as texts and as manifestations of the classical past and that no actual performances ever took place? Though we have some reports of tragedies being

\textsuperscript{6} Philoxenos: Bean (1965) no. 149. Bassus: I. Didyma 256.
\textsuperscript{7} Fantham (1984): "But if we grant that the authors of this generation read and were influenced by Menander, can we believe they ever saw a whole play staged? The evidence is uncomfortably vague" (303). On the next page: "From the Neronian period the evidence points to tragedy and para-dramatic forms like mime and melodrama rather than to public staging of comedy: the Emperor clearly had neither a sense of humour nor a sense of proportion, so that interest in comedy would be surprising at the time" (304). She cites only literary evidence, not epigraphic sources.
\textsuperscript{8} Beacham (1991) 154.
performed, most accounts show that this [sic] must have been quite exceptional events.\textsuperscript{9} These accounts are based in a stereotype of the debasement of Greek culture in the Roman period, and do not in any way reflect the evidence. Panayotakis provides a more accurate short account of drama under the Empire, though the only example given of a new play produced is the \textit{Thyestes} of L. Varius Rufus.\textsuperscript{10} This has the effect of erasing Greek poets from the narrative of drama in the Empire. When we take into account the epigraphic evidence, it is quite clear that there was regular composition and performance of Greek drama under the Empire, with newly composed drama being performed through the 2nd c. CE, and re-performances lasting into at least the early 3rd c. CE. Drama was central to imperial Greek culture, and a normal part of life for a large part of the Greek-speaking world.

Many studies omit mention of Greek drama in the Roman era, perpetuating the erroneous assumption that it did not exist, and missing many opportunities to consider how imperial Greek drama developed from earlier postclassical drama, and how imperial poetry and prose authors interacted with contemporary dramatic performance. Studies of Greek literature in the imperial period typically pass over drama. Bowie, for example, in his chapter "Greek Poetry in the Antonine Age," covers epigrams, hexameter poetry, melic poetry, but acknowledges his omission of drama.\textsuperscript{11} While interest in postclassical drama has grown recently, and several collections of essays on the Greek theater in the 4th century BCE and the Hellenistic period have recently been published, these collections have almost entirely omitted discussion of the Greek theater in the Roman era. Petrides and Papaionannou (2010), \textit{New perspectives on Postclassical Comedy}, cover Greek and Roman New Comedy, but do not touch upon the evidence for original

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{9}Schmitz (2010) 301.
\item \textsuperscript{10}Panayotakis et al. (2013) 28.
\item \textsuperscript{11}Bowie (1990) 90: "I have said almost nothing of dramatic poetry, but new tragedies and comedies were written and performed in competitions."
\end{itemize}
compositions of Greek comedy in the Roman era. Gildenhard and Revermann (2010), *Beyond the fifth century: interactions with Greek tragedy from the fourth century BCE to the Middle Ages*, approach Greek drama in the Roman era only from the perspective of literary sources. The reliance solely on literary sources leads one author in this collection to doubt whether drama was performed at all in the time of Lucian.\(^{12}\) Jones (2001), *Greek Drama in the Roman Empire*, is an article-length survey of Greek drama in the Roman era, but there is no monograph on the topic. Graf (2015) devotes one chapter to the Greek festivals in the Roman era, and identifies several important trends, notably the negotiation between present and past, tradition and innovation, and the incorporation of the imperial cult into the Greek festivals in the provinces. His focus is on the transition from pagan festivals to the Christian festivals in late antiquity, not on the role of drama in Greek society in the Roman period. The topic deserves a fuller treatment.

Festivals have more often been studied in local and regional surveys, because of the way that epigraphic corpora are published. Because of the proliferation of studies of festivals in individual places and regions, and the lack of any comprehensive survey of dramatic festivals in the Roman period, scholarship vacillates between focusing on festivals on a local and regional level only, and sketching out global trends in broad strokes.\(^{13}\) We can trace the locally-oriented interest in Greek festivals to a scholar writing in the '20s and '30s. This was Irene Ringwood-Arnold, who began writing about local agonistic festivals in her 1927 Columbia dissertation, in which she covered mainland Greece (outside of Attica) and the islands.\(^{14}\) She begins with a

---

\(^{12}\) Schmitz (2010) 301.

\(^{13}\) Csapo and Slater (1994) note the lack of a comprehensive survey of Greek festivals in their bibliographical notes on ancient drama. Local and regional studies include Ringwood-Arnold (discussed above); Sifakis (1967) on Delos and Delphi; Manieri (2009) on Boeotia; Wörrle (1988) on the Demosthenesia of Oinoanda; Roueché (1993) on Aphrodisias.

\(^{14}\) Ringwood-Arnold followed this with studies of the festivals of Euboea (1929), Delos (1933), Rhodes (1936), Italy and Sicily (1960), and Ephesus (1972), from their earliest attestations through the imperial period.
statement about localism.

In all the literature which has been written on the subject of Greek festivals, there is with little exception only passing reference to the local celebrations which must have played an important part in the life of the various districts of Greece. One receives the impression that these celebrations were of little significance, whereas they were often characterized by the greatest solemnity, ranking in some cases with the great Panhellenic games.\footnote{Ringwood (1927) 3.}

While Ringwood-Arnold's studies of individual regions have been superseded by more recent work, her intention remains relevant. Her interests foreshadowed the scholarly interests that would only fully take hold in the late 20th and early 21st centuries: localism, Greek cultural life outside of Athens, postclassicism, and the periphery as center. What Ringwood-Arnold is alluding to in her comment that there were local festivals of the same status as the panhellenic games is the "upgrading" of festivals, which adopted titles such as Isolympic ("equal to the Olympia"), Isopythian ("equal to the Pythia"), and so on. It is a well-recognized feature of Greek festivals of the Roman era that the number of panhellenic festivals rose, even beyond the expansion which began in the Hellenistic period.\footnote{"But it is generally and plausibly believed that there was a huge expansion in the number of panhellenic festivals in the third century BC. No comprehensive study exists of this interesting phenomenon. There is indeed a most suggestive sketch by the scholar incomparably best qualified to write such a study, the twentieth century's greatest Hellenist, Louis Robert, but it is only a few pages long and lacks footnotes. Any student of hellenistic cultural and social history must often feel that all he or she is doing is to write footnotes to Louis Robert, and in working on this topic one finds oneself so engaged in the most literal sense." Parker (1999) 11. Parker includes a chronological list of panhellenic festivals at the end of his chapter, excluding festivals which do not meet the criteria of being crowned, Isolympian/Isopythian/Isonemean, and/or advertised by embassies.} To this trend we ought to add another important feature of Roman era festivals, which is that even smaller, local festivals were in a sense panhellenic, in that they sought to attract international competitors.

In contrast to locally-oriented studies of festivals, recent scholarship on the Roman Empire has focused on globalization, and the dynamic between localism and globalism in an increasingly inter-connected world. Hingley introduces the concept of fragmented identities to
the conversation about globalization under the Roman Empire, using archaeological evidence to argue for the multiplicity of sub-elite identities under the Empire.\textsuperscript{17} Similarly, in a collection of conference papers on globalism and regionalism in antiquity, Sommer argues that the Empire "promoted, in the long run, the development of distinct identities rather than leveling cultural diversity."\textsuperscript{18} Celebrating festivals was a way to display Greekness, but the festivals were also sites of the display of other identities, such as social status, profession, gender, and familial relationships. The display of these multiple identities becomes more prominent in the Roman period with the increasing use of reserved theater seats, particularly for professional organizations, a topic explored in chapter 3. By considering the festivals not of one locality or region, but of the entire Greek world, I seek to define both the major developments in festival culture in the Roman period which impacted the Greek world, and also how these developments impacted specific festivals, social groups, and individuals.

Discussing Greek festivals in the Roman period immediately raises the question of what defines a Greek festival. Can a festival with competitions in Latin, as the Capitolia had, be considered a Greek festival? Greek festivals were cyclical, founded with the intention of repetition on a set time cycle, often every four years. Some Greek festivals in Rome, such as the Capitolia, were considered the most prestigious Greek festivals in the Roman era, included in the commemoration of performers' victories alongside the most ancient \textit{periodos} competitions.\textsuperscript{19} Greek festival competitors did not recognize paid competitions, whatever the attempt at a Greek aesthetic may have been, as equivalent to a festival competition, or in fact suitable for a festival

\textsuperscript{17} Hingley (2005).
\textsuperscript{18} Sommer (2013).
\textsuperscript{19} E.g. a \textit{komoidos}, Aurelius Ancharenos son of Phaedrus, of Ephesus, is designated as a circuit-victor and victor at the Capitolia in a 2nd c. CE decree of the Technitai in Rome: CIG 6829, cf. Merkelbach (1985). A complete prosopography of the victors of the Capitolia can be found in Caldelli (1993) 121-63.
The difference between spectacles in Rome which imitated Greek festival competitions, by paying Greeks to perform, or including Greek-style competitions among Roman spectacles, on the one hand, and cyclical Greek festivals, on the other, would have been immediately obvious to spectators at the time. Scholars occasionally miss this distinction, conflating both types of "Greek" games. The standard practice in scholarship, which I also adopt, is to refer to games which imitate Greek festivals as "Greek-style" games. For example, the athletic games given by M. Fulvius Nobilior in 186 BCE were the first Greek-style games in Rome.

We can see certain Roman influences on the Greek festivals under the Empire. Most notable is the prominence of the imperial cult, and the inter-weaving of the imperial cult celebrations with pre-existing Greek festivals. Days for the imperial cult celebrations were appended to festivals, and images of the imperial family were often present during the festival celebrations, in the form of moveable objects or imagery on ceremonial crowns worn in processions, or built into the fabric of the city itself. Romans also participated in Greek festivals. The competitions at Greek festivals were normally conducted in the Greek language, but there is some evidence of the inclusion of Latin poetry. A list of festival victors from Ephesus includes Lucius Sertorius Daldianus of Ephesus, "a Greek and Latin poet, writer of hymns, traveling from every (place), victor in many contests." The claim that Daldianus won in many contests suggests that Latin poetry was a part of more festivals than Aprodisias alone. One other Latin

---

20 Plutarch, *Brutus* 21, discussed below.
poet performed at a festival in Aphrodisias, around 100 CE. However, the vast majority of competitions were in Greek, and there is no evidence of Latin drama being performed at Greek festivals. A more subtle Roman presence is the emulation of the imperial center in the provinces by means of gathering the entire oikoumene for the festival, in the diversity of the performers and spectators, which I take up in the first three chapters.

Chapter 1, "Putting the Imperial in Imperial Greek Theater," addresses how the imperial framework changed the Greek festivals in the Roman era. The festivals changed gradually, in response to the new political reality. Nero's interference with the Greek festival calendar during his trip to Greece in 66 and 67 CE was unusual, and not remembered kindly, though it had no lasting effect on the festivals, which reverted to their normal cycles after the disruption. It was Hadrian who had the most lasting and far-reaching impact on the Greek theater, as he re-organized the festival calendar on a grand, international scale.

Hadrian's standardization of the calendar was in response to complaints by the Technitai, who found it difficult to travel between festivals without an internationally coordinated calendar. The second chapter, "Traveling Players: the Lives of Professional Actors and Poets," takes up the role of travel in the acting profession in the Roman period. Travel was so important to the theatrical profession that the professional association of actors, the Technitai of Dionysus, merged their regional branches into one worldwide guild, and began calling themselves the "much traveled Technitai of Dionysus." In the increasingly globalized, inter-connected Roman world, united by travel and a common political system, regionalism gave way to internationalism.

The third chapter, "Audiences," shifts the focus from the stage to the spectators, demonstrating that just as the competitions were open to the entire oikoumene, the inhabited

---

24 Roueché (1993) no. 52 (block B).
world, so too was the audience. Everybody could go to the theater in the Roman period. Festival organizers advertised inclusivity in the audiences, which were diverse. Within the theater audience, people advertised social status and their place in the social hierarchy, whether they were elites sitting in the front rows or the orchestra, or members of professional organizations with reserved seats in the cavea.

Festivals were often funded by endowments established by private benefactors in the Roman period, with some expenses paid by the festival organizer, the agonothetes. The fourth chapter, "Benefactors, Budgets, and Festival Organizers," addresses the question of what wealthy people in the Roman period had to gain from supporting festivals financially. Agonistic festivals were expensive to establish and maintain, and often paired in the ancient sources with public building projects as the two largest investments a benefactor could make. Festivals were sources of prestige, honor, and commemoration, but they also brought economic rewards for benefactors, festival organizers, and inhabitants of the cities in which they were celebrated.

The fifth chapter, "Old and New at the Festivals," addresses the conservatism of the imperial Greek festivals, and examines the ways in which festivals balanced their assertions of oldness and timelessness with presentations of new compositions and competitions. Consistently, a higher value was placed on oldness at the festivals, as actors of re-performed tragedy and comedy were awarded higher prizes than actors of contemporary (newly-written) drama. At the same time, newly-written drama was a part of many festival programs, revealing a competing desire for presentations of new plays. Plutarch and Philostratus both express concerns about changes to the festivals, locating the proper celebration of the festivals in the pre-Roman past, and using the changes to Greek festivals as a way to question whether Greeks had lost their Greekness under Roman rule.
This tension between old and new can also be seen in the introduction of a new competition, pantomime, in the imperial period. Pantomime told mythical stories through dance. The changing role of pantomime and other forms of paratheatrical entertainment is the subject of Chapter 6, "Mimes and Magicians, Puppeteers and Pantomimes: Paratheatrical Entertainment at the Greek Festivals." Pantomime became the pre-eminent form of paratheatrical entertainment in the Empire, and made the unprecedented leap from hired entertainment to prize-winning competition at the Greek festivals, first in the West, at the Sebastea in Naples, and then in the East. The final chapter considers the culture and aesthetic of paratheatrical performance, arguing that while it is portrayed as mindless distraction in elite literary sources, paratheatrical performance often interacted with "high" Greek literary culture, which sub-elite spectators knew in large part through festival performance.
Chapter 1: Putting the Imperial in Imperial Greek Drama

This chapter seeks to answer a set of questions about the relationship of the Greek dramatic festivals to the imperial framework. What changes to imperial-era festivals can be attributed to imperial rule? What interventions on the part of the emperors had a lasting impact on the Greek festivals? How did these interventions change over time, and what were the turning points? My interest is not primarily in what was theatrical about Roman imperial rule, but what was Roman and imperial about the Greek festivals under the Empire.

Overall, the number of Greek agonistic festivals increased drastically from the age of Augustus through the early 3rd century CE, what Louis Robert called an "explosion agonistique."\(^1\) Leschhorn counts over 500 festivals (agones) in the Greek East in the imperial period.\(^2\) Upwards of 30 cities in the Empire are known to have had competitions in drama, and many of these cities celebrated multiple dramatic festivals (Appendix 1). Throughout the imperial period, new Olympia, Pythia, Actia, Nemea, and Isthmia were established, especially in Asia Minor, echoing the ancient periodos.\(^3\) There are many reasons for this agonistic expansion, some to do with the Roman administration, and others to do with the social, cultural, and economic conditions of the imperial era. The military conflicts leading up to the Augustan period, the Mithridatic war and the war between Octavian and Antony, took a toll on Greece. The imperial period saw greater economic prosperity in the Greek world, particularly in the late

---

1st and 2nd centuries CE. This economic prosperity allowed local elites to found new contests and renew old ones for personal and familial gain, as explored in chapter 4. Increased urbanization, may also have contributed to the expansion particularly in Asia Minor.

Reasons for new foundations could be political as well as economic. Establishing new festivals for the imperial cult was a way of asserting political loyalty to Rome, just as festivals for the goddess Roma had been since the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE. There were also reasons of local identity. Cyclical, agonistic festivals made a claim to the importance of the city, its place in the oikoumene, and its identity as a Greek polis. In certain contexts, expression of Greek identity intensified as it was called into question by Roman rule.

1.1 Greek Games in the Roman World

One clear change to the festivals under the Empire was the incorporation of the imperial cult into Greek religious life. Cities which established temples and cult celebrations for the imperial family could be designated as neokoros, by vote of the senate, and often advertised this status on their coinage. The imperial cult was often integrated into the religious life of cities by associating it with pre-existing cults, for example, by adding days to pre-existing festivals in honor of the imperial family. Buraselis refers to these celebrations as "appended festivals." Gebhard argues that imperial cult rituals were held in the theater so that the entire citizen body could observe the honors given to emperors and local elites, tying imperial authority to civic

---

4 On the causes of increased economic activity in the Roman Empire in the 1st and 2nd c. CE, see Lo Cascio (2007).
5 Pleket (2014) 368.
8 Buraselis (2012).
hierarchy and local history. In processions, where the civic hierarchy was reinforced (e.g. holders of offices would have been noticeable from their distinctive outfits), images of the imperial family were also displayed. This incorporation of the imperial cult into rituals which took place in the theater, she argues, unified "the foreign with the local." Similarly, Graf argues that the imperial cult brought an international element to local festivals. For example, at the Demostheneia in Oenoanda, Hadrian made several stipulations regarding the presence of the imperial cult, in the form of images carried in the procession and worn on the crown of the festival organizer, before permitting the foundation and celebration of the Demostheneia.

Imperial cult was an important driver of agonistic expansion. From the time of Augustus, the imperial family was visible at Greek festivals in the form of move-able images carried in processions, images of the imperial family decorating ceremonial crowns, images on buildings which the procession passed, or in which cult activities took place during the festival, and as honorands of the days of celebration of the imperial cult, which were appended to pre-existing festivals. In addition to imperial cult celebrations being added to festivals, many new festivals were established in honor of the imperial family. One notable example is the Sebastea in Naples. Suetonius hints at the scale of these new foundations under Augustus.

Quaedam Italiae civitates diem, quo primum ad se venisset, initium anni fecerunt. Provinciarum pleraeque super templa et aras ludos quoque quinquennales paene oppidatim constituerunt.

---

Some of the Italian cities made the day on which he first visited them the beginning of their year. Many of the provinces, in addition to temples and altars, established quinquennial games in his honour in almost every one of their towns. If Suetonius is correct about this, most of the direct evidence for these provincial Sebastea has not survived. Augustus leaves his mark on local calendars (which are calibrated to perpetuate the memory of imperial visits), the urban landscape (with temples and altars built in honor of the imperial cult), and on the festival calendar (with the new festival foundations). Although he calls them ludi, the fact that the festivals are quinquennial (i.e. penteteric, held every 4 years) suggests that Suetonius is specifically thinking of Greek festivals in the provinces. This picture of agonistic expansion under Roman rule is at sharp odds with the depiction in many literary sources of Greece as culturally declining since the moment of contact with Rome. New festivals, and programs which were expanded for the celebration of the imperial cult, provided more opportunities for poets and performers than ever before.

Another change was the move from regionalism to internationalism in the festivals of the imperial era. The imperial period was a great age of travel. The stability of the Roman Empire made travel in the Mediterranean safer and more accessible than it had ever been before. The popularity of travel literature, and the prominent role of travel in the Greek novel, speak to a larger cultural fascination with travel and travelers. Travel linked individuals and cities to a wider Greek world, and through the topic of travel, we can see the interactions between local and panhellenic identity in the Roman period. In the increasingly globalized, inter-connected Roman world, united by travel and a common political system, regionalism gave way to internationalism. Each festival was a microcosm of the entire Greek world, the oikoumene, both in terms of the international performers, addressed in chapter 2, and the audience (chapter 3).

---

13 Suetonius, Augustus 59.
But this development also had to do with interventions on the part of the Roman emperors. Beginning with Augustus, the emperors exploited the Greek festival network to promote the political and cultural unification of the Empire, creating a globalized network of festivals from Italy across the Greek East.\textsuperscript{14} They did this by expanding the \textit{periodos}, the circuit of international or panhellenic games (Ill. 3), which had for over 500 years prior to the time of Augustus been composed of four festivals only, the Olympia, Nemea, Pythia, and Isthmia. Its formation in the 6th century BCE has been understood as an expression of panhellenism, not only because competitors and spectators came from all over the Greek world to these festivals, but because during festival time there was a truce between the participating \textit{poleis}.\textsuperscript{15}

The young Octavian was quick to identify the \textit{periodos} as an opportunity to assert political unity following the war with Antony. In 27 BCE, following his victory at Actium, Octavian re-founded a Greek festival at Nicopolis, the Actia.\textsuperscript{16} This festival he elevated to the highest status, that of a \textit{hieros agon}, a sacred festival. This put the Actia on the level of the \textit{periodos} games. This was the first time that a Roman political leader had founded a Greek festival, in Rome or the provinces, and the first time the \textit{periodos} had been modified since its formation in 573 BCE with the foundation of the Nemea.\textsuperscript{17} We have no contemporary Greek account of how the addition of the Actia to the \textit{periodos} was received, but Octavian's innovative move may have been softened by the fact that the Actia was a re-foundation of a pre-existing

\textsuperscript{14} Onno van Nijf and C.G. Williamson are co-PIs of a project entitled "Connected Contests" at the University of Groningen, a study of the festival networks of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, which promises to publish work on this topic. On cult networks in the Roman Empire, with discussion of globalization, see Collar (2013).
\textsuperscript{15} Panhellenism at the sanctuaries of Olympia and Delphi: Scott (2014). The panhellenism of the \textit{periodos} festivals could transfer to a sense of panhellenism at the sites of the festivals as well. One example is Aelius Aristides, \textit{The Isthmian Oration: Regarding Poseidon} 23, where he asserts that Isthmia is a "kind of route and passage for all mankind, no matter where one would travel, and it is a common city for all the Greeks."
\textsuperscript{16} Suetonius, \textit{Augustus} 18.
\textsuperscript{17} Formation of the \textit{periodos} in the 6th century BCE: Weir (2004) 29.
festival of Apollo, which was already of the second highest possible status, as a crowned festival.\textsuperscript{18}

Octavian's re-foundation of the Greek Actia set a precedent for increasing circuit expansions that would come to encompass not only mainland Greece but also Asia Minor, Italy, and Rome itself.\textsuperscript{19} The second addition to the \textit{periodos} was the Sebastea in Naples in 2 CE. The inclusion of the Neapolitan Sebastea, in a historically Greek city, was the first expansion of the \textit{periodos} beyond mainland Greece and the Peloponnese. Rome was not on the Greek festival circuit until Domitian's foundation of the Capitolia in 86 CE. The introduction of Greek games at Rome was met with some resistance by the Roman elite, but the inclusion of Rome on the normal route of the Technitai after the foundation of the Capitolia, and of the Capitolia on lists of victories by competitors across the Empire, shows that it was recognized as a legitimate Greek festival.\textsuperscript{20}

Hadrian expanded the \textit{periodos} by establishing three new contests in Athens and upgrading one more. Under Antoninus Pius, the \textit{periodos} was expanded once again with the addition of the Eusebeia in Puteoli in 142 CE.\textsuperscript{21} By the second half of the second century CE, the \textit{periodos} had expanded to include not just the major games of mainland Greece and Italy, but also games in Asia Minor. There has been some disagreement about which Asian games were on the circuit, but it is certain that at least three were. The \textit{koinon Asias}, celebrated in a rotation in

\textsuperscript{18} Pre-existing Actia: Strabo, \textit{Geography} 7.7.6. Epigraphic evidence for the place of the Actia on the \textit{periodos}: e.g. IvO 231. The latest attestation of the Actia is in the mid-3rd c. CE: Caldelli (1993) 28.


several Asian cities, is certain, as is at least one Hadrianeia (either in Ephesus or Smyrna).\textsuperscript{22} As these games included both musical and dramatic contests and athletic contests, the expansion of the \textit{periodos} beyond the original Big Four allowed victors in non-athletic categories, including dramatic actors and poets, to become \textit{periodonikai}.

As the \textit{periodos} expanded, local and international festival calendars changed to accommodate the new festivals and the new routes of the competitors. In addition to having a great effect on the lives of performers, the expansion of the \textit{periodos} changed the way that local, regional, and international festival calendars interacted. The effort to schedule festivals around one another, so as not to conflict, reflects both a local and a global outlook. Local festivals were situated on an international calendar, scheduled around the major festivals of the \textit{periodos}. To schedule around the \textit{periodos} was not to make a festival subsidiary to the \textit{periodos} festivals, but to share in their importance and prestige.

\textsuperscript{22} Jones (2007) and Gouw (2008) disagree on the Asian games of the 2nd c. CE \textit{periodos}. Jones suggests that the \textit{periodos} included the \textit{Koinon Asias}, the Hadrianea in Smyrna, and the Olympia and Balbilleia in Ephesos, while Gouw argues for the \textit{Koinon Asias} in Smyrna, the \textit{Koinon Asias} in Pergamum, and the Hadrianea in Ephesos.
Ill. 3 Maps of the periodos under Augustus (top), Domitian (middle), and Hadrian (bottom). Red = the original periodos festivals. Yellow = imperial additions.
1.2 Augustus and the Expansion of the Greek Festival Network

The age of Augustus was a turning point for the relationship of Rome to the Greek festivals. Having just conquered Antony, the philhellenic "new Dionysus," Augustus adopted a Hellenic vocabulary for his commemoration of Actium. Romanization was expressed through Hellenization. He founded an Actia at Nicopolis in Greece in 27 BCE, and also founded an Actia at Nicopolis in Egypt. At Rome, a festival was voted in Augustus' honor after Actium, to be held on a penteteric cycle. This was the first cyclic Greek festival in Rome. Unlike the Actia in Greece, the Actia in Egypt and Rome were not revivals of previous contests, nor were they of the highest status. It was the Greek Actia which had the greater impact.

The Actia in Greece was a revival of a sacred contest for Apollo. The older Actia, according to Strabo, was a crowned contest (στεφανίτης ἀγών), "but at the present time they have been set in greater honor by Caesar" (νυνὶ δ' ἐντιμότερον ἐποίησεν ὁ Καῖσαρ), i.e. elevated to the status of hieros agon. Cassius Dio, similarly, comments that the Actia was designated "sacred" because there were distributions of food at the festival. While Rome was the political center of the Empire, Augustus did not assert the cultural centrality of Rome with the renewal of the Actia. He gave priority to the Actia in Greece by making it of a higher status than the Actia in Rome, and renewing the Greek contest rather than establishing a new one. Furthermore, the Actia in Greece was geographically close to the other perios contests, and did not expand much the distance that circuit-competitors would have to travel.

24 Fraser (1972) I.809. For the Greek contests in Roman Egypt, see Remijon (2014a) and (2014b). Erskine interprets the Rhodian delegation of theoroi sent to the Actia in Greece and Egypt as an act of political loyalty to Rome and Augustus: Erskine (1991) 273.
25 Cassius Dio, Roman History 51.19.
28 Cassius Dio, Roman History 51.1.
It was also under Augustus that the circuit came to include Italy. This happened with the foundation of the Sebastea in 2 CE, a cyclical, agonistic festival in Naples, a historically Greek city. The Sebastea was isolympic (i.e. equal in status to the Olympia), and scheduled so as not to conflict with the Olympia, where it was also advertised. Unlike the Olympia, the Sebastea included musical and dramatic competitions in addition to athletics. Interestingly, neither the pre-Augustan theater, nor any records of the pre-Augustan Greek festivals of Naples survive, though they must have existed. What is clear is that the Greek identity of Naples was strongly advertised in the Roman period. It was not just the Greek population in Naples that asserted a Greek identity, but also Romans. As the closest major Greek city to Rome, Naples was a place where elite Romans could go to "play Greek." Lomas argues that the expression of Greek identity in Naples intensified in the early imperial period. Although Naples was a linguistically mixed city, made up of populations of speakers of Greek and Latin, as well as Etruscan and Oscan, the documents relating to the Sebastea are all in Greek, as are other high-status documents such as decrees. Lomas argues that this reflects a self-conscious effort on the part of the Neapolitans, particularly the Neapolitan elite, to represent Naples as a Greek city. The dominant use of Greek in imperial-era epigraphy in Naples is unique within Magna Graecia. The foundation of a periodos contest in Naples was a part of this intensification of the advertisement of Greekness in Augustan Naples.

These foundations sought to portray Rome not as an entity foreign to Greece, but as a part of the Greek world. Writing under Augustus, Dionysius of Halicarnasus traces Roman

---

31 On "playing Greek" in Naples, see Newby (2005) 272.
33 Lomas (2015) 73.
games to Greek origins, part of a larger discussion of Rome as a Greek polis. Augustan foundations of Greek festivals were political and cultural statements, which wrote Augustus' own history into the Greek festival calendar. In order to ensure the support of the Greek world following the defeat of Antony, who presented himself as culturally Greek, Augustus presented himself as a benefactor, a founder of Greek festivals, which would not be celebrated as victory spectacles once, but on a fixed cycle for perpetuity. Imperial investment in festivals was aimed at creating a culture shared by the subjects of the Empire.

Augustus' investment in festivals, and that of later emperors, is part of what has been called the "Greek Renaissance" under the Empire. Even as new festivals, new buildings, new forms of literary production were introduced, there was a strongly classicizing tendency in the art, architecture, and literature of the "Greek Renaissance." Greece and the past were inseparable, and more specifically, mainland Greece and the Classical Age of the 5th and 4th centuries BCE. As Spawforth puts it, "Augustan classicism had not only a chronological, but a geographical, referent." Classicism had a significant impact not just on the increase in the number of festivals, but on their programs, from the time of Augustus onward. This may have had an impact even on the programs of Roman-era festivals. Graf notes that the standard sequence of comedy, tragedy, and kitharoidia on the programs of imperial-era Greek festivals is itself classicizing, deriving from the festivals of classical Athens. And it deserves note that until
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35 The "Greek Renaissance": Walker and Cameron (1989), focusing on the flourishing of Greek art and architecture in the Roman era.
38 This sequence was "with variations, the standard program of musical contests in the Imperial age…In some respects, the imperial cities of the Greek East were behaving as if they derived directly from Periklean Athens." Graf (2015) 51.
the introduction of pantomime to the competitions, the subject of chapter 6, the categories of prize-winning dramatic competitions did not deviate from those at the classical Athenian Dionysia, even as the style of post-classical drama changed. On the micro-level of programming, and the macro-level of categorizing games, imperial Greek festivals operated within a framework with direct ties to classical Greece, and especially to Athens. This was not an accident, but a self-conscious expression of the classicism that was characteristic of the Augustan age, seen not only in the festivals, but also in the intense interest in and emulation of classical Athenian architecture, art, and literature by Greeks and Romans alike.

1.3 Nero Pantonikes

Like Augustus, Nero manipulated the *periodos* in order to integrate Rome into the cultural life of the Greek world. He did this not by sponsoring another *periodos* contest, but by competing in the *periodos* games himself, and by establishing a new musical and dramatic festival in Rome, the Neronia. The Neronia was only celebrated twice, and apparently not on the planned cycle. The first celebration was in 60 CE, and as the festival was penteteric, the second celebration should have occurred in 64. Due to a planned trip abroad, which was then canceled, and the fire in Rome, the Neronia was put off until 65 CE. The introduction of Greek contests in Rome was met with some resistance by the Roman elite. Tacitus portrays the Neronia as novel and foreign, opposed to the ancient *mores* of Rome. The foreign and the new are synonymous.

Nerone quartum Cornelio Cosso consulibus quinquennale ludicrum Romae institutum est ad morum Graeci certaminis, varia fama, ut cunta ferme nova.

(60 CE) Nero (fourth time), Cornelius Cossus, consuls.

---

40 Bolton (1948).
A quinquennial festival was instituted at Rome according to the pattern of Greek contests—with mixed reception, as practically everything new. Tacitus, who does not name the contest (though it is clearly the Neronia), uses Latin vocabulary to describe it rather than Greek transcription, as his contemporaries Suetonius and Pliny prefer when speaking about Greek contests, even in Rome. Tacitus' Neronia is not an *agon* but a *ludicrum*. The Greek contests, according to which custom the Neronia follows, are likewise not *agones* but *certamines*. The use of Latin festival vocabulary as opposed to Greek complicates the portrayal of the Neronia as a Greek contest. Following the notice of the Neronia quoted above, Tacitus imagines two opposing arguments about it, one against, one in favor. The criticisms of the Neronia align the contest with foreign idleness, novelty, and the decay of ancestral Roman *mores*.

Others, according to Tacitus, maintain that Greek actors had a long history of appearing in Rome.

maiores quoque non abhorruisse spectaculorum oblectamentis pro fortuna, quae tu[m] erat, eoque a Tuscis accitos histriones, a Thuriis equorum certamina; et possessa Achaia Asiaque ludos curatius editos, nec quemquam Romae honesto loco ortum ad theatrales artes degeneravisse, ducentis iam annis a L. Mummi triumpho, qui primus id genus spectaculi in urbe praebuerit.

Our forebears, too, embraced shows as amusements, in proportion to conditions back then. For this purpose actors were imported from Etruria, horse races from Thurii, and after the acquisition of Greece and Asia Minor plays were presented more lavishly. No Roman of respectable birth has sunk to theatrical pursuits in the 200 years since Mummius' triumph, which first offered shows of this type in Rome. In this brief sketch of the history of the presence of Greek drama in Rome, Tacitus portrays Greek actors as being compelled to perform in Rome. Drama is a consequence of Empire, more fully incorporated into Roman cultural life after the capture of Greece and Asia (*possessa Achaia Asiaque*). Mummius' triumph celebrated the capture of Achaia following the destruction of

---

Corinth in 146 BCE. Hill attempts to resolve the contradiction between Tacitus' assertion that Mummius brought the first Greek theatrical spectacles to Rome with Livy's assertion that it was rather M. Fulvius Nobilior in 186 BCE.\textsuperscript{43} However, Tacitus' primary purpose is not to give a history of drama in Rome, but to situate the Neronia in his imperial history. Comparing the Neronia to Mummius' theatrical shows in Rome following the capture of Corinth suggests that the display of drama in Rome by both Nero and Mummius is an act of conquest, representing Roman victory over Greece, and that this victory over Greece simultaneously involves the corruption of a pure Roman culture though exposure to foreign customs.

Tacitus ends with the curious assertion that "Greek costume, in which many appeared during that period, became obsolete" (\textit{Graeci amictus, quis per eos dies plerique incesserant, tum exoleverunt}).\textsuperscript{44} The inclusion of this statement in the account of the Neronia may refer, symbolically, to the fleeting nature of the Neronia itself, which as Tacitus and his readers knew was a short-lived contest. This represents the precarious nature of Greekness in Rome, suggesting that it is ever on the brink of obsolescence. According to Tacitus' Romano-centric decline narrative, the Romans become Greek, the Greeks become Roman, and everybody becomes less of who they once were. The motif of Romans dressing as Greeks is used in Greek and Latin literature to indicate the artificiality of Roman Hellenicity. Greek clothing is a costume, and its wearers are actors. For example, Cassius Dio asserts that Claudius wore Greek clothing at the Sebastea in Naples, changing his outfits based on the competitions, a cloak and tall boots at the musical competitions, and a purple robe and golden crown at the gymnastic

\textsuperscript{43} Hill (1932). Livy, \textit{AUC} 39.22.
\textsuperscript{44} Tacitus, \textit{Annals} 14.21. Trans. Cynthia Damon.
Claudius' Greek outfit at the musical competitions mimics what those on stage are wearing, while his costume changes also call to mind the costume changes of an actor.

After bringing a Greek festival to Rome in his foundation of the Neronia, Nero brought Rome to Greece in his appearances at the Greek games. Nero performed as a tragic actor and kitharode in Rome, Naples, and in Greece, on the *periodos*. His tour of Greece, and victories on the *periodos*, took place in 66-67 CE. In order to compete in all the festivals on the *periodos* in one year, Nero re-organized the festival calendar, moving the celebration of the Olympia by one year. Additionally, the Isthmia, Nemea, Pythia, and Actia were celebrated twice in the same year for Nero. Nero insisted on performing at all the games on the *periodos*, not only those which had musical and dramatic programs. Suetonius says that he "introduced a musical competition at Olympia also, contrary to custom." In Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, Apollonius comments explicitly on the reorganization of the festival calendar, saying that Nero will win in Olympia, but not at the Olympia, "since they are not even being held at the proper time" (ἅτε μηδὲ ἐν ὀρᾳ ἀγορευτῇ). A festival held at the wrong time is not even a festival, according to Apollonius. Nero's most serious offense is not the quality of his acting or his singing, though there was no end of criticisms on that front too, but the reorganization of the festival calendar,
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45 Cassius Dio, *Roman History* 60.6.
46 On Nero as performer, including his tour of Greece (omitting the many popular histories and biographies of Nero): Gyles (1962); Frazer (1966); Manning (1975); Bradley (1978); Kennell (1988); Schmidt (1990); Sande (1996); Champlin (2003a) and (2003b); Nervegna (2007); Power (2010); Kyle (2014). On Greek and Roman identity in the pseudo-Lucianic *Nero, or the Digging of the Isthmus*: Whitmarsh (1999).
47 All the festivals held in the same year: Suetonius, *Nero* 23. Schedule of the festival calendar during Nero's trip to Greece: Bradley (1978) 71-2. Bradley suggests the following sequence for the re-ordered festival calendar: Actia, Pythia, Isthmia (April/ early May), Nemea (midsummer), Olympia (midsummer), Actia (Sept.), Pythia (Sept.), Isthmia (Nov.). Nero's liberation of Greece took place on November 28 in 66 or 67 CE. If the speech took place in 67, it would have been on the heels of his final competition, the Isthmia, held unconventionally in November for Nero.
49 Philostratus, *VA* 5.7.
which disrupts the traditional festival cycle, and the introduction of contests which were not traditionally part of the festival program, most notably at the Olympia.

In his pursuit of a public performance career, Nero was not entirely innovative. Roman elites, including members of the imperial family, had played Greek by writing plays, and even performing in the Greek world.\(^{50}\) After Germanicus' death, Claudius had one of Germanicus' comedies put on at the Sebastea in Naples, where it was awarded first prize.\(^{51}\) His son Caligula experimented with public performance. He raced chariots, engaged in gladiatorial combat, and danced in public.\(^{52}\) He dressed up as Dionysus, was called "new Dionysus," and sometimes wore actors' shoes.\(^{53}\) Suetonius also says that Caligula sung along with the tragedies when he went to the theater, as an audience member, and imitated the gestures of the actors.\(^{54}\) While Caligula did not compete in dramatic festivals, as Nero did, we can see a similar license to act in public in Caligula's behavior in the theater audience. Nero's primary innovation, instead, was his re-organization of the Greek festival calendar. This re-organization of the festival calendar was shocking, and remembered for centuries afterward as an example of Nero's hubris, akin to the digging of the Isthmus. Digging the Isthmus, Nero meddled with nature by changing the physical landscape of Greece. Re-organizing the festival calendar, and changing the year of the Olympia, Nero meddled with Grecian time.\(^{55}\) Time was marked, across the Greek world, by Olympiads.

Nero did not simply visit historically important cities on his trip to Greece, or compete in historically important festivals. He traveled the contemporary *periodos*, including not just the original *periodos* games but also the Actia, and before his trip to Greece in 66, the Sebastea in

\(^{50}\) Champlin (2003b) 66 puts Nero's performances into the context of other Roman elite performances of Greek drama.


\(^{52}\) Cassius Dio, *Roman History* 59.5 and Suetonius, *Caligula* 54.

\(^{53}\) Suetonius, *Caligula* 52.

\(^{54}\) Suetonius, *Caligula* 54.

\(^{55}\) On Nero's disruption of the Greek calendar, see Champlin (2003b) 53-83.
Naples. Nero skipped Athens and Sparta, a noticeable omission to ancient commentators. Cassius Dio notes that "He contended in every single city that boasted any contest…Athens and Lakedaimon were exceptions to this rule, being the only places he did not visit at all." Cassius Dio suppresses the real reasons for the omission of the two most famous Greek cities, citing instead the laws of Lycurgus in Sparta and the story of the Furies in Athens to draw attention to Nero's transgressions. In the time of Nero, Athens and Sparta were not festival centers. Neither boasted contests on the *periodos*, nor significant musical or dramatic contests. The Athenian Dionysia was historically important, but not a panhellenic festival, not on the *periodos*. He competed at the festivals considered to be of the highest status during his own time.

Nero did, however, stop at Thespiae in Boiotia. Pausanias says that Nero took an image of Eros from Thespiae, but gives no other reason for his visit. Champlin suggests this stop was simply on the way from Corinth to Delphi, where Nero competed in the Pythia. Although the festivals of Thespiae were not on the *periodos*, Thespiae was a center of music and drama in the imperial period. There were two musical and dramatic festivals in Thespiae, the Mouseia and Erotidea. The Mouseia had a full dramatic program, with both re-performed and newly composed drama. It could be that Nero took the image of Eros after a victory at the Erotidea. While the sources dwell only on his performances on the *periodos*, Nero returned to Rome with 1,808 victories. Of course, he did not physically appear in 1,808 contests. Nearly all of these crowns were voted for him, without his presence at the festival. He could, however, have slipped in a performance at the Erotidea, on his way from Corinth to Delphi.

---

57 Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 9.27.3.
58 Champlin (2003b) 283 n. 4.
59 Cassius Dio, *Roman History* 63.21.
Nero also innovated with respect to the title he attained by winning at these contests. By the first century CE, three festivals, the Actia in Nicopolis, the Heraia in Argos, and the Sebastea in Naples had been added to the classical *periodos* (the Isthmia, Olympia, Nemea, and Pythia). In order to be called a *periodonikes*, a victor on the circuit, four victories at any of the seven festivals were necessary. A competitor who won at all seven festivals could be called a *teleios periodonikes*, a complete circuit victor: however, as not every festival on the circuit included dramatic competitions, actors could not attain this title. Nero also insisted on performing at all the games on the *periodos*, not only those which had musical and dramatic programs. Suetonius says that he "introduced a musical competition at Olympia also, contrary to custom." Cassius Dio says that the soldiers called Nero *Pythionikes, Olympionikes, periodonikes*, and *pantonikes*, a unique appellation which refers to his victories at every game on the circuit. The strangeness of Nero's demands would not have been lost on Greek audiences. Nero's strategy was to gain prestige in Greece by accumulating a large number of victories and titles, rather than to seek only titles with a past significance. Whereas successful festival competitors were typically awarded a limited set of titles (*periodonikes, pleistonikes, paradoxos*, or a title referring to a victory in a specific contest, such as *Pythionikes*), affirming their membership in the profession by repetition of the standard titles which had been in use for centuries, Nero's titles suggest that he did not want to be seen as one of the actors, but as superior to all other actors, by using a newly invented title.

Like the Neronia, Nero's interventions in the festivals of Greece were short-lived. The Olympia reverted to its normal cycle immediately after Nero's interference during his trip to Greece. What was remembered afterwards was the falsity of Nero's Olympia and the way in

---

62 Cassius Dio, *Roman History* 63.10.
which he overstepped by interfering in the Greek festivals. Pausanias notes that the year in which Nero competed in the Olympia is omitted from the records of the Eleans, and portrays a victor in the Olympia of 67 CE as an epigraphic liar. Nero's name was entirely erased from one inscription having to do with the false Olympia in which he competed.

1.4 Domitian: Circuit Games Come to Rome

Domitian established the first *periodos* festival in Rome in 86 CE, the Capitolia.

Though it was the first of its kind in Rome, there were many models for this festival. The Capitolia was modeled on both the Olympia (as an isolympic festival) and the Pythia (in its incorporation of musical and dramatic contests). Although the Neronia was a more recent Roman model, Domitian's Capitolia evokes the Sebastea more strongly. Like the Sebastea, the Capitolia had both musical and athletic competitions, and was isolympic. Domitian's act of founding a *periodos* festival was likely modeled on Augustus' foundation of the Actia. The Capitolia was a hybrid festival, aimed at asserting the place of Rome in the Greek cultural sphere. This was a stronger statement than Augustus' foundation of the Actia, as Domitian placed Rome on the Greek festival circuit. Celebrated for a Roman god, Jupiter Capitolinus, and in Rome, the Capitolia was nevertheless a Greek festival of the highest status: cyclical, agonistic, and on the *periodos*. It was celebrated into the 4th century CE, one of the latest survivals of any

---

63 On an inscribed victory monument of a pancratist: εἰ δὲ ἠληθε οὗ τὸ ἐπίγραμμα, ὀλυμπιάδι τῇ πρώτῃ μετὰ δέκα καὶ διακοσίας φαίνοτο ἂν τὸν κόσμον ὁ Ἑξενόδαμος εὐληφάς· αὕτη δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἡλείαι γράμμαι παρεῖται μόνη παραγον ἢ ὀλυμπιάς ("If the inscription speaks the truth, it would seem that Xenodamus received the wild olive at the two hundred and eleventh Olympic festival. But this is the only festival omitted in the Elean records").
Greek dramatic festival. The Capitolia had every possible type of competition (musical, dramatic, athletic, and equestrian), and competitions in both Greek and Latin poetry and oratory. The dramatic competitions were in Greek only.

Suetonius, who was 16 when the Capitolia was first celebrated, describes the contest in his biography of Domitian.

Instituit et quinquennale certamen Capitolino Iovi triplex, musicum equestre gymnicum, et aliquanto plurium quam nunc est coronatorum. Certabant enim et prosa oratione Graece Latineque ac praeter citharoedos chorocitharistae quoque et psilocitharistae, in stadio vero cursu etiam virgines. Certaminis præsedet crepidatus purpureaque amictus toga Graecanica, capite gestans coronam auream cum effigie Iovis ac Iunonis Minervaëque, adsidentibus Diali sacerdote et collegio Flavialium pari habitu, nisi quod illorum coronis inerat et ipsius imago.

He also established a quinquennial contest in honour of Jupiter Capitolinus of a threefold character, comprising music, riding, and gymnastics, and with considerably more prizes than are awarded nowadays. For there were competitions in prose declamation both in Greek and in Latin; and in addition to those of the lyre-players, between choruses of such players and in the lyre alone, without singing; while in the stadium there were races even between maidens. He presided at the competitions in half-boots, clad in a purple toga in the Greek fashion, and wearing upon his head a golden crown with figures of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, while by his side sat the priest of Jupiter and the college of the Flaviales, similarly dressed, except that their crowns bore his image as well.68 Suetonius' emphasis is on the comprehensive nature of the contest, which has every category of competition represented (musicum equestre gymnicum), even with categories, has multiple types of similar competitions (three types of kitharodic competitions), and includes extremely rare competitions (girls' races). Claiming that there were even more prizes at the Capitolia during the time of Domitian than there were in his own time also has the effect of asserting comprehensiveness, projected into the past. Like his mixed Greek and Latin festival, Domitian's outfit and accompaniment draws on Greek and Roman elements. He dresses as a Greek for his festival (purpurea amictus toga Graecanica), but wears a crown decorated with images of

68 Suetonius, Domitian 4.
Roman gods, Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva. The priests who sit next to him incorporate his own image into their crowns, interweaving the imperial cult with the old Olympian gods.

The importance of the contest can be seen not only in its place on the periodos but in the fact that even losses at the Capitolia were commemorated. Statius competed and lost at the Capitolia. A young Roman poet, Quintus Sulpicius Maximus, competed against 51 other poets in the competition in Greek poetry, and lost, in 94 CE, the third time the Capitolia was celebrated. He died soon after. The boy's poem is recorded on his funerary monument, found at the Porta Solaria, and now displayed at the Museo Centrale Montemartini in Rome. On the basis of prosopography, Nelson conjectures that Quintus Sulpicius was the son of a Greek freedman. The funerary monument is bilingual, with the prose biography of Quintus Sulpicius in Latin, and the poetry in Greek. In the central relief, the deceased boy holds a scroll, further emphasizing his literary accomplishments. The commemoration of losers is quite rare, and suggests that even competing at the Capitolia was highly regarded.

While inscriptions such as the epitaph of Quintus Sulpicius Maximus portray competing in the Capitolia as a high honor, and used the composition of Greek poetry as an advertisement of literacy and status, some Roman elites viewed the Capitolia as a disreputable foreign import. Pliny reports strong animosity towards the Capitolia in Rome from a friend at a dinner party. This is in a letter addressed to Sempronius Rufus, on the subject of an athletic contest (gymnicus agon) in Vienna established by a will of a private individual, and later abolished by Trebonius Rufinus, a friend of Pliny's. Rufinus was then brought to trial on the grounds that he did not have the legal authority to abolish the contest. Rufinus' speech in court is well received, because of his Romanitas. Pliny describes him as a "true Roman and a good citizen" (homo Romanus et bonus

69 Statius, Silvae 3.5.28-33: tu, cum Capitolia nostrae/ infitiata lyrae, saevum ingratumque dolebas/ mecum victa Iovem.

civis), and notes that he spoke with gravitas (mature et graviter loquebatur). This prompts Junius Mauricus, one of the presiding magistrates, to rule in favor of abolishing the contest in Vienna, to which he adds, "I wish [the contest, i.e. the Capitilia] would also be abolished at Rome" (Vellem etiam Romae tolli posset). The same Mauricus, Pliny reports, during a conversation about Domitian's cruelty at a dinner party, was asked by Nerva what Domitian would be doing if he was alive. "He would be dining with us" (Nobiscum cenaret), replied Mauricus. Pliny ends the letter with his own commentary.

Placuit agona tolli, qui mores Viennensium infecerat, ut noster hic omnium. Nam Viennensium vitia intra ipsos residunt, nostra late vagantur utque in corporibus sic in imperio gravissimus est morbus, qui a capite diffunditur. Vale.

It was decided to abolish the games at Vienna, for they had long been a corrupting influence in the town. In the same way our games at Rome spread a more general corruption, since the vices of Vienna go no farther than their town, but ours travel far and wide. The most serious diseases of the body, personal or politic, are those which spread from the head.⁷¹ Following Mauricius' lead, Pliny attributes the corruption of Roman culture to Domitian, and in particular, to his foundation of the Capitolia in Rome. Setting the conversations in elite settings, such as the dinner party with Nerva, places us firmly in a world apart from the masses, the spectators of the games. The major players in the letter are all elites: a benefactor (unnamed), magistrates (Trebonius Rufinus and Junius Mauricus), an emperor (Nerva). Neither Pliny's membership in this group, nor that of his addressee, Sempronius Rufus, is in doubt.⁷² Imagined as a disease, the games are something that come from outside of the body to corrupt it. In Pliny's account, the Capitolia is a disease upon both Rome and the Roman world, because Rome is the taste-maker for the Empire. The foreign contest, filtered through Rome, re-infects the provinces.

⁷¹ Pliny, Epistles 4.22, trans. Betty Radice. Pliny also criticizes Greek contests in the Panegyricus, portraying them as an unworthy substitute for military victory, led by a Graeculus magister, a disparaging term: Pliny, Panegyricus 1.13.5.
In a study of the athletic mosaics and inscriptions of Ostia Antica, Newby argues that attitudes towards Greek festivals changed in Rome and its environs over time, due to the introduction of Greek festivals to Rome, such as the Capitolia.\(^{73}\) The acceptance of Greek festivals in Rome, according to Newby, changed the perception of participation in festivals by Romans, with the result that in the early 3rd century CE, an Ostian performer (perhaps a musician) was honored in his hometown for victories at several international Greek festivals.\(^{74}\) This difference between the animosity of elite Roman authors such as Tacitus, Pliny, and Pliny's friends to the Greek festivals of Rome on the one hand, and the celebration of a local Ostian victor in stone on the other, could be attributed instead to the different social contexts of these writings. Tacitus, Pliny, and their circle wanted to portray themselves as the gatekeepers of Roman culture, the protectors of some "pure" Roman culture. The citizens of Ostia, a working port city, did not share the perspective of the most elite group of Romans. This contrast between elite rejection of spectacles, at least in literary accounts, and sub-elite enjoyment of them, is a topic further explored in chapter 3. As we see from the funerary monument of Quintus Sulpicius, participation in the Capitolia was used by sub-elite Romans as a way to claim higher status from very early in its history.

1.5 Hadrian and the Festival Calendar

Hadrian turned his attention to the festivals of the Eastern provinces. His manipulation of the *periodos* sought to re-center the Greek world on Athens. In order to do this, he concentrated the number of *periodos* festivals in Athens by upgrading one contest and founding three new ones. Hadrian upgraded the Greater Panathenaia in 119/20 CE to sacred status, i.e. to the

---

\(^{73}\) Newby (2002) 178: "Indeed, by the 140s, Rome had become the festival capital of the empire and housed the headquarters of the international guilds for both athletes and actors."

\(^{74}\) ILS 5233.
A decade later, in 131/2 CE, he founded the Panhellenion, centered on Athens, and soon after founded three Panhellenic festivals in Athens. The three Hadrianic foundations were the Panhellenia (founded 137 CE), the Olympia, and the Hadrianeia. This expanded again the number of games on the periodos, while re-centering the periodos on Athens. No other city had multiple periodos games. This brought competitors through Athens on a yearly basis.

Hadrian also increased the number of games in the Empire. Cassius Dio links these benefactions to his travels, saying that wherever he traveled he established festivals and built theaters (ἐποίει δὲ καὶ θέατρα καὶ ἀγώνας, περιπορευόμενος τὰς πόλεις). The Scriptores Historiae Augustae recall Hadrian giving games and shows in all the cities of the Empire. At Rome, they say, he sprinkled exotic spices over the theater-seats and "presented plays of all kinds," which has been interpreted to mean plays in Greek and Latin. While the spices sprinkled in the theater suggest a rather absurd luxury, it also references the practice of benefactors distributing gifts and food, such as sweets and cakes, in the theater. The many letters between Hadrian and the Athenian Technitai (as well as Technitai from other areas of the Empire) demonstrate a special interest of Hadrian in supporting Greek dramatic performance.

Hadrian did more than simply supporting individual festivals. He organized and standardized the Greek theater on a grand scale. In response to various complaints by the

---

77 Foundation date of the Panhellenion: IG IV² 1.384 (Epidauros, 133/4 CE). On Hadrian and the Panhellenion: Oliver (1951); Spawforth and Walker (1985) and (1986); Willers (1990); Swain (1996) 75-6; Boatwright (2000); Romeo (2002).
79 SHA 19.6.
81 Geagan (1972) collects the correspondence of Hadrian with the Athenian Technitai. Hadrian also corresponded with the Technitai in Asia Minor: Petzl and Schwertheim (2006).
Technitai, Hadrian attempted to resolve the difficulties of traveling between widely dispersed festivals by standardizing the Greek festival calendar, and limiting the lengths of several festivals. A recently published inscription from 133/4 CE from Alexandria Troas contains three letters from Hadrian to the Technitai. These three letters of Hadrian are in response to at least nine letters and embassies of the Technitai. The complaints of the Technitai, gathered from across the Empire, are presented to the emperor, whose resolutions, in turn, affect cities throughout the Greek provinces. Filtering complaints through the emperor leads to standardization, as he passes decrees in response to individual complaints that have ramifications for many cities.

In order to ensure the financial health of the festivals, Hadrian put measures in place to prevent corruption and misuse of the festival endowments. In the first letter, Hadrian forbids cities from using funds set aside for festivals from being diverted to other uses, such as building projects, and from inviting competitors to a contest and then not celebrating it fully.

8 τοὺς ἀγώνας πάντας ἀγεσθαι κελεύω καὶ μὴ ἐξεῖναι πόλει πόρους ἀγῶνος κατὰ νόμον ἢ ψήφισ-  
9 μα ἢ διαθήκας ἀγομένου ἐς μετενεκεῖν εἰς ἄλλα δαπανήματα οὐδὲ εἰς ἔργον κατασκευήν ἐφήμι  
10 χρήσασθαι ἂργουρίῳ, ἐξ οὗ ἄδολα τίθεται ἄγωνισταῖς ἢ συντάξεις δίδονται τοῖς νεὶ[κήσασιν]· εἰ δὲ ποτε ἐπείξαι  
11 πόλιν (οὐκ εἰς τριφήν καὶ πολυτέλειαν, ἀλλ’ ὡς πυρὸν ἐν σειτοδείᾳ)  
12 παρεσκέυασα πόρον τινὰ ἐξευρεῖν),  
13 τότε μοι γραφέσθω, ἣνει δὲ ἐμὴς συνχωρήσεως μηδὲν πρὸς τὸ τοιοῦτο τι ἐξέστω λαμβάνειν τάδε  
14 εἰς τοὺς ἀγώνας ἀποτεταγμένα χρήματα. ἐκεῖνο μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἀδικίαν μόνον, ἀλλὰ τρόπον τι-  
15 νά καὶ ἐνέδραν ἔχει τὸ κατανεῖλαντας ἀγώνα καὶ καλέσαντας τοὺς ἄγωνιστάς, ἔπειτα ἡκόντον  
16 ἢ εὐθὺς ἢ ἐξ ἄρχης ἢ μέρη τινὰ ἂγαγόντας μεταξὺ διαλῦσαι τὴν πανήγυριν.

I order that all the contests be held, and that it not be permitted for a city to divert funds of a contest held according to law, decree or will to other expenses, nor do I permit to be

used on the construction of a building (10) money from which prizes are offered to contestants or from which contributions are given to victors. If it should ever be urgent that a city find some source of revenue, not for the purpose of luxury and extravagance, but as when I have procured wheat (or: in order to procure wheat) in a shortage, then let me be written to. But without my permission let no one be permitted to take these funds earmarked for the contests for anything (i.e. any purpose) of this kind, for it involves not only unfairness but in a certain way even a fraud, to announce a contest and invite the contestants and then — after their arrival either immediately or at the beginning or after holding some parts of the contest — to dissolve the festival half-way.\(^{83}\)

Hadrian has in mind that cities might try to save money by eliminating some contests so as not to offer prizes in those categories, shorting competitors who had been given an expectation of a prize. He cites Miletus and Chios as examples of this practice of unfairly eliminating contests. With this decree, Hadrian sought to protect both the Technitai and the financial health of festival endowments, and thus the continued celebration of existing festivals.

Hadrian goes on to address a complaint made by the Technitai concerning shortages in the payments of prize money. He lays out a procedure to address this problem, in which the festival organizer will hand over the prize money to a Roman official, whether the provincial governor, proconsul, quaestor, or legate, in order to ensure that the correct amount of money is given to each victor. This effectively blocks the festival organizer from complete financial control of the endowment, in order to prevent corruption. That Roman officials are to serve as the middlemen between the festival organizer and the victors implies that the Roman officials are impartial, less prone to corruption than the (likely Greek) festival organizers. Hadrian's concern about establishing order at the festivals extends to the competitors, as he also establishes that whip-bearers should be designated in case contestants need to be whipped for breaking the rules. Another example of Hadrian's interest in standardization and order is that the contest rules should be displayed at every festival.

\(^{83}\) Petzl and Schwertheim (2006) l. 8-16, trans. C.P. Jones.
Hadrian's interventions in the financial aspects of the festivals seek to establish a standard practice across the Empire, while leaving it up to local and regional organizations to implement his changes. One example concerns payments by victors to the xystarchs (high priests of the athletic synod).\footnote{On the office of xystarch: Remijsen (2015) 238.} According to these letters, the current practice was for all victors (including musicians) to contribute 1% of their earnings to the xystarchs. Hadrian disputes this, on the grounds that only athletes should contribute to the xystarchs, because the xystarchs have nothing to do with musicians, nor are athletes required to give money to the leaders of the musicians. Hadrian leaves it up to individual cities, as well as the koinon of Asia, to determine how to fund the xystarchs once the musicians stop contributing, though he offers suggestions.

In the second letter, he establishes a festival calendar which includes festivals in Italy, mainland Greece, and Asia Minor. Most of these festivals on the standardized calendar are on the \textit{periodos}, but others are local contests. Hadrian's calendar is a cycle, beginning and ending with the Olympia. The first part of the calendar demonstrates the ways in which he uses multiple time-reckoning systems to create a master schedule of the Greek contests.

61 τὴν δὲ ἀρχὴν ἀπ’ Ὀλυμπίων ἐποιησάμην, ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀρχαῖος ὁ ἄγων ὤτος καὶ ἐνδοξότατος τῶν γε
62 Ἑλληνικόν, μετὰ δὲ τὰ Ὀλύμπια Ἰσθμία ἔστω, μετὰ δὲ Ἰσθμία Ἀδριάνεια, ὡς ἀρχεσθαι τὸν ἄγων παυσαμένης τῆς ἐν Ἑλευσεῖν πανηγύρεως τῆς ὑστεραίας.
63 ἐστὶν δὲ αὕτη κατὰ Ἀθηναίως νομιμία τοῦ Μαμακτηριώνος· τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέραι Ἀδριάνεια ἔστωσαν. ὁ δ’ ἐν Τάραντι ἄγων μετὰ Ἀδριάνεια ἄγε-σ<θ>ω τοῦ Ἑνωουριᾶτου μηνός, ἀπὸ δὲ Καπετωλείων, ὡς μέχρι νῦν ἐπτελεσθῆ, ἀγομένων ἐν Νεαπόλει ἄγωνων· ἔτα Ἑκτία ἀρχόμενα μὲν τῇ πρὸ θ’ καλ(ανδόν)
64 ὦ Ὀκτὼν(βριόν), συντελούμενα δὲ ἐν τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέραις· ἐν παράπλω δὲ ὁ ἐν Πάτραις ἄγων, εἰς Ἡραία καὶ Νέμεια ἀπό καλ(ανδόν) Νοεμβρ(ίων) εἰς καλ(άνδας) Ἑνωουρίας.
65 μετὰ δὲ Νέμεια Παναθήναια, ὡςτε συντελεῖσθαι τὸν ἄγων ἡ ἀυτῆς τῆς κατὰ τὸν Ἀττικὸν χρόνον, ἐν ᾧ μέχρι νῦν συντελεσθῆ·
I have set the beginning from the Olympian contests, since this contest is ancient and certainly the most prestigious of the Greek ones. After the Olympian contests shall be the Isthmian contests, and after the Isthmian the Hadrianeian, so that the contest begins on the next day after the festival at Eleusis ends, and this is by Athenian reckoning the first day of Maimakterion. There shall be forty days for the Hadrianeian contests, and the contest in Tarentum shall be held after the Hadrianeian contests in the month of January, with the Capitolian contests, as they have been completed up to now, preceding the contests in Neapolis. Then the Actian contests will take place, beginning nine days before the kalends of October, and ending within forty days. During the passage there shall be the contest in Patrae, then the Heraian and Nemean contests from the kalends of November to the kalends of January. After the Nemean contests shall be the Panathenaian contests, so that the contest is completed on the same day by the Attic calendar as it ended up to now. Hadrian uses a combination of local and international calendars. The two internationally recognized calendars are the Roman calendar and the Olympiad calendar; the use of the Athenian calendar elevates it to a similarly high status, though it is still noticeably a local calendar. The Olympiads provide a panhellenic calendar, in relation to which all other contests are scheduled. In addition, he uses Roman reckoning systems within months (e.g. the Heraia and the Nemea are to be held from the kalends of November to the kalends of January), and the Athenian calendar. When he uses the Athenian calendar, he specifies it as such ("this is by Athenian reckoning the first day of Maimakterion," "so that the contest is completed on the same day by the Attic calendar"). The Athenian calendar is the only local calendar he uses, and the only one to need identification. In other words, he does not need to say "from the kalends of November to the kalends of January, by the Roman calendar," because he expects his readers to know that the kalends of November are unambiguous. The standardization of the Greek festival calendar should be seen as part of a larger imperial interest in synchronizing Greek and Roman time. Feeney argues that the synchronization of Greek and Roman time was part of the project of Roman Hellenization. Hadrian's use of the Athenian calendar alongside the Olympiads and the

Roman calendar, furthermore, is related to his interest in re-making Athens as the cultural center of the Greek world, and the center of the Greek festival network.

The goal is to allow the Technitai enough time to make it from one contest to another, to maximize their ability to win as many prizes as possible.

78 γενήσονται δὲ οἱ ἀγωνισταὶ ἐπὶ πάντας
79 τοὺς τε νῦν ὑπ᾽ ἔμοι τεταγμένους ἄγωνας Κ………… διὰ τὸ
80 μηδένα ἄξιοσαι ΠΛΡϹΛΙΟΙ περὶ αὐτῶν τοὺς πλείστους, ἓν πρῶτον μὲν
80 πᾶσαι πανταχοῦ πανηγύρεις ἐπὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας ἄγωναι (καὶ διατετάχθω τΟΤΟ), εἶτα δὲ μὴ κατατρείβοντα<τ> μετὰ τοὺς ἄγωνας τὰ θέματα…

The contestants will get both to all the contests now set in order by me and — since nobody saw fit to — to the majority concerning them (?), provided, first, (80) that all festivals everywhere are held for forty days (and let this be laid down), and then that they (i.e. the contestants) are not worn down demanding the prize-moneys after the contests.⁸⁷ Hadrian's calendar lays out when festivals will be celebrated, how long they are to last, and what the interval of time must be for the Technitai to travel between the contests. This means that the contestants will be able to compete at the contests of the periodos, but also at festivals not on the periodos, the "majority concerning them," i.e. the Technitai.

Unlike Nero, Hadrian did not institute changes to the calendar without first seeking permission from the city in question. This helps to explain why, when Nero's interference with the calendar of the periodos was so disturbing, no sources report dissatisfaction with Hadrian's re-organization of the Greek festival calendar. For example, in the second letter, Hadrian references his request to change the date of a contest in Nicomedia. The Nicomedians refused, and Hadrian respected their refusal, affirming that they could celebrate their contest whenever they wished. Hadrian situates all changes to the Greek festivals, regarding scheduling, the length of time of each festival, and the limitations placed on spending, in terms of responses to specific problems raised by the Technitai. Where possible, he speaks of change in the language of

restoration of past customs. In the first letter, when he responds to the complaint from the Technitai that Chios and Miletus have cut contests from their festival, Hadrian orders Chios and Miletus to restore their festival to the way it was celebrated in the past. Repeatedly, he makes it seem as if he is merely resolving difficulties and restoring past practices, not innovating, although in fact an intervention on this scale in the Greek festivals is unprecedented.

1.6 Tensions between Festival Organizers and Roman Authority

Direct involvement of the emperor and the imperial administration in the cultural life of Greece, whether through epistolary responses to petitions, or imperial foundations of festivals, was not the only way in which imperial Roman authority was felt at the festivals. The presence of any Roman administrator at a Greek festival, particularly in the Eastern provinces, had the potential to create tension. The worry was that local benefactors, festival organizers, judges, and spectators would not have full autonomy when it came to how their festival would run. These interactions required negotiating between local politics and imperial authority. In the *Lives of the Sophists*, Philostratus tells two stories about festival organizers that explore how they negotiate their responsibilities to the festival and the people with imperial authority. These two sophists who act as festival organizers are Polemo, who lived under Antoninus Pius (138-161 CE) and Hippodromus, who lived under Septimius Severus (193-211 CE). Polemo treats a tragic actor badly, while Hippodromus treats a tragic actor fairly. In each case, an appeal is made to the emperor about the episode, suggesting that imperial authority trumps the authority that the festival organizer has over the festival. Actions in the theater, these accounts suggest, raise the

---

question of how free Greeks could be under Roman rule. Good festival organizers, Philostratus suggests, must find a way to allow the spectators and judges to freely choose the victors, but this freedom to choose is often illusory, as imperial authority looms in the background. Bad festival organizers restrict this freedom of choice, abusing their authority. To complicate the picture, sometimes good emperors correct bad decisions made by festival organizers.

As agonothete of the Olympia in Smyrna, Polemo mistreated a tragic actor. Philostratus embeds the story about the actor within a longer story about Polemo's lack of hospitality. Polemo was both a bad host to this actor and a bad host to the emperor, in the past. Before he was emperor, Antoninus Pius was the proconsul of Asia, and visited Smyrna. Upon his arrival, Antoninus chose Polemo's house to stay in. Polemo, who was away when Antoninus arrived, came home late at night, found himself shut out of his own house, and made Antoninus move to a different house in Smyrna. Antoninus jokes about this encounter with Polemo later, as emperor. This account of Polemo's bad hospitality leads into the account of the actor.

When Polemo came to Rome, Antoninus embraced him, and then said: "Give Polemo a lodging and do not let anyone turn him out of it." And once when a tragic actor who had performed at the Olympic games in Asia, over which Polemo presided, declared that he would prosecute him, because Polemo had expelled him at the beginning of the play, the Emperor asked the actor what time of day it was when he was expelled from the theatre, and when he replied that it happened to be at noon, the Emperor made this witty comment: "But it was midnight when he expelled me from his house, and I did not prosecute him." Let this suffice to show how mild an Emperor could be, and how arrogant a mere man.

89 Philostratus, V/8 1.25.
90 Philostratus, V/8 1.25.535. Trans. Wilmer Cave Wright.
Figuring the theater as the *oikos*, Antoninus draws a parallel between Polemo's lack of hospitality at his house and his lack of hospitality to the actor in the theater. By suppressing the reason for Polemo's expulsion of the actor, he makes Polemo appear even more un-hospitable. Antoninus and the actor are not portrayed as bad guests; it is Polemo who is the bad host. The festival organizer was a sort of host, responsible for hospitality shown towards festival competitors and spectators. Festival organizers provided feasts for spectators, and were responsible for the upkeep of the traveling competitors. Philostratus uses Polemo's behavior as an un-hospitable festival organizer to demonstrate a quality of his character, arrogance, in an inversion of the positive qualities of character advertised in honorific inscriptions for festival organizers. Philostratus' story about Polemo is also a story about Antoninus. The actor appeals to Antoninus after his expulsion from the Olympia, suggesting that above the authority of the festival organizer is the authority of the emperor. It is worth pointing out that the connection of an elite person to a dramatic festival, in this story, as festival organizer, is entirely unproblematic. In the story of Polemo, it is not the job that is bad, but Polemo who is bad at his job.

Philostratus uses the treatment of a tragic actor at the Pythia by the agonothete, Hippodromus of Thessaly, to show his capacity for justice. The story about Hippodromus raises the question of how free the Greeks are to make their own choices. Philostratus portrays Hippodromus from the beginning as admirably competitive, out-doing earlier *agonothetai* and exceeding the expectations of his fellow Thessalians.

Μεγάλου δὲ ἐν Θετταλίᾳ δοκοῦντος τοῦ καὶ ἀπαξ προστήναι τῶν Πυθίων ὁ Ἰππόδρομος προέστη δις τῶν Πυθικῶν ἄθλων, πλούτῳ τε ὑπερήνεγκε τοὺς ἄνω καὶ κόσμῳ τῷ περὶ τὸν ἄγωνα καὶ μεγέθει γνώμης καὶ δικαιότητι βραβευούσῃ τὸ εὐθός. τὸ γοῦν περὶ τὸν τῆς τραγῳδίας ὑποκρίτην ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πραχθέν οὐδὲ ὑπερβολὴν ἐτέρῳ καταλέλοιπε δικαιότητος τε καὶ γνώμης. Κλήμης γὰρ ὁ Βυζάντιος τραγῳδίας ὑποκρίτης ἦν μὲν οἶος σύμω τις τὴν τέχνην, νικῶν δὲ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους, οὐκ ὁ Βυζάντιος ἐπολιορκεῖτο, ἀπήγει ἀμαρτάνων τῆς νίκης, ὡς μὴ δοκοίη δι’ ἐνὸς ἀνδρός κηρύττεσθαι πόλις ὀπλα ἐπὶ Ρωμαίους ἠρμένη.

---

91 Philostratus, *VS* 2.27.
Though in Thessaly it was thought a great thing to have been president at the Pythia even once, Hippodromus twice presided over the Pythian games, and he outdid his predecessors in wealth and in the elegance with which he ordered the games, and also in the magnanimity and justice which he showed as umpire. At any rate, his conduct in the affair of the tragic actor has left no one else a chance to surpass him in justice and good judgment. The facts are these. Clemens of Byzantium was a tragic actor whose like has never yet been seen for artistic skill. But since he was winning his victories at a time when Byzantium was being besieged, he used to be sent away without the reward of victory, lest it should appear that a city that had taken up arms against the Romans was being proclaimed a victor in the person of one of her citizens. Accordingly, after he had performed brilliantly at the Amphictyonic games, the Amphictyons were on the point of voting that he should not receive the prize, because for the reason that I have mentioned they were afraid. Whereupon Hippodromus sprang up with great energy and cried: "Let these others go on and prosper by breaking their oath and giving unjust decisions, but by my vote I award the victory to Clemens." And when another of the actors appealed to the Emperor against the award, the vote of Hippodromus was again approved; for the Byzantine actor also won at Rome.²

The mention of the siege of Byzantium indicates that this story takes place in 193-196 CE.

Philostratus introduces Hippodromus as a good festival organizer: he is a generous benefactor, outdoing earlier organizers of the Pythia. The phrase κόσμῳ τῷ περὶ τὸν ἄγωνα, referring to the elegance or order in the contest, suggests that the Pythia were celebrated appropriately. Lastly, he passed judgment in a straightforward manner, with a loftiness of judgment and with justice (μεγέθει γνώμης καὶ δικαιότητι βραβευόμενη τῷ εὐθύ). Philostratus repeats this pairing of γνώμη with δικαιότης in the next sentence (δικαιότητος τε καὶ γνώμης), drawing attention to the repetition by inverting the order of the pair and creating a sort of chiasmus (γνώμης καὶ δικαιότητι… δικαιότητος τε καὶ γνώμης). This story about Hippodromus, then, gives evidence both of his judgment (γνώμη) and of his justice (δικαιότης), two related but distinct concepts.

Hippodromus stands up against the fear of Roman retribution and awards the prize to Clemens,

² Philostratus, VS 2.27.616. Trans. Wilmer Cave Wright (lightly adapted).
who Philostratus represents as the clearly rightful victor because of his superior skill.

Hippodromus exercises good judgment in Philostratus' anecdote not by following the opinion of the crowd, but by discerning the true, hidden opinion of the crowd, which they are constrained from revealing due to fear that they will be punished, in some way, by the Romans. This involves doing the opposite of what a festival organizer is expected to do. Hippodromus says goodbye to the spectators (ἐρρώσθων), an inversion of the role of the organizer as the one who welcomes the crowd to the festival. In a surprising turn of events, the emperor, Septimius Severus, ratifies Hippodromus' decision. Like Antoninus Pius in the story of Polemo, Septimius Severus does not attempt to restrict the actions of the organizer, or to interfere with the celebration of the festival. Nevertheless, even the knowledge of the potential for the assertion of imperial authority prevents the Greek festival participants from behaving normally. And in the end, it is the fact that Clemens won at a festival in Rome which persuades Septimius Severus to support the decision of Hippodromus, calling attention to the interconnectedness of the Greek festivals in the provinces with the imperial center, Rome.

1.7 Tensions between Audiences and Roman Authority

Spectators shared the power of arbitration with the judges and festival organizer. Like the festival organizers in the last section, audiences also negotiated tensions between the Roman provincial administration and the operation of festivals. While judges were appointed, and were officially in charge of determining the victors, the audience took an active role in the process of judgement, expressing their approval by clapping or shouting in favor of one or another participant. For example, Herodes Atticus makes this announcement at the Panathenea in Athens: "I welcome you, O Athenians, and those Hellenes that shall attend, and the athletes who are to compete, in a stadium of pure white marble" ("καὶ ὅμας," εἶπεν Ἐλλήνων τοὺς ἡξόντας καὶ τῶν ἄθλητῶν τοὺς ἄγωνιοιμένους ὑποδέξομαι σταδίῳ λήθου λευκοῦ," Philostratus, VS 2.1.550).
contestant, and their disapproval by hissing or making other negative sounds. Asserting the integrity of the judging was important. In Iasos, a statue of Justice was erected outside the theater.\textsuperscript{94} The shared power of festival officials and spectators in decision-making is reflected in Aelius Aristides' comment that \textit{agonothetai} and spectators determine whether tragic and comic actors can remove their masks to make speeches.\textsuperscript{95} The spectators participate in the regulation of the festival, along with the officials. Imbalance in this relationship was cause for concern. Particularly worrisome was the imbalance of power caused by Roman authorities, who might assert authority over the competitions, or influence the outcome of the judging, whether directly or indirectly.

One such story about a Roman in the audience concerns a procurator watching the comedy competitions the Actia. Although he does not do anything that other audience members are not doing, his behavior causes great outrage and censure, because the spectators perceive him to be unfairly influencing the outcome of the contest. While he was living in Epirus after his expulsion from Rome by Domitian in 89 or 92 CE, Epictetus witnessed a comic actor \textit{(komoidos)}, Sophron, compete at the games in the theater, presumably the Actia.\textsuperscript{96} This Sophron may be Marcus Julius Sophron, a comic actor from Hierapolis in Phrygia.\textsuperscript{97} Epictetus urges the procurator, who wants Sophron to win and displays too much enthusiasm in the theater, not to interfere with the choosing of the victor. The dialogue ends with Epictetus' advice to the procurator.

\[\text{Tína oûn thêlo nikhêsa;—Tôn nikhônta; kai oûtous aei nikhêse, òn thêlo.——Allà thêlo stefanvôthnai Sôfrona.——'Evn oikô dous thêleis agônas agôn anakhrûzon aûtôn Nêmea, Pôðia, 'Isthmia, 'Olimpia.} \vspace{0.5cm} \text{ên fane接收 de m hè pleonektêi mið 'vphárpaçê to koûnòn.}\]

\textsuperscript{94} Robert (1963) 312-313.
\textsuperscript{95} Aelius Aristides, \textit{Concerning a remark in passing} 97.
\textsuperscript{96} Arrian, \textit{Discourses of Epictetus} 3.4.
\textsuperscript{97} Jones (1987) 208-212, discussed below.
εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἀνέχου λοιδορούμενος· ὡς, ὅταν ταυτὰ ποιήσῃ τοῖς πολλοῖς, εἰς ἱκείνοις καθιστὰς σαυτόν.

Epictetus: Whom, then, do I wish to win the victory? The victor; and so the one whom I wish to win the victory will always win it.

Procurator: But I wish Sophron to get the crown.

Epictetus: Stage as many contests as you will in your own house, and proclaim him victor in the Nemean, Pythian, Isthmian, and Olympic games; but out in public do not arrogate to yourself more than your due, and do not filch away a public privilege. Otherwise you must put up with being reviled; because, when you do the same things that the people do, you are putting yourself on their level.  

Epictetus makes a clear distinction between private and public behavior regarding the Greek festivals. In private, the procurator is welcome to pretend that Sophron is a circuit victor, who wins at games which have dramatic contests (the Nemea, Pythia, and Isthmia) and ones that do not (the Olympia). The inclusion of the Olympia on this list implies that the procurator is like Nero, who performed as a tragic actor at the Olympia despite the fact that the Olympia did not have dramatic contests, in not knowing how to behave properly at a Greek festival. Epictetus omits the Actia from this list because it was not on the classical periodos, i.e. the procurator may proclaim Sophron a victor of games even more prestigious than the Actia when he is in his own house. In public, Epictetus urges him to respect the Greek way of choosing a victor, with judges. To exert too much influence on the outcome of the contest is immoderate. Epictetus urges the procurator not to claim more than is fairly his (πλεονέκτει) and not to take away what is common to all (τὸ κοινόν), i.e. the right of choosing the victor. The spectators are the ones to enforce the traditional way in which the victor is chosen, as they are the ones reviling the procurator at the beginning of the dialogue for his behavior in the theater. In public, the procurator is accountable to the people.  

99 Similarly, Plutarch complains of crowds abusing elites at the games: "They [the Spartans] did not behave like some uncultured and unmannerly persons who, as if swaggering in the excess of their own
Conclusion

Imperial founding of Greek games in the provinces, interweaving the imperial cult with pre-existing local traditions, passing judgement on local disputes regarding festivals, and the presence of Roman administrators in theater audiences, in various ways, brought the imperial center to the periphery. Founding Greek games in Rome brought the periphery to the center, quite literally, as Greek performers traveled from the provinces to compete there. These foundations can be seen as part of the imperial project, which involved the unification of the Empire, with its vast cultural, linguistic, and religious diversity. Changes did not go unnoticed. The new political reality created some tensions surrounding the festivals, as explored in the last two sections. Concerns about interference in the operation and administration of the festivals by imperial authority, whether by emperors or by imperial administrators, called into question how autonomous Greeks could really be under the Empire.

The interventions made by the emperors in the festivals of the \textit{periodos}, such as Augustus' renewal of the Actia, Nero's performances in Greece, Domitian's foundation of the Capitolia, and Hadrian's festival calendar, were a series of innovations, couched in tradition. When Augustus renewed the Actia and modified the \textit{periodos} for the first time in half a millennium, he made his innovation seem traditional by renewing an older contest. Nero's primary innovation was not his acting but his re-organization of the calendar of the \textit{periodos}, which was badly received, but short-lived. Domitian founded the Capitolia on the models of two

---

power, abuse the umpires at the games, revile the choregi at the Dionysiac festival, and jeer at generals and gymnasiarchs, not knowing and not understanding that it is often more glorious to pay honour than to receive it'' \(\text{(ὄψις ὄσπερ ἕνιοι τῶν ἀπειροκάλων καὶ σολοίκων, ὡς ἰσχύος ἐκατεράν καλλοπιζόμενοι περιουσία, βραβεύων ἐν ἀγώνις προπηλακίζουσι καὶ χορηγοὺς ἐν Διονυσίως λοιδοροῦσι καὶ στρατηγῶν καὶ γυμνασιάρχων καταγελῶσιν, οὐκ εἰδότες οὐδὲ μανθάνοντες ὅτι τοῦ τιμᾶσθαι τὸ τιμάν πολλάκις ἐστὶν ἐνδοξότερον, Plutarch, \textit{Precepts of Statecraft, Moralia} 817b).
of the most venerable and ancient Greek festivals, the Olympia and the Pythia, but was innovative in situating it in the imperial capital. Hadrian was the most innovative, and had the greatest impact on the festivals, both in his assertion of Athens as the festival capital of the Greek world, and in his standardization of the festival calendar. His centering of the festival circuit on Athens was classicizing, as he sought to renew the glory of classical Athens in the modern Roman world. The expansion of the *periodos* throughout the imperial period, and with it, the globalization of the Greek festivals, had a significant impact on the poets and performers who competed at them. In the next chapter, we turn to the forces exerted upon the competitors, and what role they played in the changing landscape of festivals in the Empire.
Chapter 2: Traveling Players: the Lives of Professional Actors and Poets

The spread of drama in the Greek world in the late 5th and 4th centuries BCE led to the creation of groups of professional, traveling actors. In the Hellenistic period, travel played an important role at the festivals, as cities sought to assert good relationships with one another by hosting and sending sacred ambassadors, theoroi. In addition to the sacred ambassadors, who traveled as VIP spectators, performers traveled to compete. In the Roman imperial period, most festival competitors were professionals traveling the festival circuit.¹ Imperial-era actors and poets traveled great distances to compete, crisscrossing the Mediterranean. A retinue of supporting actors, musicians, and other theater people traveled along with the festival victors.² Hired entertainers, such as mime actors, pantomime dancers, acrobats, and other paratheatrical entertainers, also traveled to perform. The careers of these performers, known from victory lists, honorific inscriptions, and epitaphs, suggest a segment of society constantly on the move.³

Travel was a source of prestige for professional performers, whose reputations were increased by winning international victories, and for festival organizers who could attract international performers to their festivals. By the 2nd century CE, travel had become so central

¹ Scholarship on the acting profession in the imperial Greek world: Leppin (1992) is a social history of actors in the Western Roman Empire. Easterling and Hall (2002) is an excellent collection of essays on performers, covering a variety of aspects of the acting profession from classical antiquity through the Renaissance. Csapo (2010) focuses on classical and Hellenistic acting, but does discuss some aspects of acting in the imperial period, particularly private performances of drama under the Roman empire. It is likely that the trends which he identifies in Hellenistic acting (especially the preference for realism) continued in the imperial period. Aneziri (2009) focuses on travel in relation to the Technitai in the Hellenistic and Roman periods.


³ There are several compilations of evidence for actors from the classical period through late antiquity. Lüders (1873) includes a catalogue of sources for actors in antiquity. Prosopographies of Greek actors: O'Connor (1966), reprinted from his 1908 dissertation; of the 563 actors O'Connor identified, about 70 are from the first three centuries CE. Parenti (1961) is a revision and supplement to this list. Ghiron-Bistagne has also compiled a list of the actors of antiquity through the first century BC: Ghiron-Bistagne (1976) 301-379. Stephanes (1988) is a prosopography of Greek actors from the origins to late antiquity, including some (but not all) paratheatrical entertainers.
to the acting profession that the associations of actors adopted the epithet "itinerant," or "much-traveled" (περιπολιστικός). Associations of dramatic and musical artists, as well as associations of athletes, used this term in order to advertise their travel. Travel was not simply a necessity of the acting profession. It was a point of pride and a demonstration of status and reputation for those who traveled to perform, and those who received them. Traveling players were part of the appeal of the festivals, whose organizers advertised the geographical range of their competitors by listing their *ethnika* on publicly displayed victory lists.

This internationalism did not mean that local identity ceased to matter. In fact, it had quite the opposite effect, much in the same way that globalization in the modern world has led to a simultaneous interest in localism (seen, for example, in the local food movement). The interconnected dynamic of globalism and localism has been termed "glocalism." But how precisely did such "glocalism" work at the festivals, and how did it affect the lives of professional actors and poets? Actors traveling abroad to compete and win at international festivals brought glory to their hometowns, which celebrated their accomplishments abroad on stone at home. For example, a comic actor, Rufus of Rhodes, won 55 sacred contests in the 1st century CE, and was honored with an inscription commemorating his victories in Rhodes. Rufus was an international celebrity whose hometown advertised its connection to him by the public commemoration of his victories. It was his victories abroad which made him worthy of honors at home. Such honors, as

---

4 The term περιπολιστικός appears only in epigraphy (though related compounds are used in literary sources).
5 Theatrical examples include IG II 1348 (Athens, 2nd c CE), SEG 47-222 (Athens, 129/30 CE), IGSK Heraclea Pont. 2 (2nd c. CE), TAM 5.2.1033 (Thyateira in Lydia, 138-161 CE), IGSK Laodikeia am Lykos 65A (138-161 CE), IGSK Prusias ad Hypium 49 (imperial period). Athletic examples include IG XIV 747 (Naples, ca. 110 CE); I.Aph. 12.719 (Aphrodisias, 117-138 CE); I.Eph. 1082A, 1084 and 1087.
6 On localism and globalism in the imperial Greek world: Whitmarsh (2010).
7 IG XII 1.84; IGR IV 1133. Cf. SEG 30-1853; Jones (1987) 208; SEG 49-1062; Rusten and Henderson (2011) 730, no. 47B.
we will see, were not uncommon, and are often found in the hometowns of the theatrical professionals who spent most of their lives on the road.

The connection of the victor to the homeland was actively maintained both by cities and the victors themselves. In addition to advertising the victories of their own citizens in contests abroad, cities spent large amounts of money supporting these victors for life. This practice of life-long maintenance for victors at certain contests was an invention of the Roman period. It kept the bond between the homeland and the traveling competitor strong, and lured victors home once they had made names for themselves elsewhere. It was probably when the victors were home that honors were bestowed upon them, a spectacle in and of itself, which could have taken place in the theater. The travel of the victors was not only away from the homeland to international victories, but looped back and forth, intersecting the homeland during a career. The system of payment for victors at Greek festivals, which included both prizes awarded at festivals, in the form of money or crowns, and life-long maintenance, paid by the home city, exerted both a centrifugal and a centripetal force upon the victors, driving them out to compete at festivals abroad, to win prizes and a reputation, and back in to their home towns to collect money and honors.

The movements of the festival competitors were the result of careful negotiation between the professional organization for crowned musical and dramatic victors, the Technitai of Dionysus, those who organized the contests, and at times, the emperors or other Roman officials. The agendas of these groups sometimes came into conflict, as they each had different goals in relation to the festivals. The Technitai were professionals whose reputations depended on winning many victories, and collecting money in the form of prizes and other related support. It was in their best interest to increase the number of contests available, to travel far and wide to
compete, and to ensure that festivals did not overlap with one another. Cities sought to increase their reputations also, by upgrading festivals or establishing new ones. As it was in their best interest to ensure the participation of the Technitai, they tried to schedule their contests to minimize schedule conflicts with other festivals. Planning a festival required an awareness of the festival calendars of other local contests as well as the panhellenic festival calendar, the calendar of the *periodos*, the circuit. Festival organizers did not always behave honorably. It was the responsibility of the Roman provincial administration, and ultimately of the emperor, to mediate conflicts, such as complaints by the Technitai of canceled contests and prize money withheld.\(^8\)

The types of things the Technitai complain about (schedule conflicts, unpredictability of contests, and skimping on prize money) reveal that their priorities were those of traveling professionals.

2.1 Travel and the Development of the Acting Profession

Until the late the 5th century BCE, the actors at the Dionysia in Athens were local amateurs. Athenian citizens acted the plays at the Dionysia, and performed in the choruses. There was no acting profession. The acting profession developed in response to two circumstances, (1) the spread of dramatic festivals outside of Athens, and hence the increase in demand for theatrical performers, and (2) the development of "New Music," which allowed individual performers to display their virtuosity.

---

In the mid-5th century BCE, dramatic festivals spread to the demes of Athens. Drama was certainly known outside of Athens in the 5th century. Hieron I, tyrant of Syracuse, brought the tragic playwright Aeschylus to Sicily in the 470s BCE, and Archelaus, king of Macedon, brought Euripides to his court in 408 BCE. In the late 5th century BCE, dramatic festivals began to spread outside of Athens, to other cities in mainland Greece and the Peloponnese, and to Southern Italy and Sicily. With the spread of dramatic festivals came the rise of the acting profession. There were opportunities for actors beyond Athens. Also in the late 5th century BCE, a new style of music became popular, which was more complex and technically challenging, more suited to professional performers than amateurs. This "New Music" influenced the style of tragedy, particularly tragic monodies. The demand for performers, and the taste for individual virtuosity, gave rise to what Eric Csapo calls the "star system," or what we might understand as the development of celebrity culture in the ancient world. Not only were there more actors, but also some actors, the "stars," were vastly more successful, famous, and well paid than others.

By the 370s BCE, foreign actors were appearing at the Athenian Dionysia, indicating that actors were traveling to compete. Dramatic festivals spread widely in the 4th century BCE.

---


10 Csapo (2004) argues that the rise of acting as a profession should be traced to the late 5th and 4th century BCE. An expanding audience for theater, indicated by the rise in theater-construction in the fourth century, caused a rise in demand for actors. This increase in demand, Csapo suggests, contributed to "the development of the star system which gave some actors high status and salaries far above the norm" (55). On celebrity culture and the acting profession in the Roman theater, see Leppin (2011).

11 Easterling (1993) challenges the long-held scholarly opinion that drama declined after the 5th century BCE. The collection of essays in Bosher et al. (2012) make the case for the importance of Greek drama in Classical and Hellenistic Sicily and Southern Italy. The collection of essays in Csapo et al. (2014) cover many aspects of the 4th century Greek theater. Particularly relevant to the spread of drama in the 4th century BCE are the regional studies of 4th century dramatic performance: Moloney (2014) and Liapis (2014) on Macedonia; Le Guen (2014) on dramatic performances on Alexander's travels; Biles and Thorn (2014) and Robinson (2014) on Apulia; Green (2014) on Boeotia, Corinth, and Cyprus; Braund and Hall (2014) on the Black Sea. Moretti (2014) covers the construction of theaters outside of Athens in the
Near the same time, there is evidence of actors organizing, at first by donating funds as a group to produce re-performed tragedy at the Dionysia. While this organization among actors may be seen as a precursor to the formal actors' associations, nearly another hundred years elapsed before the formation of the associations. The members of the association, the Technitai ("craftsmen" or "artists"), were devoted to Dionysus, the god of drama. An association of actors was called a "synod of the Technitai of Dionysus" (τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνιτῶν ἡ σύνοδος). The Technitai were theatrical professionals, including actors, poets, and musicians.

The earliest evidence for the Technitai of Dionysus is from 279-278 BCE. One decree from Delphi grants the privilege of first consultation of the oracle and the right to sit in the front rows of the theater (the right of proedria) to the Technitai in Isthmia and Nemea, and another decree from Delphi grants the Athenian Technitai freedom from arrest and military service. These attestations of the Technitai indicate that from their earliest existence, one significant purpose of the association was to ensure its members special rights and privileges. These privileges were later extended to include exemption from taxation, and from quartering soldiers. It is significant that the earliest evidence for the Technitai attests to not one association, but two. The development of acting as a profession happened in the context of a world in which drama was not localized to Athens, but was popular in many Greek cities, which

---

12 On the development of the name of the actors' organization, see Ceccarelli (2004). The extent to which the synod of the Technitai of Dionysus was a religious organization is difficult to determine, and disputed. Lightfoot (2002) argues against the secularization of the festivals with the professionalization of the theater. One interesting piece of evidence for the religious nature of the synod is a moment of cooperation between the Technitai and the Mystai (initiates) of Dionysus. Between about 150 and 200 CE, the Technitai, together with the initiates of Dionysus Briseus, honored a benefactor, "Marcus Aurelius Julianus son of Charidemos, twice Asiarch, crown bearer, temple warden of the Augusti (Sebastoi), and bacchant of the god." IGSK Smyrna II 1.639. Trans. Ascough et al. (2012) no. 193.

13 On the early history of the Technitai, see Aneziri (2009) 218-220.


15 Sifakis (1967) 99-105 covers the privileges of the Technitai, and provides a table of evidence for the conferral of privileges on the Technitai through the Hellenistic period (280 BCE to 98/7 BCE).
were geographically dispersed, leading to the development of regional organizations from the very beginning. Two more regional associations formed during the Hellenistic period, the Technitai in Ionia and the Hellespont, based first in Teos, later in Ephesus, and finally Lebedus, and the Egyptian Technitai, with headquarters in Ptolemais and on Cyprus.\textsuperscript{16} The regional associations in Southern Italy and Sicily are less well known.\textsuperscript{17} Of these associations, the most prominent in the epigraphic record are the Athenian Technitai, the Technitai of Isthmia and Nemea, and the Technitai of Ionia and the Hellespont.

Hellenistic festivals attracted poets and performers from many regions. The ability to attract traveling poets could increase the reputation of sanctuaries. Many honorific inscriptions for "wandering poets" (\textit{poeti vaganti}), including dramatic poets, survive from the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE. Rutherford writes on these \textit{poeti vaganti}, "The foreign poet brings an external, transcendent perspective, and his stamp of approval elevates the sanctuary to a transregional status."\textsuperscript{18} The same interest in panhellenic participation can be observed at certain festivals. Members of the three main regional branches of the Technitai are represented in the Hellenistic inscriptions concerning the Delian festivals.\textsuperscript{19} Hardly any victors at the Delian festivals are from Delos; most come from elsewhere. The festivals of Delos, like the panhellenic festivals of the circuit (the Olympia, Isthmia, Nemea, and Pythia), attracted participants from all over the Greek world.

A similar trend in the increased participation of non-local competitors in the Hellenistic period can be observed in the festivals of Boiotia, but here participants were often regionally

\textsuperscript{16} Egyptian Technitai: Aneziri (1994). Sherk (1966) provides a brief history of the Technitai of Ionia and the Hellespont and the Technitai of Dionysus Kathegemon, which merged into one organization in the 2nd c. BCE. Strabo (14.1.29) says that they moved from Teos to Ephesus, and then from Ephesus to Lebedus.
\textsuperscript{17} Technitai in Southern Italy and Sicily: Aneziri (2001).
\textsuperscript{18} Rutherford (2007) 290.
\textsuperscript{19} Sifakis (1967) 20-21.
organized, due to the regional associations of the Technitai. Fossey has mapped the birthplaces of the victors at the Boiotian festivals.\textsuperscript{20} He demonstrates that while foreign victors began to appear at Boiotian festivals in the 4th century BCE, there was a great expansion in the geographical range of the victors in the 2nd and early 1st century BCE, culminating in victors from the widest geographical range in the mid-1st century BCE. As elsewhere, much less is known of the festivals of Boiotia in the 1st century CE, due to a lack of epigraphic evidence. In the 2nd and 3rd century CE, he observes a contraction. For example, no victors from Sicily and Southern Italy are represented in the imperial-era victory lists of Boiotia, although they are well represented in the Hellenistic period. The main issue with these maps of the \textit{ethnika} data from Boiotia is that it is difficult to separate clusters in the amount of epigraphic data from the expansion or contraction of the areas from which victors came, a difficulty which Fossey acknowledges.\textsuperscript{21} The mid-1st BCE geographical expansion in victors’ birthplaces may simply be a peak in the amount of available data. Second and more importantly, Fossey maps the \textit{ethnika} of all victors from all Boiotian festivals together, not the \textit{ethnika} of victors of individual festivals. This obscures the practice of festival organizers contracting with individual branches of the Technitai, and thus the concentration of victors from one region at a particular celebration of a festival.

In the Hellenistic period, festival organizers often contracted with an individual association to provide performers for the festival, ensuring that all the competitions would be covered.\textsuperscript{22} One such Hellenistic contract is recorded in a decree of the Technitai of Ionia and the

\textsuperscript{20} Fossey (2014). Manieri (2009) collects the evidence for the musical and dramatic festivals of Boiotia.
\textsuperscript{21} Fossey (2014) 115.
\textsuperscript{22} Several scholars have written about the contracts for the Technitai to perform at festivals. Capps (1900) 118-119 writes on the selection process of the artists sent out by the synod. Le Guen (2004) argues that in addition to contracts made between festival organizers and the Dionysiac synod, organizers could also make contracts with individual actors. She challenges the idea that all actors were members of the
Hellespont and the Technitai of Dionysus Kathegemon, possibly from the 2nd c. BCE, concerning the Dionysia at Iasos. The Dionysiac synod contracted with Iasos to provide competitors for the Dionysia. The members chosen are obligated to appear at the festival, with severe penalties for no-shows, a 1000 drachma fine and expulsion from the synod, with allowances made for sickness and shipwreck. For practical reasons, it would have been difficult for cities and festival organizers to communicate directly with individual actors as they traveled. The Technitai of Dionysus could communicate with their own members, or at least secure enough members to send to a city to fulfill a contract. Meanwhile, should any practical aspects of the performance need to be sorted out, the cities could communicate directly with the main office of the branch in question. The Hellenistic contracts with regional branches of the Technitai meant that at a particular festival, while many competitors traveled from abroad to the festival, there was likely to be a concentration of competitors from the same region. For example, competitors from Asia Minor would have dominated the Dionysia at Iasos, because the regional association, the Technitai of Ionia and the Hellespont, had made a contract to supply performers for this festival. At festivals in Boiotia, contracts with the Athenian Technitai were common, leading to a concentration of Athenian victors at Boiotian festivals. In both of these cases, the trend is to get performers who are non-local (from Athens, in the case of Boiotia; from Asia Minor, in the case of Iasos), but from a region near to or in which the festival is located. Nothing barred others from entering the competitions, in addition to the contracted performers who came from the regional associations.

Dionysiac synod in the Hellenistic period. Aneziri (2007) classifies types of festivals according to how the Technitai were involved, including by contractual arrangement.

23 LBW 281; Michel, Recueil no. 1014; Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 316, no. 11; Mette (1977) 72 no. II D 3c. Cf. Wilhelm (1906) 46 ff.; Robert (1937) 445-50; Robert (1938) 41; Robert et al. (1939) no. 416.
While those contracted to compete came from the same region, cities invited sacred ambassadors, *theoroi*, from across the Greek world to participate in the festival as spectators. As it was made up of ambassadors from one city to another, the theoric system reinforced political ties between *poleis*, particularly between their ruling elites. Under the Roman Empire, *poleis* no longer had to establish friendly relations with one another on an individual basis, as they were all subject to the same central Roman authority.\(^2\) Therefore, in the imperial period, what cities asserted through the festivals and public festival documents was not an inter-polis network, but the importance of the festival in the *oikoumene*, the inhabited world. We can see this both in the move away from inviting and receiving *theoroi*, a practice that ends in most places by the end of the 2nd century BCE, and also in the changes to the interactions between the festival organizers and the Technitai of Dionysus. The contracts which were commonly made between festival organizers and various branches of the Technitai for appearances at the festivals, peter out in the first century BCE. There are multiple possible explanations for this development. Festival organizers may have wanted to attract performers from more diverse areas of the Greek world, rather than having all the performers come from the same region, as would result from a contract with one branch of the Technitai. It is also possible that performers were more independent in the Roman era than they had been before, and did not need to go through the professional associations to "book" performances.

Reflecting the move from regionalism to internationalism in the imperial period, the branches of the Technitai merged into one organization, the "Technitai of the *oikoumene,*" the whole world. The world-wide association of the Technitai is first attested in a letter from Claudius in 43 CE, affirming various privileges of the world-wide Technitai, and there is a large

body of evidence for the world-wide association throughout the 2nd century CE.\textsuperscript{25} The shift is away from regionalism and towards a more all-encompassing organization, which we might call international, in the sense of trans-regional.\textsuperscript{26} The regional branches did not cease to exist, but must all have been sub-groups of the world-wide Technitai. Hadrian, for example, corresponded with the Athenian Technitai, at a time when the world-wide association was well established.\textsuperscript{27} While the formal organization of the Technitai as one world-wide organization was new in the imperial period, it had its roots in earlier co-operation between the regional branches, as a koinon of the regional synods.\textsuperscript{28} We see this in the agreement of the branches of the Technitai to send \textit{theoroi} to festivals. The Technitai sent \textit{theoroi} to the Leukophryneia in Magnesia on the Maeander. In one decree, a koinon of the Technitai of Dionysus establish "that \textit{theoroi} should be sent, now and for all time, from all three (branches of the) Technitai," i.e. the Technitai of Ionia and the Hellspont, the Athenian Technitai, and the Technitai of Isthmia and Nemea.\textsuperscript{29} There is no indication in this inscription that the \textit{theoroi} sent by the Technitai are to behave differently than the \textit{theoroi} sent by cities, and no indication that the \textit{theoroi} sent by the Technitai are going to perform rather than to observe. Even before their incorporation into one world-wide

\begin{itemize}
  \item On the world-wide association of Technitai: Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 297-302; Aneziri (2009). Jones (1963) 9 erroneously claims that the regional organizations of Technitai merged into the worldwide association under Trajan. This development of a world-wide organization of festival victors is paralleled in the professional organization for athletes, which also becomes a world-wide synod. One inscription from Miletus from c. 20 BCE mentions an athletic contest which was "established by the sacred and crowned victors from the whole world." Roueché (1993) 178. Cf. Robert (1950) 117-25.
  \item Aneziri (2009) contextualizes this move from the regional associations of Technitai in the Hellenistic period to the world-wide Technitai of the imperial period in the political structures of the Hellenistic and Roman periods.
  \item Geagan (1972).
  \item Burrell (2004) 258: "This is the only occasion that a body outside the structure of a city calls itself neokoros. Elsewhere the title is occasionally attributed to the council, more often to the people or to the city as a whole." This is in reference to the use of \textit{neokoros} in IGSK Heraclea Pontica 2, l. 21. She points out a possible parallel designation of the Dionysiac synod as \textit{neokoros} in IGSK Ephesus 22, and suggests (with reservations) that the Dionysiac synod was considered \textit{neokoros} because of their shrine to Hadrian in Rome.
  \item I. Magnesia 54. The Technitai also sent \textit{theoroi} to the festivals of Samothrace in the Hellenistic period: Dimitrova (2008) no. 10, 11.
\end{itemize}
organization, the various branches of the Technitai made joint decisions. The formation of the world-wide Technitai was a response to a new political reality in the Roman Empire, but it was not a Roman invention.

Because of the scale of the organization and its trans-regional reach, the Technitai were unlike other professional organizations in antiquity, which were typically locally oriented. The Technitai negotiated with individual cities across the Mediterranean to ensure the rights and privileges of their members. These rights and privileges included freedom from taxation, exemption from quartering soldiers, exemption from military duties and public offices and liturgies. Although the privileges of the Technitai remained unchanged from the 3rd c. BCE through the 3rd c. CE, the Technitai had to constantly re-affirm these privileges with any individual city to which their members might travel, whether for festivals or during their travels, as well as with each Roman emperor. The continual erection of decrees ratifying the privileges of the Technitai throughout the Empire suggests that there was an ongoing question about their legal status as they traveled from city to city, and that the Technitai needed to exert pressure on many fronts in order to maintain these rights and privileges. Cities which wanted the Technitai to participate in their contests, either in the present or in the future, must have been motivated to grant the performers their traditional privileges, and the emperors also speak of the affirmation of privileges for the Technitai as a continuation of past tradition.

The Technitai were a powerful and active organization. They speak and act like a polis, and are treated in certain respects like a polis. They issued decrees, elected members to offices modeled on civic offices, gave honors to benefactors and others whose services they relied on, negotiated for the rights of their members, and at one time, minted their own coins.\(^{30}\) Although they must have collected fees from their members, like other professional organizations, they

never mention this in their decrees or letters. They were not interested in advertising such payments, and may have wanted to differentiate themselves from other associations in their public presentation in this respect. This self-conscious posturing was surely intended to assert the importance and independence of the organization. In certain respects, they were even treated like a polis. The Technitai, as we saw earlier, sent *theoroi* to festivals, a practice usually reserved for cities. In the 2nd century CE, the Technitai maintained a *temenos* for the imperial cult in Rome, and were granted the title *neokoros* ("temple-warden," specifically used of those who maintained a sanctuary and rites of the imperial cult). This is a unique instance of a group which is not a city being granted this title. Members of the Dionysiac synod retained citizenship in their hometowns; the Dionysiac synod only presented itself like a polis, and did not offer citizenship.

The synod of the Technitai of Dionysus also acted as benefactor, funding new contests. One of these contests was in Aphrodisias. A list of prizes for the competition established by the Technitai survives from around 100 CE. The contests at this festival established by the Technitai were in chiastic order (kitharode, aulete, tragic drama, comic drama, aulete, kitharode), a creative intervention on the part of the artistic founders.

The independence of the Technitai may be seen in Philostratus' account of the difficulty they posed to managers imposed upon them by Roman authorities. Philostratus says that Eudianus of Smyrna was put in charge of the Technitai in Rome.

ἐπιταχθεὶς δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἀμφὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνίταις, τὸ δὲ ἑθνὸς τοῦτο ἄγερσιοι καὶ χαλεπὸν ἀρχῆσαι, ἐπιτηδειότατος τὴν ἄρχην ἔδωξε καὶ κρεῖττων ἢ λαβέιν αἰτίαν.

---

31 Aneziri (2007) covers Hellenistic contests established by the Technitai.
He was appointed also to supervise the artisans of Dionysus, a very arrogant class of men and hard to keep in order; but he proved himself most capable in this office, and above all criticism. Presumably, Eudianus was appointed by the emperor. Philostratus' life of Eudianus is very short, consisting of two stories about Eudianus' admirable behavior in the face of great difficulty. The other story is about the death of his son, and his own restrained reaction. The pairing of these stories amplifies the sense that Eudianus faced a great challenge in managing the Technitai. Philostratus calls the Technitai an ἔθνος, which the Technitai never call themselves. This implies that the reason that they are difficult to manage is not that they are themselves well-organized, powerful due to their large membership, or history of advocating on behalf of their members, but that they are arrogant and difficult to govern because of the sort of people they are. It is likely that the Technitai had little interest in being managed by people external to the organization, as they were accustomed to negotiate directly with cities and emperors, and had successfully managed their own international network of performers for hundreds of years without such intervention.

2.2 Timing Travel: Festival Calendars and the Technitai

Hadrian's calendar, discussed in chapter 1, did not solve the difficulties posed by international travel entirely, though it may have alleviated some scheduling conflicts at the time. In addition to the periodos festivals, the Technitai performed at local festivals. These local festivals had to take into account regional and international festival calendars, in order for performers to be able to compete. Newly founded festivals were scheduled so as not to conflict with each other, sometimes with specific reference to the travel requirements of the Technitai. One letter inscribed in Aphrodisias from 180-189 CE from Marcus Ulpius Apuleius Eurykles to

---

33 Philostratus, VS 2.16.596. Trans. Wilmer Wright.
the Aphrodisians specifies the date of a festival, the Lysimacheia, between the Barbillea in Ephesos and the regional contest, the *koinon Asias*, in Smyrna. These festivals were not to conflict so that it would be possible for performers to travel and compete in all three. The Technitai were directly involved in the negotiations surrounding the date of the Lysimacheia. In the letter, Eurykles mentions his frequent meetings with the Technitai about the festival.\(^{34}\)

> vacat ἄγαθή τύχη·
> Mάρκος Οὐλπιος Ἀππουλής Εὐρυκλής ἀρχιερεύς Ἀσίας ἀποδεδεί[γ]μένος
> ναὸν {ΚΑΙ} τῶν ἔν Σμύρνῃ τ<ὁ> Β’ Ἀφροδίτ[ι]έον ἀρχουσι βουλής δήμω
> χαίρε[ι].
> βουληθέντον ύμων πρόνοιαν ποιήσασθαι με καὶ τόν κατὰ τοὺς ἁγῶνας
> δια τὴν πρὸς τὸν μέγιστον αὐτοκράτορα ευθείειαν Μάρκον Αὐρήλιον
> Κόμοδον Αντονίνον Σεβαστόν, καὶ διὰ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς διαθεμένους
> μνήμην καὶ διὰ τὴν τῆς πόλεως δό<ξ>αν, ἥδη καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς συνόδου π[ολ]
> λάκις ἐνυγχόντων μοι, οὐδὲ τούτου τὸ μέρος κατέληπτον αὐτάκριτον
> ἐπόμενος τῇ κατὰ τὴν λογιστείαν τά<ξ>ε[ί] καὶ προθυμία μέχρι νῦν τῆς περί
> τοὺς ἁγῶνας καταστάσεως ἐνελιπουσῆς διὰ τὴν τῶν χρημάτων παρ
> ρασκευὴν ὕφελόντων συ[να]ξηθήναι κατὰ τε τὰς τῶν τελευταῖω
> τῶν γνώμας καὶ κατὰ τῶν ἁγῶνας καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἁγώνα μαι τοῦ πόρου ἀρ’ ὀδ
> χρή τοὺς ἁγῶνας[ζ] ἐπιτελεσθῆσαι
> ἁγῶν μὲν δὴ ὡ ἐκ τῶν Φλαβίου Λυσιμάχου διαθηκῶν προελήμφ
> θεν εἰς ἀρχεῖον πόρου μυριάδας δ<ω>δεκα ώς δύνασθαι ἀπὸ τοὺ
> τῶν παρὰ ἔτη τέσσαρα πληροῦσθαι μ<ω>οικὸν ἁγώνα καθὰ τὸ
> διαθεμέν<ν> αἰδοξεῖν. αἱ δὲ μετὰ τὰς δ<ω>δεκα μυριάδας ὁδοῖ ἐν ἐκ
> δανεισμῷ καὶ ὁ προσγεγ<ν>τοις τοὺς τόκος μέχρι ἀρχής [ἐ]τοὺς
> ποιεῖν] κεφαλεῖν διήνυσιν μυριάδας τρεῖς δηνάρια χειλία ὁκτ<ω>κόσια
> τρίακοντα ἐνενέα. δ<ω>δεκα []==[1] οὖν ἀρχομένου τοῦ ἔτους τοῦτον
> τὸν ἁγώνα ἐπιτελεῖν ἄγαθή τύχη ἐπὶ θάλοις ταλαντιαί
> οῖς καὶ ἀγονίσασιν κατὰ τὰ ἄθλα προθεσμία δὲ εἰς τὸν ἕ
> ξῆς χρόνον καὶ τὴν ἐπισκόπησιν τετραετιρίδα [Σ] ἐστὶν χρ<ν>το[ν]
> ο ὀπὸ [Βαρ]<βίλλης τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ [ἀγομένων] πρὸς [Κοινά?] Ἀσίας
> ἔφρωσθε?]

With good fortune. Marcus Ulpius Apuleius Eurycles, designated high priest of Asia, of the temples of Smyrna, for the second time, greets the Magistrates, Council and People of the Aphrodisians.

Since it was your wish that I make provision also for the (funds) relating to the contests, because of your piety towards the very great emperor Marcus Aurelius Commodus

Antoninus Augustus, and because of the memory of those who bequeathed them, and because of the reputation of the city, and since those from the Synod had also already approached me several times, I have not failed to examine this sector as well, applying the same order and zeal as (I observed) in my curatorship. So far the competitions have not taken place because the provision of money needed to be increased in accordance with the directions of the deceased (founders) and with the reckoning of the funds from which the contests are due to be carried out. However, the contest from the will of Flavius Lysimachus has reached a total endowment of 120,000 denarii, so that it is possible from this sum for the musical contest to be held every four years, as the testator wished. The funds over and above 120,000 denarii, which are on loan, and the interest accruing to this up to the beginning of the year, makes a total of 31,839 denarii. You can therefore, when the year begins, carry out this contest, with good fortune, for prizes amounting to a talent, and with competitions according to the prizes (available). The appointed time for the following period and the next four-yearly celebration will be the time between the Barbilleia at Ephesus and [?the provisional contest] of Asia.

The curator, Eurycles, has been summoned to settle a problem regarding the Lysimacheia, a well-endowed festival in Aphrodisias. Eurycles notes the budget for the prizes (1 talent in total), and the timing of the festival. He establishes that both the city of Aphrodisias and the Technitai of Dionysus have an interest in ensuring that this festival is celebrated, and have independently contacted him regarding the budgetary issues. The Technitai, he says, have "already approached me several times." The curator affirms that the prize amounts remain the same, saying that the competitions will be in accordance with the prizes (ἀγωνίσματαν κατὰ τὰ ἀθλα). The number of competitions will be determined by the set prize amounts and the total budget for prizes, rather than the number of competitions and the total prize budget determining the prize amount for each individual contest. The prize amounts for the Lysimacheia were inscribed in Aphrodisias, and so

36 In the 2nd c. CE, 1 Roman talent would have been approximately 9,384 denarii, figuring 32 kg per talent and 3.41 g per denarius. Based only on the budget for the prize amounts given in the letter, the interest rate would have been about 6%, in line with other known interest rates on endowments at this time. Calculation: the principal (151,839 denarii) must yield a total of at least 9,384 denarii at x interest, where x = 9,384/151,839 = 0.062, or 6.2%. The actual interest rate would presumably have been slightly higher, perhaps around 7%, to account for non-prize related expenses, which are not accounted for in the letter.
this information was readily available to competitors and anyone else who cared to read them. The Technitai had an interest in the stability of the prize amounts, as the prizes were effectively pay for professional performers. The concerns of the Technitai involve money and travel. They want the prizes to be consistent, and the festival to be scheduled around other festivals which they plan to compete in. Because the Technitai are competing in other Asian festivals, those responsible for organizing the festival, including the curator, must place the Aphrodisian festival in a the context of the regional festival calendar of Asia Minor.

The same concerns about money and travel appear in another letter regarding the festivals of Aphrodisias, from the same period (180-189 CE). The contest established by Callicrates son of Diotimus was scheduled so as not to conflict with the departure of the Technitai for Rome, presumably for the Capitilia. Decisions regarding the prize amounts and the schedule must be communicated to the Technitai. The timing and the total amount set aside for prizes (12,600 denarii) is settled in the letter, which goes on to note that "it is necessary] to send now on this matter to the synod, and to [announce this] contest, on behalf of [the safety] and eternal rule of the great Imperator Commodus [Augustus], as due to be celebrated at the appointed [time]." The same letter discusses a contest established by Claudius Adrastus, which had competitions in tragedy, and was also scheduled to take into account the travel requirements of the Technitai. According to this letter, the contest of Claudius Adrastus must be celebrated "in the ninth month, as appointed, because the competitors [must leave afterwards for] Heraclea." This is just before the city contest in Aphrodisias, the curator notes. The prize amounts and the festival program

have been determined by the testator, but not, apparently, the timing of the festival.\textsuperscript{40} The letter suggests that the curator has reached an agreement about the timing of the contest and the amounts of the prizes, taking into account the local festival calendar, the international festival calendar which the Technitai timed their travel by, and what funds were available in the endowments for the two festivals for prizes. The curator may have been in contact with the Technitai to work out their schedule, before determining the date of the new contests, and was certainly in contact with them afterwards, to announce the schedule and prizes to them.

2.3 Celebrity, Status, and Honor

Actors were physically mobile, traveling far and wide and winning victories in festivals spread across the Empire. Because of their celebrity status and potential to accumulate great wealth on the festival circuit, they were also socially mobile. While celebrity had long been a part of the acting profession, the celebrity of successful imperial-era actors was magnified, due to their ability to travel continuously around the Empire. One striking example of the increased focus on the performer is the practice of not recording the titles of winning plays on imperial-era lists of victors. Classical and Hellenistic lists of victors record the title of the winning play next to the name of the victorious poet. The last attestation of the recording of the play titles on the victory list is in a 1st century BCE inscription recording victors at the Romaia in Magnesia on the Maeander.\textsuperscript{41} Not recording the winning play titles increased the focus on the performers and their \textit{ethnika}.

\textsuperscript{40} The beginning of the letter is fragmentary, but suggests that the endowment documents specified the prize amounts: "...to prepare them for the requirements of the contest and ?denarii [...] and the prizes and the competitions in accordance with [?the intention of the deceased;]." Trans. Rouché (1993) no. 51.

\textsuperscript{41} I. Magnesia 88.
Celebrity status in the ancient world inspired both disparagement and admiration.\(^{42}\) Cities erected honorific statues and inscriptions for theatrical professionals which celebrated their character, way of life, virtue, and piety, and bestowed on these actors, musicians, and dancers citizenship honors and the status of bouletes. Tragic actors and kitharodes were awarded the most lavish prizes at the festivals, some topping 3,000 denarii. A budget for a dramatic festival in Sparta from 143-8 CE indicates that the victorious tragic actor took home 12,000 sesterces, 14% of the total budget of the festival.\(^{43}\) The status of actors in a Greek context was different from the status of Roman actors. Under Roman law, at least from 38 BCE on, those of equestrian and senatorial status were forbidden from appearing on stage.\(^{44}\) There were no such legal restrictions on actors in the Greek world.\(^{45}\) However, Greek literary authors of the imperial period disparage theatrical professionals with the same animosity as their Roman counterparts. To say that theatrical professionals were loved and admired by non-elites and treated with suspicion by the elites would also be an oversimplification.\(^{46}\) Elites were heavily involved in many aspects of the theater. Local elites in cities throughout the Greek world endowed dramatic festivals, took on offices such as agonothetes and choregos with administrative and financial obligations which supported these dramatic programs, and were highly visible audience members with rights to

\(^{42}\) For antitheatricality in Western culture, see Barish (1985).
\(^{43}\) SEG 11-838. The prizes given to actors are covered in chapter 5.
\(^{44}\) Levick (1983) 107-8. Forbidden from the stage: senators and their sons (38 BCE), grandchildren of senators (22 BCE), equites (22 BCE), "but after persistent evasion equites had been exempted from it explicitly by SC as far as gladiatorial shows were concerned, and a fortiori for performances on the stage" (Levick [1983] 108). All those of senatorial and equestrian status subject to infamia for appearing on stage under the SC from Larinum (19 CE).
\(^{45}\) Hugoniot (2004) demonstrates that infamia was not brought upon actors who acted at Greek festivals, as it was upon actors at Roman ludi.
\(^{46}\) A common refrain, phrased variously. Champlin (2003) 64, on celebrity performers: "some were wealthy beyond the dreams of avarice, idolized by the people and lionized by the aristocracy." Champlin considers the ambivalence of the elite towards performers, suggesting that they despised performers and feared their effect on society, but also desired to perform. Manning (1975) 173: "On rare occasions, a Roman aristocrat might condescend to grace a local festival, mixing, of course, only with amateur performers."
proedria at the contests. They also funded the erection of honorific statues and inscriptions of theatrical professionals, as positive examples for spectators to emulate.

At the same time, literary sources disparage anything and anyone relating to the theater as morally corrupt, dangerously luxurious, and often sexually deviant. The disparagement of actors in elite literary sources is well known. The practice extended to texts which were not aimed for the most elite readership, such as astrological texts. Vettius Valens, for example, whose astrological predictions frequently involve actors, writes, "The first 7° in Capricorn belong to Mercury, theatrical, comic, on the stage, lying, whoring, seducing, covetous of others' things, of no reputation, <talented> in everything, blessed, wealthy, but not of high rank."

Actors are associated with lying, sexual indulgence, and low social status on the one hand, and wealth and talent on the other. Because of their celebrity status, they are both sub-elite, yet also granted statues and honorific inscriptions next to elites, including festival organizers and benefactors.

The negative qualities associated with actors, particularly in literary sources, are in sharp contrast to the statues and honorific inscriptions erected in their honor, which praise qualities of character. Neither inscriptions nor literary texts present an unclouded window into the past. Both are rhetorical, in their own ways. Actors are frequently honored for their virtue (arete), goodwill (eunoia) and piety (eusebeia), as well as the orderly way of their life, qualities common to honorific inscriptions. It is these qualities of character which the viewer of the statue or inscription was to emulate, not the profession of the honoree. Actors vied for honors and commemoration just like elite benefactors and festival organizers. A major festival victory, or multiple victories, was cause for great pride, not only for the actor, but also for his relatives.

After 212 CE, the grandson of a tragic actor, Marcus Aurelius Alexandros, held office on Cos,

---

48 Webb (2008b) 43-44 writes similarly about the rhetorical nature of honorific inscriptions and epitaphs for pantomimes.
and advertised his theatrical ancestry, describing himself as "the grandson of Marcus Aurelius Alexandros, outstanding tragic actor, circuit victor" (ἐκγονὸς δὲ Μ[άρκου] Α<ὑ>ρηλίου//Ἀλεξάνδρου τραγῳδοῦ παραδό-/<ξ>ον περιοδονείκου). The man honored in this inscription was a wealthy individual who held public office, and made major donations to Cos. The fact that the lineage of the grandson is traced to an actor, who had attained the highest level possible, as circuit victor, suggests the good reputation that actors could have in the Greek world.

Actors were well aware of both sides of their celebrity status, the suspicion and the admiration. One tragic actor, Diogenes, is known from his epitaph in Stratonikeia, where he makes a joke about the association of acting with deception.

The son of noble Diogenes set up this stone stele, with his stepmother, so that it would be known that a man lies here, who hurt noone and did not act (deceitfully), for he was raised most truthful and genuine, and (though) raised in the tragic art, he had a prudent mind. As his native city is not named, we may assume that it was Stratonikeia. The meter is, appropriately, elegiac couplets. The epitaph responds to stereotypes of actors as deceitful, claiming instead that this actor has admirable qualities of character, such as a prudent mind. There is a humorous paradox, in μηδ᾽ ὑποκρινάμενος: an actor who does not deceive. This paradox continues in the claim that Diogenes was truthful in his tragic techne, as the techne of the tragic actor was the art of deceit.

Literary sources treat the honors given to theatrical professionals, including the practice

---

50 IGSK Stratonikeia II 1.1201.
of erecting statues of victorious poets and actors, with disdain. Pausanias and Dio Chrysostom report that there were statues of poets alongside the statues of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, and Menander in the Theater of Dionysus in Athens, some of whom were probably Hellenistic and imperial poets. Dio Chrysostom says that he spoke with a man on Rhodes about contemporary Athenians conferring too many honors. One of the man's examples is a statue of a "very slovenly poet, whom he also named, who once gave a recital here in Rhodes too, they not only have set up in bronze, but even placed his statue next to that of Menander" (τὸν δὲνα δὲ τὸν εὐχερή λίαν ποιητήν, δς καὶ παρ’ ύμῖν ποτε [κάνθάδε] ἐπεδείξατο, οὐ μόνον χαλκοῦν ἐστάκασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὰ Μένανδρον). Dio Chrysostom pointedly does not name the poet, suggesting that his name is not worth remembering or recording. His disdain is directed at the elevation of the contemporary poet to the status of Menander, a poet of the past, by the juxtaposition of their statues.

Similarly, Pausanias says that there were statues of poets in the Theater of Dionysus other than the classical tragedians and Menander, but does not name them.

In the theatre the Athenians have portrait statues of poets, both tragic and comic, but they are mostly of undistinguished persons. With the exception of Menander no poet of comedy represented here won a reputation, but tragedy has two illustrious representatives, Euripides and Sophocles. Though he does not include him in tragedy's "illustrious representatives," Pausanias mentions the statue of Aeschylus later in the passage. Pausanias seeks to preserve the names of famous men.

His omission of the names of the ἀφανεστέρων reflects this agenda. Furthermore, when it comes

---


to which types of men he records, Pausanias shows clear preferences. He particularly avoids
naming musical and dramatic victors, focusing almost exclusively on statues of athletic victors as
worthy of describing.

Of the 295 festival victors and competitors Pausanias names in his geography, only 15
won in musical or dramatic categories. In his account of Delphi, he explains why he will not
describe the statues of the musical victors, saying that "the athletes and competitors in music that
the majority of mankind have neglected, are, I think, scarcely worthy of serious attention"
(ἀθλητὰς μὲν οὖν καὶ ὁσοὶ ἁγωνισταὶ μουσικῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῖς πλεῖσσιν ἐγίνοντο μετὰ
σύνεντος λογισμοῦ, οὐ πάνυ τι ἣνοῦμαι σπουδῆς ἀξίους). In contrast to his lengthy account of
the statues of athletic victors at Elis, Pausanias only names a handful of Pythian musical victors in
his history of the Pythian games who were notable for being the earliest victors in a given
category, and does not describe a single statue of a musical victor at Delphi. Pausanias prefers to
record athletic victors, and when he does record musical and dramatic victors, he gravitates
towards the oldest and most distinguished poets and performers. He does not just ignore more
recent poets and musicians, but also calls attention to his suppression of their names by
informing the reader that he saw their statues, but will not include them in his account, in the
same way that Dio Chrysostom does with the "slovenly poet" in his Rhodian Oration. That there
were statues of later poets in the Theater of Dionysus can be confirmed by the statue base of Q.

53 Musical and dramatic victors mentioned in Pausanias' Geography of Greece: Aeschylus, Sophocles,
Euripides, and Menander (1.21.1); Sacadas of Argos, Pythian victor, aulete (6.14.10 and 10.7.4); Pylades
of Megalopolis, Pythian victor, kitharode who performed Timotheus' Persians (8.50.3); Corinna of
Tanagra, who beat Pindar at Thebes in lyric poetry (9.22.3); Chrysothemis of Crete, first winner of the
Pythia, hymn singer (10.7.2); Philammon, second winner of the Pythia, hymn singer (10.7.2); Thamyris
son of Philammon, third winner of the Pythia, hymn singer (10.7.2); Eleuther, Pythian victor, singer
(10.7.3); Melampus, Cephalenian, Pythian victor, kitharode (10.7.4); Echembrotos, Arcadian, Pythian
victor, aulode (10.7.4); Agelaus of Tegea, Pythian victor, kitharist (10.7.7). The Pythian victors in book
10 are named in a history of the Pythian games (not in an account of the statues at Delphi).
Pompeius Capito, a citizen of Pergamum and a poet "in every meter and rhythm," who was honored with Athenian citizenship and a statue in the Theater of Dionysus in Athens before 128/9 CE. The fact that such honors were given and statues erected at the theater suggests that theatrical professionals were considered of high enough status to be worth honoring. Their statues were placed in visible places in the city, alongside the statues of elite benefactors and festival organizers. Dio Chrysostom and Pausanias distance themselves from the practice of honoring theatrical professionals, deeming them unworthy of honor and commemoration. Their open discomfort with the practice of commemorating contemporary poets and theatrical professionals, along with the honorific inscriptions for such professionals which survive from the Roman era, demonstrates the popularity of the practice.

The Technitai were not only objects of honor, but also participated in determining how festival organizers and benefactors were remembered. The Technitai issued honorific decrees regularly. Honors given to emperors (especially Hadrian), benefactors, festival organizers, and even a physician, who had perhaps treated the Technitai, also survive. The connection of the Technitai to the benefactor might be due to the benefactors' donation to a festival fund, the establishment of a new festival, or a donation directly to the synod. In 128 CE, the Technitai issued two decrees, which were inscribed in Ankyra. One honors the organizer of a contest, the helladarch Ulpius Aelius Pompeianus. The voting members of the Technitai include a comic actor (komoidos), Gaius Julius Collega, son of Neocaesarus. By issuing this decree, the Technitai

55 IG II² 3800. Snell reprints the text of the inscription: TrGF vol. 1, no. 186.
56 Examples of honors granted by the Technitai: SEG 4-418 (for Titus Aelius Alcibiades of Nysa, for a donation of books and property to the synod, 141/2 CE); IGSK Heraclea Pontica 7; cf. Burrell (2004) 257 (for Marcius Xenocrates of Heraclea Pontica, possibly for medical services, 130 or after 138 CE); IGSK Pessinous 19 (for a Galataarch, Januarius Licianus, probably second half of the 2nd c. CE).
claimed the right to publicly judge the success of the festival organizer, and commemorate his role in the festival. The other decree of the Technitai in Ankyra also concerns a mysticon contest, this one held in Claudiconium. It reveals that the helladarch, presumably Pompeianus, wrote to the Technitai to request an honor, which they voted to grant him. The honors are two gilded statues of the helladarch with shields, to be erected "in the most visible places of the fatherland" (ἐν τοῖς ἀφότοις παῖσι-) [τρίσφις ἐπισημωτάτῳ]. Elites actively sought out the honors granted by the Technitai.

2.4 Traveling actors

The epigraphic record is skewed towards the most successful theatrical professionals, those who won at the international festivals of the circuit, and were therefore more likely to be honored with statues and inscriptions. There was more than one way to be a theatrical professional in the imperial period. Theatrical careers could be local as well as international. Three examples of traveling actors represent the different choices actors could make regarding their own professions, and how their careers were publicly displayed. The first, Philoxenos of Side, won many victories across the eastern Mediterranean. He is represented as a performer who traveled widely, participated in a variety of types of contests, local and pan-Asian, and was remembered in the form of an inscription and statue in his hometown. The second, the tragic actor Bassus, won at contests spread across the Mediterranean, from Marseille (Massalia) in the West, to the major contests of Greece and Asia Minor. His son, Bassus, was also a tragic actor, and had a more local career. He won a variety of competitions (as tragic actor, comic actor,


59 Bosch (1967) 166, no. 130, l. 9-10. Similarly, the athletic and thymelic Technitai honored a contest president of the Augusteia Antoninea in the 3rd c. CE: IGSK Prusias ad Hypium 49. Cf. Duruy (1883) 408.
The Sidetans erected an honorific inscription for Philoxenos because of his many victories as herald and comic actor. This combination of specialties (herald and actor) was not uncommon, unsurprisingly given the importance of a strong voice in both types of performance.

Philoxenos competed at contests in the eastern Mediterranean. He won at the Mysticon contest in Side, at various contests of Asia minor (the most important regional festival in Asia Minor, the koinon Asias, and smaller provincial koina, as well as contests at Antioch and Castabala), in Damascus in Syria, and in Hermoupolis in Egypt.

Good fortune. Marcus Aurelius Philoxenos the Sidetan, herald and comedian, incredible sacred victor, won the contests inscribed below: in his most brilliant and esteemed fatherland, the Mysticon, seven times; and the Isocapitolion in Hermoupolis; the Sebsamnia in Damascus; the Hadrianeia in Antioch near Daphne; the contest of Eukratos, the Koinon of Pontus, equal to the Actian games, in Neocaesarea, eiselastic sacred (contests) open to the whole world; and in Castabala, the Severeia Peraseia, two times; and...two times, eiselastic sacred contests...and other Koina...and at talent-prize games fifteen times, and half-talent-prize games and 1000-drachma-prize games, 85
times. This statue was set up as a prize by...Konon, when Mousaios was festival organizer.\footnote{Bean (1965) no. 149 (Side, after 212 CE).}

The festival organizer, Mousaios, and the man who funded the statue and inscription, the son of Konon, tie their names to the fame and success of Philoxenos by helping to fund the contest and the subsequent commemoration of the victor. Philoxenos' victories are grouped into four categories. First, the inscribers list the local contests of Side. Second, they list sacred contests, which were open to competitors from the entire oikoumene, and granted victors an award of lifetime maintenance paid upon the return to the home city, a practice discussed further below.

The aspiration of cities to access the prestige of the ancient contests of the periodos can be clearly seen in the elaborate title of one festival among Philoxenos' victories, the contest founded by Eukratos, the koinon of Pontus. This regional contest claims parity with the Actia, a festival on the periodos, forming a connection between Neocaesarea and mainland Greece. Another source of prestige for the festival is the orientation towards the entire oikoumene, as it welcomes competitors from all over the world. The title of the festival advertises its local context (Neocaesarea), regional context (Pontus), and global context (the oikoumene). Third in the list of Philoxenos' victories come the sacred contests which were open to regional competitors, also designated as eiselastic (i.e. which guaranteed the victor the right of triumphal return to his hometown, with some complexities discussed below). Finally, there are the contests which award prizes in money, in the case of Philoxenos, one-talent games, half-talent games, and "1000-drachma contests." Philoxenos won these money-prize contests 85 times, and won multiple times at several of the more prestigious contests. His travels took him back through the same places repeatedly, over time. The ranking of Philoxenos' victories, then, is local festivals, international festivals, regional festivals, and lastly, lower-status festivals with money prizes.
The Sidetan contests, although smaller than the *koinon Asias* and provincial *koina*, are treated with great pride, as they are listed first. There is emphasis on the "most brilliant and esteemed" Sidetan land and Philoxenos' connection to it. Philoxenos is being celebrated by his hometown, for victories in the local festival. Winning at the local Mysticon seven times required Philoxenos to be present at the contest at least four times (as he could have won in both categories, as herald and comic actor). This suggests that Philoxenos returned to his hometown repeatedly throughout his career. Philoxenos' victories outside of Side add luster to the local festival by showing him to be an internationally acclaimed performer who competed regularly in the local Mystikon. Professionals retained ties to their hometowns while becoming celebrities in the wider world. The placement of the local contest first, before a list of festival victories ranked by prestige, is typical of honorific inscriptions for festival victors. What is advertised in honorific inscriptions for festival victors is how the international accomplishments of the victor reflect well on the local place where the inscription is erected. Therefore, the local contest has pride of place, above even the highest-ranking festivals of the *periodos*. In Philoxenos' case, the local contest is also the contest of his homeland, but the local-contest-first rule applies also to situations in which a victor is honored in a city which is not his hometown.

One such honorific inscription for a well-traveled actor, listing the victory in the local contest first, comes from Argos in the 2nd or 3rd century CE. Gaius Julius Bassus was an actor and herald, the record of whose victories show a simultaneous concern for local and international prestige. He competed on the festival circuit as tragic actor, comic actor, and herald, winning at the major games of mainland Greece, as well as at the *koina* competitions of Asia and Crete. The Milesians honored him after his victory at the Nemea and Aspida in Argos in old tragedy.

ψη(φίσματ) Βουλής Ἀργείων. Ἡ πόλις

---

61 The rule also applies to inscriptions for athletic victors: König (2005) 169-70.
By vote of the council of the Argives. The city of the Milesians (honors) its own citizen Gaius Julius Bassos, who won the Nemea and the Aspida in Argos 6 times, as herald, tragic actor, and the over-all (victor); the Capitolia 2 times as tragic actor and herald; the Panathenea; the great koina Asias at Pergamum, Ephesus, Smyrna 24 times, in which (he won) the over-all (competition) and the koinon (competition) 3 times; and other koina of Asia 24 times, the koina of Crete 4 times, (at) Massalia as comic actor, tragic actor, and other 5-year contests 260 times.62 Bassus' honorific inscription claims a total of 323 victories. The contests are ranked: contests on

the periodos first (Nemea, Capitolia, Panathenea, and the koinon Asias), followed by koina contests in Asia and Crete, and other unnamed 5-year contests. The Nemea and Aspida are listed first because of the local significance, as the inscription was erected in Argos. The ranking, as with Philoxenos' honorific inscription, is local contests, international contests, regional contests, and lastly, contests of lower status, which are not named. In this case, the local contest, the Nemea, is also an international contest on the periodos; it is therefore ranked first among the contests of the periodos. Bassus' success concerns both his native Miletus, and Argos, where he won his victory, enhancing the reputation of both.

Bassus' son also pursued a theatrical career, but did not travel the periodos like his father. The son competed as tragic actor, comic actor, herald, and kitharode, a broad spectrum of specialties which has no parallel among theatrical professionals of the Roman era. No other actors, aside from the clearly exceptional exception of the emperor Nero, win in more than three

62 Vollgraf (1919) 258.
categories. Rather than specializing in one or two categories and traveling long distances to compete, Bassus competed across rather different categories but within a small geographical area. He won several festival victories, but all within about 60 kilometers of his native city of Miletus. The festival organizers of the Didymeia honored him.

[Bassus son of Julius] Bassus the Milesian, herald and tragic actor, victor on the circuit five times, who won as tragic actor in the sanctuary at the Didymeia, as kitharode at the Megala Didymeia in Miletus, at the Nea Sebasteia as tragic actor, at the Artemisia in Ephesus as comic actor; the festival organizers Domitius Damas, Domitius Faustus and Domitia Faustina (honor him)...

There is more information given about Bassus' father than is usual on inscriptions of this type. It is the father, not the son, who is noted to be a circuit-victor. Even his specialties, herald and tragic actor, are named. Bassus was somewhat overshadowed by his famous father. What the festival organizers advertise is the connection of the victor in their contest to other local victories, and to the international victories of the periodos, through his father. The fact that Bassus was related to a famous, internationally successful circuit-victor may have led the festival organizers of the Didymeia to erect this inscription for a victor whom they would not otherwise have commemorated.

Theatrical professionals like Bassus, who did not have international careers, were

---

\(^{63}\) I. Didyma 183 (2nd or 3rd c. CE).
probably more common in the Roman era than is reflected in the epigraphic record, which preserves only the careers of victors who people wanted to advertise as connected to their festivals, i.e. the most famous and internationally successful victors. Epitaphs, however, do not discriminate against less successful victors. One comic actor, Sulpicius Pollio, was buried on Chios, only 50 kilometers from his native Smyrna.64 His epitaph reads simply, "Sulpicius Pollio, Smyrnaean, comic actor, remembered his native land" (Σουλπίκιος/ Πωλλίων/ κωμιοδός/ Ζμυρναῖος/ ἐμνήσθη/ τῆς ἰδίας/ πατρίδος). If Sulpicius had won any notable victories, we would expect them to be recorded on his epitaph. As no victories are listed, but only his specialty of komoidos, we may be seeing here a parallel to the locally-oriented Bassus, a competitor who did not travel to seek his fame at the great festivals.

Lists of victories in honorific inscriptions advertise internationalism and localism, ranking contests according to importance, with the local contest given first priority. A victor who had traveled internationally, and been successful at festivals which attracted competitors from across the Mediterranean, especially the festivals of the periodos, reflected well on any local festival he might appear at, showing that the local festival was important enough to attract competitors from abroad. The practice of honoring festival victors in their hometowns, rather than or in addition to in the city where the victory had occurred, is paralleled with athletic victors. Honors given to victors at Olympia decreased, while honors given to Olympic victors by their native cities increased in the imperial period.65 This shift from honors at the site of victory

65 “As Olympia necessarily opened admission to non-Greeks and Roman citizens, fewer victories went to athletes from the old homeland, and more victors came from Asia Minor, Egypt, and Africa (Scanlon 2002, Appendix 2.1). To see this as decline is a matter of perspective. While Olympic victors increasingly came from the eastern provinces, commemoration of victories at Olympia by such victors began to decrease in the second century, just as commemoration increased within the cities of Asia Minor. Apparently Olympic victories brought more prestige if commemorated in the victor’s own city rather than at Olympia (Farrington 1997).” Kyle (2014) 317-8.
to honors at home reflects the same interplay between internationalism and localism that we observe in honorific inscriptions for dramatic victors.

### 2.5 The Ties that Bind: Life-Long Maintenance of Festival Victors

We earlier encountered eiselastic contests among Philoxenos' victories. These eiselastic contests are a telling example of the complex relationship between victors and their hometowns. Eiselastic contests literally mean ones in which victors were guaranteed the right of triumphal entry to their hometowns. Slater, however, casts serious doubt on the idea that any triumphs were ever celebrated for Roman-era festival victors other than Nero, who entered Rome on Augustus' triumphal chariot through a hole knocked out of the wall specifically for the purpose. In addition to the nominal right to enter their hometowns in a triumph, victories in these eiselastic contests entitled victors to life-long maintenance from their hometowns. Debates about how such stipends should be paid revolve around the issue of whether victors must be required to return to their hometowns in order to collect their stipends, a challenge for competitors constantly on the move. For the victors, the "right of triumphal entry" (or any physical return to the hometown) was really more of a responsibility, as it involved significant time and expense to get back home from abroad, and the benefit was the lifetime stipend. For the cities paying out the stipends, the responsibility was financial, and the benefit was in the return of the victor. It is entirely consistent with the value structure of the time that it was the return home which was emphasized in the title of the festival, and not the financial reward. The higher the status of the festival, the less remuneration is emphasized. As professionals who were interested in maximizing their own financial interests, the Technitai petitioned to get out of the responsibility of returning home, while still reaping the benefit of the stipend. Cities pushed back against this, wanting the benefit

---

66 Slater (2012).
of the victor's return if they were to pay their maintenance. We will see evidence of these disputes below.

This may be why Philoxenos returned so many times to his native Side, to start the pension clock. Philoxenos’ return to Side was a benefit to the city and the local elites who organized the contests of Side, as he could enhance the reputation of the local contest by competing in it, and the reputation of the city and its elites by means of the commemoration of the honors bestowed upon him after his victory in the festival. Every time a new festival was designated eiselastic, more victors became eligible to collect payments from their native cities. The cities must have gotten something out of the arrangement; why else would they agree to such payments? The reciprocity of the arrangement, in which cities paid their citizens who had won at eiselastic festivals, and expected these famous citizens to return home in order to collect payment, must have contributed to the co-operation of cities in this scheme.

The awards of lifetime maintenance hearken back to a time before competition-related travel was quite so common, to the travel of competitors to the periodos festivals of mainland Greece in the archaic and classical periods. Vitruvius recalls the origin of this practice among the ancestors of the Greeks (Graecorum maiores). In fact, it was a Roman invention.

Nobilibus athletis, qui Olympia, Isthmia, Nemea vicissent, Graecorum maiores ita magnos honores constituerunt, uti non modo in conventu stantes cum palma et corona ferant laudes, sed etiam, cum revertantur in suas civitates cum victoria, triumphantes quadrigis in moenia et in patrias invehantur e reque publica perpetua vita constitutis vetigalibus fruantur.

Famous sportsmen, who win victories at Olympia, Corinth, and Nemea, have been assigned such great distinctions by the ancestors of the Greeks that they not only receive praise publicly at the games, as they stand with palm and crown, but also when they go back victorious to their own people they ride triumphant with their four-horse chariots into their native cities, and enjoy a pension for life from the State.67

---

Recalling the institution of the practice of granting circuit victors maintenance for life, Vitruvius depicts the travel of competitors to the festivals and back again to their hometowns. The first honors are granted at the site of victory (the palm, crown, and praise), while the second round of special treatment (the triumphal return and pension) are granted only when they return home. Vitruvius’ account may not be an accurate depiction of contemporary Greek practice, as Slater argues that he projects knowledge of the pensions granted to Roman-era victors, and his own experience and memory of Roman triumphs, back onto the classical past.68

In the imperial period, contests which guaranteed victors lifetime pensions increased, as contests were upgraded. The increase in eiselastic contests, Slater has shown, began in the time of Trajan, and continued into the 3rd century CE.69 Under Trajan, victors were required to return to their hometowns to start the pension clock. The Technitai lobbied for this rule to be changed, so that the accrual of the pension would be counted not from the time the victor returned home, but from the moment of victory. Pliny writes about the complaints of athletes with eiselastic victories. While in Pliny's letter, the conversation is between the athletes, Pliny, and Trajan, the dispute also concerned the cities. The petition of the athletes must have arisen because cities refused to pay the stipends from the date of victory in order to compel victors to return home. Hidden behind this petition, then, may be some number of local disputes between the victors and their hometowns.

Athletae, domine, ea quae pro iselasticis certaminibus constituisti, deberi sibi putant statim ex eo die, quo sunt coronati; nihil enim referre, quando sint patriam invecti, sed quando certamine vicerint, ex quo invehi possint. Ego contra scribo 'iselastici nomine': itaque Åeorum vehementer addubitem an sit potius id tempus, quo εἰσήλασαν intuendum.

68 Slater (2012) 141.
69 Slater (2012) 162-3 collects the epigraphic evidence for the eiselastic contests, including contests upgraded to eiselastic status in the Roman period. He also relies on papyrus letters which were sent from the site of the festival to the hometown of the victor to announce the victory. On Trajan and the eiselastic contests, see also Remijsen (2011) 108.
The winning athletes in the Triumphal Games, Sir, think that they ought to receive the prizes which you have awarded on the day they are crowned for victory. They argue that the actual date of their triumphal entry into their native towns is irrelevant; the date which matters is that of the victory which entitled them to the triumph. On the other hand, I point out that the name refers to "triumphal entry," and so I am very much inclined to think that their date of entry is the one we should consider.  

It was clearly in the best interests of the victors to count the pension from the time of victory, as returning home could have meant weeks of travel, and would have interfered with the tightly packed schedule of a professional competitor traveling the circuit. Trajan was unsympathetic. He agreed with Pliny, and denied the request of the athletes. The Dionysiac synod was more successful with Hadrian, who granted them the right to collect from the time of victory rather than the return home, which he notes in the letter from 134 CE inscribed at Alexandria Troas, which addresses the demands and complaints of the Technitai. This apparently did not settle the issue, as Marcus Aurelius refers to the practice of victors returning home to collect their pensions in a letter to the Milesians in 177 CE. Cities, it seems, were reluctant to spend money on supporting victors who did not return home, despite Hadrian's ruling.

**Conclusion**

Travel shaped the formation of the acting profession, and the rise of the professional associations of Technitai of Dionysus. The place of festival travel, traveling spectators and traveling competitors, in the documents which festival organizers and cities chose to display in public, reflects how they wanted their festival to be seen in relation to the wider Greek world. In the Hellenistic period, festivals were a means for cities to re-affirm and advertise their ties with other Greek cities. While Hellenistic performers traveled widely, festivals often contracted with regional organizations to provide the performers. The main display of international travel was

---

not in the performers, but in the sacred ambassadors, the *theoroi*, who participated in the festival not as competitors but as honored spectators. In the imperial period, the Technitai of Dionysus merged into a world-wide association, part of a more general shift away from regionalism and towards an international outlook and organization. This world-wide organization of Technitai of Dionysus was powerful, well-organized, active in seeking and affirming the rights and privileges of its members, and in constant communication with the imperial center, with cities, and with people involved with organizing festivals in the provinces. The travel requirements of the Technitai affected local, regional, and international festival calendars, as the Technitai were always on their way from one place to another.

Internationalism and localism exerted opposing forces upon the competitors, yet these opposing forces were deeply interconnected. In order to be honored at home, a victor needed credentials gained abroad. Victors on the circuit were honored in ways which advertised how their international victories enhanced the reputation of the local festival. Those who honored Philoxenos and Gaius Julius Bassus gave priority to the local contests, listing them before the contests of the *periodos*. Festival competitors were incentivized both to compete abroad, so that they could win prizes, but also drawn back to their native cities, where they were honored with statues and inscriptions, and given life-long pensions if they had won at eiselastic contests. While he was abroad, the connection of the traveling performer to his hometown was emphasized by the use of his ethnic, which designated him as a competitor who had traveled from an impressive distance.
Chapter 3: Audiences

The theater was a gathering place. At dramatic festivals, spectators of different genders, ages, ethnicities, professions, socio-economic, civic, and legal statuses shared in the experience of Greek poetry and myth through theatrical performance. "Philosophy," writes Strabo, "is for the few, whereas poetry is more useful to the people at large and can draw full houses" (αὐτὴ μὲν οὖν πρὸς ὀλίγους, ἤ δὲ ποιητικὴ δημοφιλεστέρα καὶ θέατρα πληροῦν δυναμένη).¹ In his contrast between the literature of the few (philosophy) and the literature of the many (poetry), Strabo is talking not about poetic texts, but performances, and not about a reading public, but a public of spectators. For Strabo, an author of historical prose meant for an elite circle of educated readers, the point is not to privilege the knowledge of the many, through poetic performance, over the knowledge of the few, through reading, education, and the study of texts. His comments on the popular knowledge of myth through performance, however, are a glimpse of a world in which poetry was a part of the lives of most people.²

Scholarship on ancient theater audiences gravitates towards classical Athens and Republican Rome, the two contexts from which complete plays have survived.³ The concentration on classical Athens and Republican Rome is a geographical as well as a temporal bias, focusing on two urban centers, and neglecting a great variety of local dramatic viewing

¹ Strabo, Geography 1.2.8, trans. H.L. Jones. Strabo is speaking generally of myths told in poetry to children, to illiterate and uneducated adults, to people who live in cities, and to crowds of women, and focuses especially on myths told in Homeric poetry. On Homer in imperial Greek literature, see Kim (2015).
² In a Latin context, Quintilian Inst. Or. 11.3.4 contrasts performed drama to dramatic texts in libraries, aligning pleasure with performance.
contexts in the Empire. Rehm, for example, compares the theater audiences of classical and Hellenistic Athens to the theater audiences of Rome, but does not touch on the Athenian audiences of the Roman era. This omission is not due to a lack of evidence, as most of the inscriptions on the seats of the Theater of Dionysus date from the Roman era. Origins draw more attention than later developments. Even when later evidence is discussed, it is often done so in service of reconstructing the 5th and 4th century BCE Athenian practices. For example, reserved theater seats for elites in the front rows of the Theater of Dionysus from the imperial period are treated as evidence for the same practice in the 5th and 4th century BCE.

There have been recent forays into postclassical Greek audiences. Wallace contextualizes the 4th century BCE Athenian audience in relation to developments in the postclassical theater, arguing that the theater became more concerned with popular appeal and audience response in the 4th century. As evidence, he advances the rise of "purely popular entertainment" (i.e. paratheatrical entertainment), actors' interpolations in dramatic texts, and virtuosic performers, the stars. The popular appeal and importance of the audience response changed the aesthetic of the postclassical theater, which moved towards thauma, amazement, further addressed in chapter 7. Focusing on the Greek East in the Roman era, Gebhard uses four case studies to define the relationship of theater audiences and festival participants to the emperor. She argues for the theater as a space of unity.

While the question of how diverse theater audiences were in Rome, particularly in the time of Plautus, remains controversial, it is clear that theater audiences in the Greek world in the

---

4 Rehm (2013).
5 Maass (1972); Pohlmann (1981).
7 Gebhard (1996).
Roman period were heterogeneous. The question of whether women were present in the audience of the classical Athenian Dionysia is part of this discussion about homogeneity and heterogeneity, although the evidence is not conclusive and scholars are still divided on the topic. Nightingale has argued against the sole focus on the gaze of Athenian citizens, and considers the gaze of foreigners in the Athenian audience. Roselli also argues against seeing the ancient Greek theater audience as a homogeneous mass, centered on the gaze of the Athenian male citizen, and criticizes the description of audiences as "mixed" as obscuring specific identities. Instead, he advocates focusing on distinct groups in the theater audiences, in every period. In this chapter, I adopt Roselli's approach to the audience as a heterogeneous collection of distinct groups, but seek to contextualize this heterogeneity in the social conditions of the Roman period.

The audiences at the Greek dramatic festivals in the Roman period were diverse. Dramatic spectators can be found at every level of society. They included Greeks and Romans, men and women, adults and children, elites and sub-elites, free and enslaved people, citizens and non-citizen residents, and visitors from abroad. Just as performers traveled to festivals, so too

---

8 Fontaine (2010) argues that Plautus' audiences were much smaller and more homogeneous (made up almost entirely of elite men) than Greek audiences. On the other end of the spectrum is Richlin (2014), who argues for a heterogeneous Roman audience which included slaves.

9 Podlecki (1990) collects the testimonia regarding the presence of women in the classical Athenian theater audience. In favor of the presence of women in the classical Athenian Dionysia: Henderson (1991); Hughes (2008). Against the presence of women at the classical Athenian Dionysia: Goldhill (1997). The origins of the debate lie in Enlightenment concepts of the role of women in society: Katz (1998). Roselli (2011) 158-194 provides a historiographical overview of the scholarship on the question, and argues that the controversies over women in the theater audience in Athens which we find in the ancient sources had to do with fear of the power of the people, whether as spectators or as political actors. Even if women were present in the classical Athenian theater audience, it is clear that there was no attempt to advertise their presence. This is not true in the Roman period. Not only were women present in the theater audience, their presence was publicly commemorated in stone.

10 Nightingale (2001) 30: "This exclusive focus on the ‘democratic gaze’ of the Athenian citizens—on the local theates (spectator) rather than the foreign theoros—has almost completely eclipsed (what we might call) the ‘theoric gazes’ of the foreign visitors."

11 Roselli (2013) 32: "Audiences comprised of these ‘other,’ mostly subaltern, publics—non-citizens, the poor, women, slaves, and metics—engaged in public acts of adjudication (typically understood as political) in a space constituted by the interrelated practices of the economic, political, cultural, and educational." Roselli (2011) is a monograph on the topic.
spectators traveled to watch. Benefactors and festival organizers had various reasons for wanting to attract visitors to participate in their festivals, not least of which must have been the economic benefit of the flood of festival-goers into the city, a stimulus to the local economy. Attending festivals was tourism, and festivals were advertised outside of the city in order to attract spectators. As spectators, people asserted multiple, overlapping identities. Participating in festivals could be a way of asserting Greek identity, but also a way of asserting other identities, such as profession, factional allegiance, familial ties, and social status.

In addition to literary passages, which typically characterize festival spectators as uneducated masses, prone to uproar, rioting, and other dangerously unruly behavior, we have a fair amount of epigraphic evidence for theater spectatorship. Several types of inscriptions give some insight into who was in the audience, and how spectators represented themselves. First, there are inscribed theater seats, which reserve a seat for an individual or a block of seats for a group. These are sometimes also called topos-inscriptions, because many of them use the formula topos + genitive. Second, there are inscriptions which describe benefactions given at festivals, such as meals and distributions of wine, food, and money. These inscriptions specify to whom the benefactions were given, and so provide evidence of what groups participated in the festival. Third, there are honorific inscriptions for elite individuals given proedria, the right of sitting in the front seats in the theater. To this set of evidence may be added literary passages which concern theater audiences, informed by elite attitudes toward the masses.

One trend that emerges from both epigraphic and literary sources is that many spectators sat in pre-determined groups. Group spectatorship can be seen in the reserved theater seats, in the practice of selling specific seats in the theater with tickets, which would have allowed people to reserve seats next to one another, and in literary anecdotes about people going to the theater
together. People went to the theater with their friends and family. Vitruvius refers to male spectators sitting with their wives and children.\textsuperscript{12} Plutarch went to the theater with his friends, more to discuss philosophy with them than to watch the shows.\textsuperscript{13} Sitting together was on one level about placing oneself within a hierarchy in the theater, about showing where one sat in relation to the rest of the community. But on another level, it was about the pleasure of going to the theater, and spending time with friends and relatives. These groupings can be seen not only as reinforcing a civic hierarchy, but also as reinforcing bonds within groups, particularly in familial groups, friend groups, and professional networks.

\textbf{3.1 Global Audiences: Traveling Spectators}

Theater audiences were not only made up of citizens, but also included spectators from surrounding cities, or even farther afield. Traveling spectators had long been a part of the Greek festivals. In the Hellenistic period, an important group of festival travelers were \textit{theoroi}, sacred ambassadors.\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Theoroi} were sent by cities to festivals in other cities. In Magnesia on the Maeander, there was a festival of Artemis called the Leukophryneia. Each time the Leukophryneia was celebrated, the Magnesians sent letters of invitation to dozens of Greek cities, asking them to send \textit{theoroi} to the festival. The Magnesians promise to host, feed, and house the \textit{theoroi} during their stays. These cities sent back letters in response to the Magnesians. The correspondence, the letters of invitation and the letters of reply, were inscribed on stone and erected in the agora at Magnesia, along with other festival-related documents, a grand public

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} Vitruvius, \textit{De Arch.} 5.3.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Plutarch, \textit{Dialogue on Love} 749b-c.
\item \textsuperscript{14} One important body of evidence for \textit{theoroi} are the theoric inscriptions of Samothrace, all dating to the Hellenistic period: Dimitrova (2008). On \textit{theoroi} at the archaic Olympia: Gehrke (2013).
\end{itemize}
display of the relationship of Magnesia to many other Greek poleis.\textsuperscript{15} One benefit of the theoric system was the opportunity to spread knowledge of the festival to other poleis through correspondence and announcements. For example, one 1st c. BCE letter from Paros, inscribed at Magnesia, indicates that the Leukophryneia will be announced at the Parian Dionysia.\textsuperscript{16} The announcement of the festival increases its reputation abroad, and is a display of the relationship between Paros and Magnesia. This relationship is reinforced by the commemoration of the announcement and theoroi in stone in Magnesia.

Taken as a whole, these documents advertise that Magnesia had good relationships with many Greek poleis. The festival was a place where Magnesia could demonstrate its place within the wider Greek world, and demonstrate that it was situated in a network of friendly poleis. The role of travel at the Hellenistic festivals, then, was twofold. Performers traveled to compete, and theoroi traveled to be honored guests in the audience. In both cases, the host city was responsible for feeding and housing the travelers, their guests, and the involvement of foreigners in the festival was advertised in stone and publicly displayed.\textsuperscript{17}

As part of the institution of the festival, the system of theoria that characterized Hellenistic festivals died out, for the most part, by the 1st century BCE. On an individual level, unsupported by festival funds or officials, theoria remained an important part of the festival, in the sense that individual spectators traveled to participate in festivals and other cult activities. Jones argues that there was some continuation of institutional practice of theoria in the Roman

\textsuperscript{16} I. Magnesia 50.
\textsuperscript{17} The budget for these theoria-related expenses was part of the festival budget. For example, one thymelic festival, funded jointly by a group of cities (Ilium, Dardanus, Skepsis, Assos, Alexandria, Abydos, and Lampsakos), is known from a decree from Ilium from 77 BCE: SEG 4-664 = IGSK Ilion 10. The decree establishes that the budget for theoria should remain intact for ten years.
period, under a different name, *sunthusia*, joint sacrifice.\textsuperscript{18} Invitations to other cities to send ambassadors to festivals continued, with the ambassadors called *sunthutai* rather than *theoroi*. On Rhodes, the term *theoros* persists, which Jones attributes to Rhodian conservatism. Under the Roman Empire, there was no need for Greek *poleis* to establish friendly relations with one another, because they were all a part of the same political system. Instead of inviting ambassadors from friendly *poleis*, festival organizers in the Roman era attempted to fill the theater with as broad a cross-section of society as possible, including traveling visitors. The safety of travel in the Roman period made travel much more accessible, although certainly not everyone would have had the means and leisure to travel to festivals beyond their own localities.

Artemidorus was one such traveling spectator. The area of Artemidorus' travels is the *oikoumene* as defined by the *periodos*. Festivals provided him with large numbers of people to interview for his dream book, the *Oneirocritica* (mid-2nd to early 3rd century CE). This is by far the longest surviving eye-witness account of Roman-era festivals. Because of his first-hand research, Artemidorus claims, his dream interpretations are better than those based on research from books. In order to find the greatest concentration of people, Artemidorus traveled the festival circuit: "And in Greece, in its cities and festivals (κατὰ πόλεις καὶ πανηγύρεις), and in Asia and in Italy and in the largest and most populous of the islands, I have listened patiently to old dreams and their outcomes."\textsuperscript{19} In the preface of the fifth book, Artemidorus reiterates that he has collected dreams and their outcomes "in the festivals in Greece and Asia and also Italy" (ἐν τῇ δὲ πανηγύρεσι ταῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ ἐν Ἀσίᾳ καὶ πάλιν ἀν ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ).\textsuperscript{20} As a result of his travels through the festivals of the Greek world, the dreamers in his dream book are largely

\textsuperscript{18} Jones (1998) 186.
\textsuperscript{19} καὶ ἐν Ἑλλάδι κατὰ πόλεις καὶ πανηγύρεις, καὶ ἐν Ἀσίᾳ καὶ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ καὶ τῶν νήσων ἐν ταῖς μεγίσταις καὶ πολυαιθροποτάταις ὑπομένων ἀκούειν παλαιοὺς ὀνείρους καὶ τούτων τάς ἀποβάσεις. Artemidorus, *Oneirocritica* praef. 1, trans. Harris-McCoy.
\textsuperscript{20} Artemidorus, *Oneirocritica* praef. 5, trans. Harris-McCoy.
festival competitors (athletes, musicians, actors) and other performers associated with the festivals (paratheatrical entertainers). His book of dream interpretations, with the dreams of festival performers scattered among the dreams of people from many walks of life (rich and poor, enslaved and free, men and women, adults and children) suggests the heterogeneity of the crowds at the festivals where he traveled.

The opportunity to see other people, to meet up with friends, was a reason in and of itself to attend festivals. In Plutarch's *Dialogue on Love*, his son Autobulus describes an encounter at the Erotidea at Thespiae. His father, Plutarch, he says, traveled to Thespiae for the Erotidea with his wife and their friends when they were young, before Autobulus was born. Even in a story about his own attendance of a theatrical festival, Plutarch uses several tactics to distance himself from the enjoyment of the theater.

τὸν δὲ φίλον οὖκ ὤθεν μὲν αὐτῷ παρῆσαν οἱ συνήθεις, ἐν δὲ Θεσπιαῖς εὗρε Δαφναῖον τὸν Ἀρχιδάμου [καὶ] Λυσάνδρας ἐρώντα τῆς Σίμωνος καὶ μάλιστα τῶν μνημέων αὐτήν εὐθυμεροῦντα, καὶ Σώκλαρον ἐκ Τιθόρας ἢκοντα τὸν Ἀριστίωνος· ἦν δὲ καὶ Πρωτογένης ὁ Ταρσεύς, καὶ Ζεύξιππος ὁ Λακεδαιμώνιος, ἔνοι Βοιωτῶν δ' ὁ πατὴρ ἐρή τὸν γνωρίμου τοὺς πλείστους παρείναι. δύο μὲν οὖν ἦν τρεῖς ἡμέρας κατὰ πόλιν, ὡς ξύκεω, ἡσυχή πως φιλοσοφοῦντες ἐν ταῖς παλαίστραις καὶ διὰ τῶν θεάτρων ἀλλήλοις συνήσαν· ἔθετα φεύγοντες ἄργαλέον ἄγωνα καθαρῳδόν, ἐντεύξεσι καὶ σπουδαῖς προειλημμένον, ἀνέζευξαν οἱ πλείους ὡσπερ ἐκ πολεμίας εἰς τὸν Ἑλικώνα καὶ κατηυλίσαντο παρὰ ταῖς Μούσαις.

His usual friends came with him from home and at Thespiae he found Daphnæus, son of Archidamus, who was in love with Simon’s daughter, Lysandra, and the most favoured of all her suitors. Socræus, son of Aristion, had come from Tithora; and there were present also Protagenes of Tarsus and Zeuxippus of Lacedaemon, friends of his from abroad. My father said that most of his other Boeotian acquaintances were there. Now they passed, it seems, the first two or three days in the city, indulging mildly between spectacles in learned conversation in the athletic buildings. After that, routed by a stubborn feud among the harpists which was preceded by appeals for support and enlisting of partisans, most of the visitors decamped from the hostile territory and bivouacked on Helicon as guests of the Muses.21

This account of the Erotidea is Plutarch’s own memory, narrated by his son, purportedly recalling a story told to him by his father. This elliptical way of telling the story distances the events from

---

the present, as they are remembered in the past, from the time when Plutarch was young, and told second-hand, in the voice of Autobulus. The spectators travel as a group from their hometown to Thespiae, and meet other Boiotians, as well as xenoi from Phocis (Tithora), the Peloponnese (Lacedaemon), and Asia Minor (Tarsus). The festival is a gathering place for these friends, who come more for the purpose of seeing each other, and discussing philosophy (φιλοσοφοῦντες), than for seeing the contests. Their flight from the kitharode competition is likened to the flight from a war zone (ἐκ πολεμίας), with the spectators taking refuge in the sanctuary. The depiction of the philosophizing spectators, uninterested in popular performances, repeats Strabo's contrast between the enjoyment of poetry by the masses and the enjoyment of philosophy by the few, with which we began this chapter. The performances on stage fade into the background in Plutarch's account. The distancing of elite spectators (Plutarch and his friends) from the stage, temporally, in the framing of the story, physically, in the escape from the theater, and intellectually, in their preference for philosophy over performance, distances Plutarch's circle of the intellectual elite from the masses. It is the masses, in Plutarch's writings, who go to the theater to enjoy the shows. Plutarch emphasizes his own cosmopolitanism by inserting himself into a group of elite traveling spectators, who have come from all over the oikoumene. He and his friends are both insiders and outsiders at the festival. They are Greeks at a Greek festival, but

---

22 The spectators later abandon the contests altogether, when a debate about whether a young, wealthy Thespian woman, Ismenodora, a widow, should marry a certain boy, Bacchon, proves more interesting than what is happening in the theater. The love story could be lifted from a plot of New Comedy. The λόγος is moved from the contests in the theater to the streets, outside Ismenodora's door, where the spectators engage in debate (ἐν λόγοις): "No one paid any more attention to the contests; everybody deserted the theater and gathered about Ismenodora's door, where they engaged in a fierce debate." ἦν δὲ λόγος οὗθεν τῶν ἀγωνιζομένων, ἀλλ' ἀφέντες τὸ θέατρον ἐπὶ τῶν θυρών τῆς Ἰσμηνοδώρας ἐν λόγοις ἦσαν καὶ φιλονεικίαις πρὸς ἄλληλους. Plutarch, Dialogue on Love 755a-b.

23 Plutarch also contrasts spectatorship of philosophy and tragedy in On Listening to Lectures, 43F, saying that people think they should listen to philosophers in school as they listen to tragedians in the theater. This comment refers both to the passivity of theater spectatorship, and also to the spectacular power of tragedy. He also distinguishes between enlightened men who are able to enjoy every day as if it were a festival, because they know Platonic philosophy, and the hoi polloi who only enjoy festival days: Plutarch, On Contentment 477d-e.
none of them are citizens of Thespiae, where the festival is held. They are part of an exclusive
group of friends, which demonstrates its exclusivity by refusing to fully participate in the
festival. It is their status as outsiders that reinforces their in-group.

How did spectators know what festivals to go to, especially if they were interested in
traveling away from their hometowns? Everyone would have known the panhellenic festivals,
the festivals on the *periodos*. They also would have known the festivals of their own hometowns,
the local festivals. Knowledge of other festivals, particularly if they were held in cities or towns
in the same region as a spectator's hometown, would have been transmitted by word of mouth,
and through announcements at festivals (as evidenced by the Leukophryneia in Magnesia). That
traveling spectators will bring stories of a festival back to their hometowns is explicitly
mentioned in the honorific decree for Epaminondas of Acraephium, discussed below.
Additionally, at a festival, other festivals were announced, sometimes at the request of nearby
cities, thus advertising more festivals to spectators.

Festival organizers may have advertised festivals even more aggressively. One interesting
inscription found at Olympia is a sort of advertisement for the Sebastea in Naples (fully named
the Ἰταλικὰ Ῥωμαῖα Σεβαστὰ Ἰσολύμπια), which was modeled on the Olympia. Inscribing the
rules and program of the Neapolitan Sebastea at Olympia tied the new contest to its old forebear.
The specific information included in the inscription, the by-laws of the competition, were geared
at the competitors. The inscription also served to advertise the Sebastea to spectators at the
Olympia, whether simply to inform them of the existence and greatness of the contest, or to
entice them to travel to Naples for the event. This advertisement for the Sebastea was placed in
the location where it would have the greatest impact, at Olympia, the convergence point of
festival travelers from the entire oikoumene.

---

24 Geer (1935).
3.2 Global Audiences: The Audience as a Microcosm of the *Oikoumene*

In imperial Greek literature, the theater was figured as a gathering place of the *oikoumene*, a microcosm of the Empire. Writing about an omen, a thunderbolt striking a theater during the reign of Commodus, Cassius Dio remarks that the omen affected the whole world, the *oikoumene*, "with whose inhabitants the theatre was customarily filled."\(^{25}\) The gathering of the *oikoumene* in the theater was not merely a product of Roman rule, but a symbol of the unity of the Empire. Aelius Aristides returns repeatedly to the theme of the freedom to travel in the Roman Empire, due to peace and stability, in contrast to constant fighting between Greek cities in the pre-Roman past.\(^{26}\) He gives festivals as a primary reason for travel in a speech delivered in April 155 CE on Delos.

> μάλιστα δὲ Αἰγαῖον πέλαγος δεδιότες, μάλιστα καὶ ποθοῦσιν ἅπαντες δεύτερον περαιωθῆναι, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἕπ᾽ αἰτίαις ἡδίσταις τοῦτον ἄθροῳ περαιωθῆναι. ἡγόνες καὶ μυστήρια καὶ τὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος καλὰ πληροὶ τούτον τὸν στόλον, καὶ τῶν πανταχόθεν φιλοκάλων καὶ γενναίοι ὦτός ἕστι συναγωγεύς καὶ πληροτής τῶν ἡδίστων θεαμάτων τοῖς ἐπιφανεστάτοις τῶν θεῶν τὰ κάλλιστα ὑπηρετῶν.

Although men are most afraid of the Aegean, all also most desire to cross it a second time. In fact, men cross it for the most pleasant reasons. Contests, mysteries, and the beauties of Greece fill it with travelers. And it is the Aegean sea which gathers together and provides what is everywhere exquisite and noble, serving up the fairest of the most pleasant spectacles to the most glorious gods.\(^{27}\)

Aristides omits two practical reasons to travel, namely trade and war, because his point is that pleasure-travel has become possible and even popular under Roman rule. Pleasure-travel, what we might call tourism, has as its object watching contests (ἀγώνες), participating in mysteries,

---

\(^{25}\) "And so it proved, for the evil did not confine itself to the city alone, but took possession of the whole world under its dominion, with whose inhabitants the theatre was customarily filled." οὖδὲ γὰρ ἐν τῇ πόλει μόνη τὸ δεινὸν ἐξεινένα ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην αὐτῆς, ὥστε τὸ θέατρον ἂεὶ ποτὲ ἐπληροῦτο, ἔπεσον. Cassius Dio, *Roman History* 78.25.

\(^{26}\) On the freedom to travel in the Empire (without mention of festivals): Aelius Aristides, *To the Rhodians: Concerning Concord* 31; *Regarding Rome* 11 and 100; *The Isthmian Oration: Regarding Poseidon* 23.

\(^{27}\) Aelius Aristides, *Regarding the Aegean Sea* 18, trans. Charles Behr.
and sight-seeing in Greece. As elsewhere in his work, it is the gods who are the ultimate spectators. While the traveling spectators see the beauties of Greece (τὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος καλά), it is the gods who see the most beautiful (τὰ κάλλιστα) spectacles, which are superlative because they are gathered from everywhere (πανταχόθεν). The gods watch not only the contests, but also the travel of spectators to those contests, a spectacle in and of itself. Another author, writing in the same style as Aristides, echoed the connection between the freedom to travel, the attraction of spectators to festivals, and the pleasure of the gods. In Regarding the Emperor, this anonymous author praises the emperor for making it possible for anyone to travel freely, making the festivals more charming and dearer to the gods. The presumption is that the best festival is one which attracts visitors (and competitors) from everywhere, and that by this process of gathering, the best of the entire Empire will be on display.

The Greece of Aristides' present is unified under Rome, not fragmented as in the past. In Regarding Rome, delivered in Rome in 155 CE, Aristides likens Roman rule of Greece to the gathering of the world (πᾶσα η οἰκουμένη) for a festival. Greek cities no longer fight with each other, "but this single rivalry holds all of them, how each will appear as fair and charming as possible" (μία δὲ αὕτη κατέχει πᾶσας ἔρις, ὅπως ὅτι καλλίστη καὶ ἤδιστη αὕτη ἑκάστη φανεῖται). Aristides' metaphor of the oikoumene attending a festival, likening the peace of the Empire to the peace and celebration of festival time, merges into the literal a few sentences later, when Aristides says that war has been replaced by festivals.

28 Ps-Aristides, Regarding the Emperor 37. The date and authorship of the speech is highly disputed, with suggestions ranging from the time of Antoninus Pius to the 9th century CE: Behr (1981) vol. II, 400-401 provides an overview of the scholarship on this question.
29 Aelius Aristides, Regarding Rome 97, trans. Charles Behr.
There has been introduced instead every kind of charming spectacle and a boundless number of games. Therefore the celebration of national festivals, like a sacred and inextinguishable fire, never ceases, but passes at different times to different people, yet always is somewhere.\textsuperscript{30}

Festival time is a time of peace, and so the immediate contrast is between the war of the past with the peace and festivity of the present. Also characteristic of the time in which Aristides lived is the awareness of festivals on the global scale, that festivals fill an international calendar.

\section*{3.3 Local Audiences: Hierarchies at Play}

Travelers joined local spectators in the theater. As mentioned above, an important source of evidence for the inclusion of many groups in Roman-era theater audience, and for the divisions within the theater for different groups, are reserved theater seats.\textsuperscript{31} Permission for seat reservations seems to have been granted by local authorities.\textsuperscript{32} The exact process of obtaining a reserved seat in the cavea is rather obscure. It is possible that seats were granted in exchange for some donation, or that political influence was necessary to convince the council to agree to a new reservation. In some cases, elite benefactors were involved in the process, as at Aphrodisias, where a female benefactor, Claudia Seleucia, may have reserved a row of seats for a professional association of gold-smiths.\textsuperscript{33} These theater seat inscriptions advertised the identities of those who occupied the seats. As people filtered into the theater and took their seats, they would have observed who got to sit in reserved seats. The inscriptions on these reserved seats were visible to anyone who came into the theater, except when they were obscured by their occupants.

The practice of dividing the theater audience into different groups was not new in the Roman period. In the 5th century BCE Theater of Dionysus in Athens, areas of the theater were

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{30} Aelius Aristides, \textit{Regarding Rome} 99, trans. Charles Behr.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Reserved theater seats: Dilke (1948) 167-185; Sear (2006) 3-6.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Van Nijf (1997) 221.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Roueché (1993) 88-9, Cf. van Nijf (1997) 222. Roueché is more cautious than van Nijf about the connection between Claudia Seleucia and the gold-smiths.
\end{itemize}
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reserved for ephebes, *bouleutai*, and their attendants. Theater tickets from the 4th century BCE are designated by tribe, suggesting that the audience was divided accordingly. Some reserved theater seats are known from the Hellenistic period. In Epidauros, names of individuals are inscribed on the seats of the theater, dating from 350-200 BCE. However, the practice of reserving theater seats by inscribing the name of an individual or group directly on the stone seats of the theater became much more common in the Roman period.

While in some theaters, such as those in Epidauros and Hierapolis in Phrygia, the only seat reservation inscriptions which survive are for individuals, in many, group divisions may be observed. The clearest division in the audience was between the elites sitting in the front rows, and those sitting in the rest of the theater. The right of *proedria* was often granted to an individual in return for organizing a festival, being a benefactor, or fulfilling the duties of an office or priesthood, all responsibilities which involved financial investment, and therefore, in effect, were restricted to the elites. In the Theater of Dionysus in Athens, 67 inscribed thrones were placed in the first row in the 2nd or 1st c. BCE. These may have replaced earlier thrones dating from the 5th or 4th c. BCE. In many theaters outside of Attica, thrones were placed in the orchestra. Seats could be passed down within a family, a practice attested in honorific inscriptions guaranteeing the right of *proedria* to benefactors, and on the seats themselves at Mylasa, where 13 rows of the theater are reserved for the Ἀκράτητοι and their heirs. These seats were made to look different from the rest of the seating in the theater in order to clearly differentiate the elites who had the right of *proedria* from the sub-elites who did not. These
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35 SEG 26-452. Some of the seats were re-used as part of a late Roman wall: SEG 48 436-441.
36 Hierapolis: SEG 57-1370. These are from the late imperial period.
37 Dilke (1948) 178; Pickard-Cambridge (1968); Maass (1972); Pöhlmann (1981); Gödde (2015) 335.
38 Dilke (1948) 179-181, on this practice in Priene, Oropos, Orchomenos, and Tegea.
39 I.Mylasa 584; SEG 49-2404.
special seats were larger and more comfortable than regular theater seating. They typically had high backs, and some even included footstools.\(^\text{40}\)

From a viewing perspective, the front-row seats were not the best in the house. Spectators sitting in the front row and in the orchestra would be seated under the stage level, looking up at the performers from below. Writing in the 1st century BCE, Vitruvius comments on this problem, suggesting that the height of the stage be limited so that those seated in the orchestra be able to see.

\[\text{ita latius factum fuerit pulpitum quam Graecorum, quod omnes artifices in scaena dant operam, in orchestra autem senatorum sunt sedibus loca designata. et eius pulpiti altitudo sit ne plus pedum quinque, uti, qui in orchestra sederint, spectare possint omnium agentium gestus.}\]

The platform has to be made deeper than that of the Greeks, because all our artists perform on the stage, while the orchestra contains the places reserved for the seats of senators. The height of this platform must be not more than five feet, in order that those who sit in the orchestra may be able to see the performances of all the actors.\(^\text{41}\) Vitruvius' inclusion of this instruction regarding the height of the stage suggests that the ability of those seated in the orchestra to see the action on stage was already a problem. Sear observes that over time, from the time of Augustus to the Severan age, the height of the stage in Roman theaters gradually lowered. Imperial-era stages are typically close to or below Vitruvius' recommendation of 5 Roman feet (1.47 m), with the very lowest stages found in the Western provinces.\(^\text{42}\) This could reflect both the increase in the practice of seating prominent individuals in the orchestra, and also an attempt to cater to those spectators by improving their viewing experience. Nevertheless, the stage was still raised, and, it would be in the lower rows of the cavea, but not the front row or the orchestra, that spectators would have been at eye level with the performers. For paratheatrical entertainment, particularly magic shows and other small-scale

\(^{40}\) On spectators' comfort in Roman theaters and amphitheaters: Rose (2005).  
\(^{41}\) Vitruvius, *De Arch.* 5.6, trans. Morris Hicky Morgan.  
\(^{42}\) Sear (2006) 33-34.
performances, these orchestra or front row seats would have been ideal, but stories of people crowding into the orchestra to see these paratheatrical shows suggest that the "seating" may have been more fluid during such performances. Those who occupied the front-row seats were more interested in being seen by the rest of the audience, and sitting with other notables, than they were in having the best view of the stage.

The privilege of proedria was granted to all Roman senators by Augustus in 27/6 BCE. This is reported by Cassius Dio: "and the privilege was granted the senators of occupying the front seats in all the theatres of his realm" (καὶ προεδρία τοῖς βουλευταῖς ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ἀρχῇ αὐτοῦ ἐς πάντα τὰ θέατρα ἐδόθη). The extension of proedria to Roman senators was based on the practice of granting reserved theater seats to Greek bouleutai, one of the earliest known ways of reserving theater seats in the Greek world, as mentioned above in reference to the Theater of Dionysus in Athens. In essence, Augustus extended to Roman bouleutai a privilege that their Greek counterparts already had, as the Latin senator was a βουλευτής in Greek. The particularly Roman imperial move was the standardization of the practice across the Empire, which Cassius Dio emphasizes by doubling the adjectives which reference the all-encompassing nature of the decree, noting that this privilege took effect "in his entire realm" (ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ἀρχῇ αὐτοῦ) and also "in every theater" (ἐς πάντα τὰ θέατρα).

The Augustan theater legislation developed out of prior Roman regulation of the theater audience. Roman senators had enjoyed the right to sit in a separate area, in the front, in wooden theaters in Rome since 194 BCE, as recorded by Livy and Valerius Maximus. When discussing

---

43 Cassius Dio, Roman History 53.25.
this Roman law, both Livy and Valerius Maximus stress not the hierarchy within the viewing space, but the separation of classes which had before been mixed. Livy splits the senators from the people with the verb *secerno*, both in meaning and in word order (*ut loca senatoria secererent a populo*).\(^{45}\) Valerius Maximus emphasizes their prior intermingling by juxtaposing *senatus* with *populus* (*senatus populo mixtus spectaculo ludorum interfuit*).\(^{46}\) The physical division of the Roman theater audience into two groups, the senators and the people, imposed a hierarchical order upon the audience. This was reinforced by the *Lex Roscia Theatralis* in 67 BCE, which reserved the first fourteen rows of the theater for the *equites*.\(^{47}\) Augustus' theatrical legislation, the *Lex Julia Theatralis*, imposed further hierarchies upon the audience in Rome, separating the soldiers, married men, boys wearing the toga praetexta, their tutors, and women.\(^{48}\) These groups were physically separated in the theater, with boys seated in one *cuneus*, and women forbidden from the front rows. Like Livy and Valerius Maximus writing on the theater legislation of 194 BCE, Suetonius, in his account of the *Lex Julia Theatralis*, views the legislation as imposing order where before there had been chaos. The extension of the right of *proedria* in the provinces to Roman senators, which Cassius Dio refers to, applies the earlier legislation of 194 BCE to the provincial theaters, rather than the *Lex Roscia Theatralis*, which reserved seats for the *equites*, not the senators. What was new about this ruling was its application to theater seating in the provinces. There is no indication that the *Lex Julia Theatralis*, which was introduced later, after 5 CE, was intended for or ever imposed on theater audiences in the provinces.
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\(^{45}\) Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita* 34.44.  
\(^{46}\) Valerius Maximus, *Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium* 2.4.  
\(^{48}\) Suetonius, *Life of Augustus* 44.
The stratification of Roman society filtered out into the provinces.\textsuperscript{49} This, combined with social mobility in the Empire, led to an increase in the display of social status in the theater.\textsuperscript{50} Architecturally, Roman theaters encouraged spectators to think about hierarchy, as they divided the audience by separating the three areas of the cavea, the prima/ima cavea, media cavea, and summa/ultima cavea, whereas earlier Greek theaters separated seating by kerkides (cunei) but not by vertical levels in the cavea.\textsuperscript{51} In the Roman period, some Greek theaters were renovated to adopt the more hierarchical form of the Roman theater.\textsuperscript{52} Subelite spectators may have started actively asserting their place in these hierarchies by inscribing theater seats precisely because social status was open to negotiation.

Subelite spectators reserved seats in the cavea in imitation of the reserved seats for the elites in the front rows and the orchestra. Reserved seats may be found in every level of theaters, even up to the very top row, generally considered the least desirable seating. In the theater at Arykanda in Lycia, many of the seats in the uppermost row were reserved for individuals in the imperial period.\textsuperscript{53} Spectators reserving seats in the uppermost row were not claiming seats for themselves that were better than others, as these seats were the farthest from stage, and therefore, comparatively, the worst seats in the house. In this case, it may have been the practice of reserving seats, and not the seats themselves, that the inscribers wanted to demonstrate their connection to. Even in the nosebleed section, the ability to claim space was desirable.

\textsuperscript{50} Social mobility in the Roman world: MacMullen (1964) on evidence for social mobility preserved in the legal tradition; Weaver (1967) on freedmen and slaves; Reinhold (1971) on illicit social mobility; Purcell (1983) on the social mobility of apparitores; Malnati (1987) on the attitudes of Juvenal and Martial to social mobility; Quiroga (1995) on the social mobility of freedmen; Spawforth (2011) 48 on the role of the imperial cult in the social mobility of elites in the eastern provinces; Haynes (2013) on the effect of social stratification and social mobility on military identity in the Augustan period.
\textsuperscript{51} Manuwald (2011) 108.
\textsuperscript{52} Roman renovations to Greek theaters: Sear (2006) 114-5.
\textsuperscript{53} IGSK Arykanda 79.
While divisions among the audience may often be observed from theater seat inscriptions, each theater has its own organizational principles.\textsuperscript{54} Seating reservations could be based on citizenship, as in Maroneia in Thrace, where blocks of seats are reserved for the citizens of two nearby cities, Topeiros and Flaviopolis.\textsuperscript{55} Age-class seat reservations are known. In Ephesus, the \textit{paides} had reserved seats in the 2nd century CE. In Termessos, ephebes did, and at Miletus, \textit{neoteroi} had a reserved spot.\textsuperscript{56} In Late Antiquity, seat reservations could also be based on factional allegiance, as at Aphrodisias and Miletus, where several blocks were reserved for the supporters of the blue and green factions.\textsuperscript{57} In addition to priests, sanctuary officials could have reserved seats, as the porters of the Asclepeium did at the theater in Smyrna in 210 CE.\textsuperscript{58} This was a group which took up a significant part of the theater, reserving four rows. In Athens, the theater was divided by gender. While the presence of women in the theater audience in Classical Athens has been long disputed, in the Roman period it is well known that women attended the theater. In Athens, theater seat inscriptions include the names of women, both in the front rows, where one priestess had a reserved seat around 134 CE, and farther up in the \textit{cavea}. Joan Connelly has suggested, based on the distribution of female names on the seats in the Theater of Dionysus, that in the Roman period, "the left side of the \textit{cavea} was largely reserved for women."\textsuperscript{59} This division based on gender is unusual. There is no epigraphic evidence from

\textsuperscript{54} Van Nijf (1997) 216.
\textsuperscript{55} SEG 35-824.
\textsuperscript{58} IGSK Smyrna I 713, 717.
any other theater in the Greek world to suggest that divisions based on gender were used outside of Athens.

In many theaters, seats were reserved in blocks for the *phylai*. This system works in concert with individual seat reservations, within the blocks. For example, at Stobi in Macedonia, the seating blocks in rows three and above are divided by *phylai*, and within these blocks, several hundred seats are inscribed with the names of individuals. The seating inscriptions at Stobi date from the 2nd and 3rd centuries CE. It has been suggested that these *phylai* divisions were only for political meetings in the theater, not for performances.\(^6\) In another Macedonian city, Herakleia Lynkestis, seats are reserved for four *phylai*.\(^6\) Similarly, the seating in the theater at Flavia Neapolis in Palestine is divided into blocks by *phylai*. At Gerasa, one *cuneus* in the odeum was reserved for the boule, and two other *cunei* reserved in sections for *phylai*. These inscriptions date to after 165/166 CE.

Permanence may have been the intention of these divisions by *phylai*, inscribed into the stone seats of the odeum at Gerasa, but they were vulnerable to attack. In the 3rd century CE, the professional association of linen-workers partially erased the name of the Hadrianic tribe which had formerly occupied the front row and had the name of their association inscribed in its place.\(^6\) Like other ancient examples of erasure, the point was not to erase the memory of the tribal seat, but to remind viewers, who would have seen the partial erasure, that the linen-workers had replaced the tribe as the occupants of the front row. The linen-workers claimed the highest status seats. The involvement of professional associations in the competitive display of status in the theater is paralleled in many Greek cities in the Roman period.
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\(^6\) SEG 37-556.
\(^6\) Retzleff and Mjely (2004); SEG 55-1711 (linen-workers); SEG 54-1691 (*phylai* and boule).
Professional associations sat together in many theaters. Reserved seats for the members of professional associations are also attested at the theater in Laodikeia on the Lykos, in the twelfth and thirteenth rows, though the names of the associations are not preserved. The stone masons reserved the ninth row in the theater at Termessos, where seats in the third row were reserved for victors of sacred contests (hieronikai). These inscribed seats date from the 1st century BCE to the 1st century CE. In Didyma, where there was a well-known dramatic festival, the Didymeia, hieronikai, as well as one trigoidos, had reserved seats, in addition to several other professional associations. In Athens, the stone-masons also had reserved seats. In Aphrodisias, one seating block in the thirteenth row was reserved for the butchers. In Miletus, the goldsmiths had reserved seats in lower rows of the theater. Two individual merchants had reserved seats in the theater in Ephesus, a shipper and a horse trader.

Professional organizations often claim particularly good seats, asserting a high status within the cavea. Members of two professional organizations, gold-smiths and leather-workers, in Bosra in Syria had inscribed thrones placed in the second praecinctio of the theater. This is a striking assertion of status, in imitation of and competition with the thrones of the elites in the orchestra below. Among the sub-elite populace, members of the professional organizations were in the best position to obtain the right to special seats. There was also a hierarchy between the professional organizations in Bosra, as the bronze-smiths had reserved seats in the media cavea,

63 AGRW 11105.
64 AGRW 9878.
66 IG II² 5084.
67 IApH 8.61.
68 AGRW 1383.
but not thrones in the *praecinctio* like the gold-smiths and leather-workers.\textsuperscript{71} Gold-smiths are particularly well-represented among professionals who had reserved seats in theaters in the Roman Empire, which reflects a relatively high status among the trades. In the theater in Aphrodisias, for example, the "first gold-smith," Theodotos, has a seat in the eighth row, while the butchers sit five rows behind, in row 13, in the same *cuneus*.\textsuperscript{72} This conforms to the trend of gold-smiths occupying better seats relative to other professional associations.

Identities advertised in such inscriptions could overlap. The theater at Miletus is a good example of the display of overlapping identities. The reservations, dating from the 2nd to the 5th century CE, are found in the *ima cavea*. As elsewhere, gold-smiths dominate the seat reservations. They are further differentiated by factional allegiance ("place of the blue gold-smiths," τόπος αὐραρίων βενέτων; "place of the victorious gold-smiths," τόπος ἐπινικίων | αὐραρίων) and political allegiance ("place of the emperor–loving gold-smiths," τόπος φιλα/γούστοι | αὐραρίων). One seat is reserved for gold-smiths without any other descriptor ("place of the gold-smiths," τόπος αὐραρίων).\textsuperscript{73} At some point, probably in late antiquity, seat reservations were added for Judeans, some of whom also differentiated themselves as loyal to the Blues. Similarly, in the theater at Aphrodisias, the butchers note that they are loyal to the Blues, displaying their professional identity and factional allegiance together ("Place of the butchers. May the fortune of the Blues triumph!" (τόπο τῶν μακελλήτων [sic] / Νικᾶ ἵ τύχη τῶν Βενέτων).\textsuperscript{74} An occupant of the seat of the "blue gold-smiths" in Miletus showed himself to be a member of two groups, one a professional association, and the other defined by factional allegiance. The seat could presumably be used by any member of the association. The fact that

\textsuperscript{71} Bronze-smiths: IGLS 13.9156.
\textsuperscript{72} IApH 8.61.
\textsuperscript{73} AGRW 1383.
\textsuperscript{74} IApH 8.61.
he occupied a reserved seat in the theater would strongly suggest that he was a part of the community in Miletus, and not a visitor. It was, then, the membership in multiple in-groups (the community in Miletus, the professional association, and the faction of supporters of the Blues) that occupancy in the seat advertised.

Individuals might also have a block of seats reserved, which may have been intended for family or friends. At the theater in Hyllarima, two adjoining seats bear the name Ζμάραγδος, which is written on one seat left to right, and on the other right to left.75 At the theater in Aphrodisias, a certain Eusebius reserved two adjacent seats.76 With these pairs of seats, we may be seeing the reservations of a couple, with the husband's name claiming a pair of seats for himself and his wife. These pairs of seats could also, of course, have been used for Zmaragdos' and Eusebius' friends and relatives, whoever they wished to bring to the theater. Whoever sat in the second seat, it appears that these two men anticipated sitting next to someone they knew.

Attending the theater was a family event in the Roman period. In his instructions on where to place the theater in the city, Vitruvius describes spectators going to the theater with their families (wives and children).77 This implies, unsurprisingly enough, that families sat together.

Seats could also be reserved by the use of tickets. There are several examples of theater tickets with the name of the cuneus, the proper door to enter by, and/or the seat number.78 Often these theater tickets have theatrical imagery, such as masks, in addition to the location of the seat. The reason for selling tickets is rather obvious: ticket sales were lucrative. In the classical Athenian theater, the right to sell tickets to the theater was contracted out, with the ticket seller

75 SEG 54-1072.
76 I Aph 8.60.
77 “For the spectators, with their wives and children, delighted with the entertainment, sit out the whole of the games, and the pores of their bodies being opened by the pleasure they enjoy, are easily affected by the air” (Per ludos enim cum coniugibus et liberis persedentes delectionibus detinentur et corpora propter voluptatem innota patentes habent venas) Vitruvius, De Arch. 5.3, trans. Morris Hicky Morgan.
providing in exchange some upkeep to the theater, such as the construction of temporary wooden seating for the festival. This was a benefit, then, to the ticket seller, who made a profit, and the city, which got some help in maintaining the theater building. It is difficult to say how precisely ticket sales worked in the Roman period, or how common they were. Ticket sales are never included in festival budgets, suggesting that if and when tickets were sold, the revenue was separate from the festival endowment.

But why did people buy tickets? They may, at times, have been worried about the show selling out. Theaters could certainly fill up. Plutarch tells a story in the *Sayings of Spartans* about an old man trying to find a seat at the Panathenaia, suggesting that seating availability could be tight. The small space allotted for each seat in the theater also suggests that seating was in high demand. But as dramatic and musical festivals were stretched into month-long events in the Roman period, there surely would have been plenty of opportunities to attend the theater. Spectators may also have wanted to be sure to get a seat with a good view of the stage. While there was clearly an advantage to being lower down, and therefore closer to the performers, all seats in a Greek or Roman theater afforded an unobstructed view of the stage. None of these reasons sufficiently explains the practice of reserving specific seats by means of purchasing tickets. A more likely reason, to my mind, is that people wanted to reserve seats together, in order to sit with family, friends, or business associates. This would better explain why specific seats were sold, not just tickets for general admission. If this is the case, the sale of tickets maps more closely onto the reserved seating in the theater, which, as we have seen, was often reserved for groups of people, particularly professional organizations. Purchasing tickets would have been a much simpler way to guarantee the ability to sit together than obtaining inscribed theater seats,
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80 Plutarch, *Sayings of Spartans* 235c.
a means of sitting together which was accessible not only to the elites and the more influential professional organizations in a city, but also to anyone who could afford the cost of a ticket.

What these various ways of reserving seats have in common is that they suggest that people preferred to sit together, with people who had some connection to them, whether that connection was based on citizenship, social status, age class, profession, factional allegiance, or familial relationship. One important aspect of group seating was the assertion of hierarchy within the theater. This is most clearly seen with the seating of bouleutai and senators, benefactors, priests and priestesses, festival organizers, and other elites in the front rows and in the orchestra, dividing the theater into two clear zones, the lower one with distinctly different and more expensively made seats for the most elite audience members, and the upper one, the majority of the theater, for the rest of the populace. Within the cavea, there were more hierarchies at play, with professional organizations especially claiming relatively better and more visible seats for themselves in order to assert their status within society. Sitting in groups, and sitting in reserved seats, was a form of exclusivity available to elites and sub-elites alike.

3.4 The Benefactor and the Audience: the Whole and the Part

We see inclusivity and at the same time, separation by group, in inscriptions which concern benefactions given at festivals. These benefactions included the sacrifices, feasts, distributions, and the contests and entertainments provided for the spectators. Two examples illustrate this phenomenon, the benefactions of Epaminondas of Acraephium from the 1st century CE, and the benefactions of a priestly family of Stratonikeia from the 2nd century CE. The benefactions of Epaminondas directly attest to the audience of the festival, the Ptoia, while the inscriptions of Stratonikeia attest to the participants in the festivals of the city, some of which
included contests and entertainment in the theater, but not directly to the theater audience, as not everyone who participated in the festival may be assumed to have attended the theater. Both serve to show the relationship of the benefactor to the festival participants. Festival participants are divided into groups and subgroups by a wide range of criteria (gender, socio-economic status, age-class, civic and legal status, profession), establishing multiple hierarchies. The benefactor advertised how many groups he had included in the festival in order to demonstrate his own generosity.

Epaminondas renewed the old contests of the Ptoia at Acraephium. Sometime after 37 CE, an honorific inscription was erected in Acraephium commemorating his benefactions.\(^\text{81}\) The renewal of the contest included theatrical spectacles (\(\theta\varepsilon\omega\rho\iota\iota\iota\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\vartheta\omicron\mu\ell\iota\kappa\omicron\delta\)).\(^\text{82}\) These spectacles in the theater were most likely the competitions. They probably refer to musical and poetic events, as only musical and poetic contests are attested in the Hellenistic inscriptions for the Ptoia in Acraephium, not drama.\(^\text{83}\) Nevertheless, this inscription gives us a glimpse into the activity of a Greek festival which surrounded the competitions: the many public meals given, the sweet wine served at the thymelic events, and the distributions of money and food. There is great emphasis placed on the participation of many different groups of people in the festival: men and women, free and enslaved people, adults and children, Acraephians and foreigners. Epaminondas, the benefactor and festival organizer, and his wife Kotila, act as the hosts to many guests, the spectators and festival participants.

The emphasis is on the inclusion of all possible groups. The benefactors distribute grain and wine to all the citizens, \textit{paroikoi} (metics), and \textit{ektemenoi} (lit. "owners," perhaps land-
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\(^\text{81}\) IG VII 2712. This inscription is also the only attestation of the theater at Acraephium: \(\varepsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\ \theta\varepsilon\alpha\tau\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\), l. 76. Cf. Sear (2006) 385.
\(^\text{82}\) IG VII 2712, l. 75.
owners), and meals provided for the sons and wives of citizens, parthenoi, male and female slaves. Epaminondas even includes the stall-keepers and festival personnel, "those who helped in arrangements for the festival."^{84}

69 [καὶ] κατὰ τάξις ἀπὸ εἰκάδος μέχρι τριακάδους πρὸς ἐνπασὶ τοῖς ἀρίστοις
70 παιδάς τοὺς τῶν πολε<τ>ῶν καὶ δούλους ἑνήλικους τάς τε γυναίκας τῶν πολει-
71 τῶν ἡ γυνὴ ἀυτοῦ Κωτίλα ἠρίστησεν καὶ παρθένοις καὶ δούλας ἑνήλικους· οὐ
72 παρέλιπεν δὲ οὐδὲ [τοὺς] σκηνίτας καὶ συνκοσμοῦντας τὴν ἑορτήν, ἠρίστησεν
73 δὲ [αὐ]τοὺς ἅπ' ἐ[κ]θέματος κατ' ἱδιαν, ὁ μηδεῖς ἄλλος τῶν προτέρων ἐποίησεν,
74 μηδένα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ φιλανθρωπίας βουλόμενος ἄμ[ο]ρα γενέσθαι.

Then in groups from the twentieth to the thirtieth he invited to all the breakfasts also sons of the citizens and male slaves of age, while his wife Kotila entertained at breakfast the wives of the citizens and also maidens and female slaves of age.

He did not leave out even the stall keepers and those who helped in arrangements for the festival. He entertained them at breakfast privately after a proclamation, which no one else had done, none of his predecessors, for he did not wish anyone to be without a share in the favors that came from him.^{85}

Epaminondas' goal is to assert inclusivity in order to demonstrate his generosity. The way that this inclusivity is expressed is by enumerating smaller groups within the whole, or more accurately, by enumerating groups which are in addition to the citizen body, that is, non-citizens who live in or near the city, wives and children of citizens, and their slaves. Epaminondas and his wife Kotila provided meals for these people κατὰ τάξις, group by group. Presumably the sons of citizens eat together, as do the male slaves, the wives of citizens, the parthenoi, and the female slaves. Continuing the breakfasts divided by group, Epaminondas has a separate breakfast for the stall-keepers and festival-arrangers, the only groupings determined by profession rather than gender, age, or civic status. There may have been a practical reason for this separate breakfast for the stall-keepers and festival-arrangers, who may have been staying close to one another, and would have been busy during the day with their festival-related work. The first grouping is by

---

84 IG VII 2712, l. 72. These may be paratheatrical entertainers. Lucian similarly refers to pantomime as a κόσμημα, an adornment, to a festival. Lucian, On Pantomime 32.
gender, with males entertained by Epaminondas and females by Kotila. Within the gender
divisions there are sub-divisions of civic status (sons and wives of citizens), legal status (male
and female slaves), and age (slaves "of age," and *parthenoi*). There is a focus on what
Epaminondas has added to the celebrations, particularly the breakfast for the professionals, the
stall-keepers and festival personnel, "which no-one else had done." Epaminondas is represented
as the best benefactor, because he has added to the groups entertained at the festival without
leaving out any who were previously hosted.

The spectators of the Ptoia are not only locals, but also include those who have come
from other cities. The inclusion of traveling spectators in the theater audience allows
Epaminondas to advertise his benefactions to other cities.

At the spectacles of the thymelic contest which took place he treated with a sweet wine
collation in the theatre all the local spectators and those who had come from the other
cities, and he tossed out great and valuable presents, so that his expenditures became the
talk of even the surrounding cities. 86

From the perspective of the audience, the treats and gifts distributed in the theater would have
added an incentive to return to the next festival. In this case, there is an additive principle in the
expression of the totality. Epaminondas is said to have entertained all the local spectators
(*πάντας τούς [θε]ωμένους*) and in addition, spectators from other cities. The audience is not local
but regional. Having an audience not only of locals allows Epaminondas to spread knowledge of
the festival and his own benefactions. The benefactor provides entertainment, wine, food, and
gifts, and the spectators take stories of their good treatment home, increasing the reputation of
Epaminondas, the festival, and Acraephium.

The assertion of generosity by enumerating groups hosted by the benefactor can also be observed in other Roman-era accounts of festival benefaction. A family of benefactors supported the festivals of Stratonikeia, in Caria, and in a series of inscriptions from the 2nd century CE, asserted their inclusivity of many civic groups as participants in the festivals (table 1). As participants in the festival, groups are welcomed to the festival by the benefactors, given dinners, or distributions of money, food, oil, or wine. The effect is to assert that everyone has participated in the festivals of the city, due to the generosity of the benefactors, making clear how much they have spent on the festival and its sacrifices, feasts, and entertainments. Like Epaminondas, the benefactors of Stratonikeia include professionals associated with the operation of the festival in the account of their benefactions. They provided meals for the theatrōi, theater-people, who may have been dramatic competitors or paratheatrical entertainers such as pantomimes, and the athletic and thymelic competitors in the agones.\(^\text{87}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Festival</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>City-dwellers</th>
<th>Country-dwellers</th>
<th>Citizens</th>
<th>Foreigners (xena)</th>
<th>Resident Foreigners</th>
<th>Perioikoi</th>
<th>Slaves</th>
<th>&quot;Any age-class&quot;</th>
<th>Athletic competitors</th>
<th>&quot;Any fortune&quot;</th>
<th>Thymelic competitors</th>
<th>Akroamata</th>
<th>pantomime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dionysia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komyria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panamaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{87}\) There were certainly pantomime shows at the Panamaria, as the festival organizers "paid for both a resident pantomime and all the other akroamata," i.e. the other paratheatrical entertainers: [μισθοσάμενοι καὶ τὸν ἐπιδημήσαντα ὀρχηστήν καὶ τὰ ἄκροάματα πάντα, IGSK Stratonikeia I 199, l. 3. Athletic and thymelic competitors received by the benefactor: IGSK Stratonikeia I 266.

\(^{88}\) The data in table 1 is extrapolated from the following inscriptions from Stratonikeia: IGSK Stratonikeia I 192, I 199, I 203, I 254, I 266, I 295a, I 309, II 1.684, II 1.685, II 1.706. All date to the 2nd c. CE. IGSK Stratonikeia I 203 can be securely dated to 164-166 CE. See Laumonier (1937) for a relative chronology.
The benefactors express the inclusivity of the whole by means of division by group. Rather than saying that they gave dinners for everyone in Stratonikeia, they say they gave dinners for citizens, metics, and foreigners, or city-dwellers and country-dwellers. Participants in the festival are therefore organized into groups of similar gender, civic or legal status, or profession. Inclusivity by group affiliation was a way of ordering the festival participants. The value or quality of the distributions differs depending on the group, establishing the hierarchy, with the benefactor, the distributor, at the top. For example, one inscription records that men were given five drachmas at the Komyria, but women were given only three drachmas at the Heraia. The same inscription records who the benefactors provided a public feast for, in ranked order, from most to least central to the governance of the city: those who hold office (the synarchs), citizens, ephebes, and children (συναρχίας τε καὶ πολείτας καὶ ἐφήβους καὶ παιδῶς).

Sometimes the groups of festival participants are divided into further sub-groups, as when the benefactors say that they "received all the women at the Heraia, those in the city and those in the country" (ὑπεδέξαντο δὲ καὶ ἐν Ὑπεράντων τὰς γυναῖκας ἐν πάσας καὶ ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ). In another inscription, the benefactors say that they have feasted

89 IGSK Stratonikeia I 192.  
90 IGSK Stratonikeia I 192, l. 5-6.  
91 IGSK Stratonikeia I 192, l. 8-9.
"all the women: citizen, freed, and enslaved" ([— τὰς γυναῖκας πᾶσας τὰς τε πολειτίδας καὶ ἐ[λευθέρας καὶ δούλας —]).\(^{92}\) The emphasis is on the assertion that all women participated, with the totality represented by division into sub-groups. Women who dwell in the city and country represent the whole, i.e. all women, as do women of every legal status (citizen, free, and enslaved). The subgroups are listed from highest status (citizen women) to lowest status (female slaves). As no difference in the participation of citizen, freed, and enslaved women in the festival is noted in the inscription, this ranked list may simply reflect an interest in the display of hierarchical arrangement rather than festival practice. The rhetorical strategy of the festival inscriptions of Stratonikeia is pleonastic. Enumerating the constituent parts of the whole (e.g. citizen, freed, and enslaved) only repeats the totality (all women). But it is a very specific type of pleonasm, in which the apparent redundancy defines an organizational principle for the totality, and proves the inclusion of all possible groups within the whole.

That many groups of people participated in the festivals of Stratonikeia as receivers of distributions and feasts, and that some of these festivals had theatrical entertainments, is not direct evidence for the participation of such groups in the theater audience. At Stratonikeia, not every festival named in the benefactors' inscriptions included events in the theater. Only the Panamaria and the Komyria are known to have theatrical events, and these may not have been dramatic. Instead, the inscriptions of Stratonikeia speak to a larger trend in the Roman period of the division by group, ranked hierarchically, of the festival participants. This is a parallel development to the theater seat inscriptions in Roman-era theaters, which reserve blocks of seats for groups. As we saw above, these seat inscriptions suggest that theater audiences were often divided into sub-groups and organized in a hierarchical fashion. There were multiple reasons for the arrangement of spectators and festival participants into groups. From the perspective of the

---

\(^{92}\) IGSK Stratonikeia I 254, l. 7.
spectators, group seating could be a way of displaying an identity or multiple identities, such as a professional affiliation, and placing oneself within a hierarchy in the audience, or a way of reinforcing bonds within that group by sitting together and sharing in the experience of the festival. The motivation for the benefactor was to make his generosity appear to have had the maximum effect, but reaching all possible groups of people. The result, however, was the same: an audience which was inclusive, but which expressed heterogeneity through the display of exclusive group membership.

**Conclusion**

Dramatic festivals were as much about what was happening in the audience as they were about what was happening on stage. The crowd was not one mass, it was made up of many distinct groups. While audiences at Greek dramatic festivals in the Roman era were diverse, they were not mixed in an egalitarian fashion. Rather, they were hierarchical, with some hierarchy imposed by factors external to the audience (such as laws regarding seating, and the architectural form of Roman theaters), and some factors internal to the audience (such as seat reservations made by spectators and groups of spectators). Internal and external factors are inextricably linked. The prominence of and increase in elite seating in the orchestra may have led sub-elite spectators to assert their own hierarchies within the theater by imitating the elite practice of reserving seats. While spectators may have initiated the process of obtaining reserved seats, these reserved seats may have needed approval by authorities, or by the council, or the sponsorship of a benefactor. The hierarchies on display in the theater were a result of negotiation between elites and sub-elites, and between different groups of sub-elite spectators.
Traveling spectators had always been part of certain festivals, the pan-Hellenic games of the *periodos*, just as traveling competitors had. In the Hellenistic period, sacred ambassadors, *theoroi*, also traveled to festivals, connecting Greek *poleis* to one another in a network of political relationships through festival participation. In the Roman period, the shift in the representation of the audience is away from the *theoroi* and these individual relationships between Greek *poleis*, and towards a more all-encompassing audience, an audience which can be seen as a microcosm of the *oikoumene*.

This totalizing tendency applies not just to a geographical conception of the *oikoumene* but to a social one as well. When benefactors and festival organizers claim to have included many groups of people in a festival which they have sponsored, they are advertising their own generosity. I argue in the next chapter that elite sponsorship of dramatic festivals was primarily self-interested. However, in order to pass off this investment as beneficial to the community at large, elites enumerated those who benefited from their generosity, the participants in the festival, organized into groups. During the festival, dinners and distributions given to groups reinforced the inclusivity of the whole community through group membership. A successful festival was one in which many people participated. It was not just the participation of the whole that mattered, but the participation of the whole divided into its constituent parts, split along the lines of social divisions. Gender, civic, social, and legal status, and professional affiliation are all social divisions which can all be expressed hierarchically. The audience was both divided into groups and unified into a single audience in the space of the theater, reinforcing social stratification while simultaneously providing opportunities for spectators to redefine their place within the hierarchy.
In this chapter we will trace how and why dramatic festivals were founded and organized in the Roman period by following the money. Festival budgets reveal not only the details of programming and practicalities, but also a system of values and power relationships. A major source of festival funding in the imperial period, particularly for new foundations, was private benefaction. Private funding for festivals took the form of perpetual endowments, several examples of which survive. Endowments could be in the form of property or cash, or a combination. The festival organizer was expected to supply certain funds as a supplement to the festival budget, a smaller scale form of private funding. Why did local elites fund festivals, whether by establishing endowments for new festivals, or serving as festival organizers (agonothetai)? What were the intentions of the elites regarding their financial involvement in festivals? What were the advantages of endowments? What benefits did festivals, especially dramatic festivals, bring to benefactors (euergetai)? Why would a benefactor choose to endow a festival over something else, such as a public building project? How do festivals fit into larger programs of benefaction?

In the imperial period, benefactors frequently established new contests rather than supporting old ones. In this way, they ensured that their memory would be perpetuated endlessly, written into the local festival calendar, as the new festival carried the name of the benefactor. By establishing these contests by means of perpetual endowments, which were carefully drafted in order to be financially stable in the long term, benefactors attempted to establish festivals that would last, and in the future, be old. We will trace throughout the chapter how the founders tried to ensure the stability of endowments over time: by building flexibility into parts of the festival...
budget, by planning for low interest rates, and by punishing those who mismanaged festival funds. Our project is to determine the motives of the benefactors, rather than the success of their endowments. Based on the limited evidence available, it is not possible to determine how lasting any individual festival endowment really was.

The ongoing scholarly discussion about the purpose of elite benefaction, or euergetism, is central to the question of why benefactors established endowments to fund festivals. In his foundational work on euergetism, Veyne claimed that benefactors, *euergetai*, gave money for public projects in order to demonstrate that they were able to give, not in order to receive a reward in return.¹ He distinguished euergetism, in this way, from archaic gift-exchange, with its expectation of reciprocity. Recent scholarship has also pushed back against the idea that elite benefactors were disinterested givers, emphasizing the tangible and intangible benefits that benefactors received. Intangible benefits include honor, commemoration, and elevated social status, and tangible benefits include financial gain. Dignas argues that elites received reciprocal rewards for their benefactions as priests. These reciprocal benefits, importantly, included financial benefits as well as honors and public commemoration, as priesthoods were bought in exchange for exemption from liturgies.² Sosin takes the argument for tangible rewards the farthest, and treats *euergetai* as rational economic agents.³ According to Sosin, Hellenistic *euergetai* set up endowments as tax shelters.⁴ Sosin's argument that *euergetai* were motivated by economic self-interest is not incompatible with the idea that they also expected to receive

¹ Veyne (1976).
² Dignas (2006). Chaniotis (2012) also focuses on reciprocity, and views benefaction as social capital, which in some cases was rewarded with legal benefits, such as citizenship. Gordon (1990) cites gratitude, honor, and respect as the reciprocal benefits benefactors received. Gygax (2016) traces the development of euergetism from its origins.
³ Sosin (2012) 175: "The survival of endowments, selfstanding economic entities, depended on careful calculation, rational engineering, forethought."
⁴ Sosin (2014).
intangible benefits. I approach festival benefaction with both of these motivations in mind. I also see Dignas' observation that priests could benefit financially through exemption from liturgies at work in the office of the agonothete, who was also expected to contribute money to the festival, but received exemption from liturgies or other offices in return.

Intangible benefits, such as honor, commemoration, and public visibility, and also economic rewards, such as tax benefits and stimulus to the local economy, help to explain why benefactors would fund festivals through perpetual endowments, but why fund dramatic festivals specifically? One reason is that dramatic festivals provided benefactors with a way of linking their names and their families to the literature of the past, and also contemporary literary production. By founding a dramatic festival, a benefactor became a perpetual patron of the arts. The audience may have influenced this decision too, demanding both the tax-free festival markets which festivals would bring, and entertainment, the chance to see famous, international performers. The people had some say in how the money of the benefactor was spent, as we will see in a dispute between the people of Ephesus and a benefactor. The people were also an arbiter of honors, and so securing their support for the project was in the best interest of the benefactor. Recent scholarship has focused on non-elite participation in the direction of elite benefaction. Taking Demosthenes of Oinoanda as his case study, Rogers has argued that the foundation and celebration of festivals was a process of negotiation between many individuals and groups, including the people, a process which the benefactor set in motion but did not control. In his study of elite benefaction in Roman-era Asia Minor, Zuiderhoek emphasizes the role of the people in determining how the money of the elite was spent. This too applies to my consideration of why elites founded festivals, and supported pre-existing ones. I treat not only

---

5 Rogers (1991) 97.  
6 Zuiderhoek (2009).
the benefactors as rational economic agents, but also the people, whose reasons for advocating for festivals extend beyond a desire for entertainment alone.

Zuiderhoek, following van Nijf, argues that local elites founded festivals for political purposes. By presenting an idealized picture of the community, organized into different groups (for processions and distributions), but sharing in a common experience, the purpose of festivals was to create social cohesion while reinforcing civic hierarchy.\(^7\) Both Zuiderhoek and van Nijf focus primarily on athletic festivals, and the importance of the gymnasia to Greek identity in the Roman era. Their observations also apply to theater festivals, where the audience was physically divided between the elites who sat in the front rows, and the rest of the spectators, mostly non-elites, who sat in the upper rows. Von Reden also takes into account the role of the city in the establishment of endowments, arguing for the importance of collective piety in addition to elite self-presentation in endowments for cultic purposes.\(^8\)

Public commemoration was certainly one motivation for benefactors to establish new dramatic festivals. The theater was a site for *euergetai* and *agonothetai*, the collective local elite, to be seen by the populace, sitting together in the front rows of the theater. Theater festivals provided an opportunity for this public visibility, by gathering a theater audience, which was as much an audience for the elites seated in the front rows as it was for the performances on stage. The theater was the site at which honors were announced. Indeed, drama was closely associated with the announcement of honors, which happened at many festivals on the first day of the tragedy competitions. The theater building itself was a physical nexus of honors in the city, housing statues and honorific inscriptions not just for theatrical festival victors, the benefactors, and organizers of dramatic festivals, but also athletic victors and other notables. Theater festivals

---


\(^8\) Von Reden (2010) 177-182.
brought people into the theater, creating both a time and a place for the conferral of honors, and also an audience.

The question of the intentions of the benefactor, and the benefits he reaped from founding a festival, is only the beginning of the story. Once founded, the festival continued to evolve, managed by the festival organizer, the agonothete (ἀγωνοθέτης). Throughout the chapter, I will use "benefactor" to refer to a founder of a festival through the creation of a perpetual endowment, and "festival organizer" or "agonothete" to refer to the person who served in the office of ἀγωνοθέτης. At times, a benefactor who established an endowment for a festival would also serve as the festival organizer, or instate a member of his own family to organize the festival. In these cases, we must carefully examine what benefits the benefactor envisioned for the festival organizer, and ask whether the creation of the office of agonothete for a newly founded festival was in and of itself a motivation to establish the festival. The economic benefits to benefactors overlap with those of festival organizers, as for both, giving money in support of festivals came with direct financial rewards, such as freedom from liturgies and tax exemption, and indirect rewards, such as influence in decisions regarding the marketplace, price fixing, and stimulation to the local economy. While they are purportedly for the benefit of the city, festivals funded by perpetual endowments worked to the benefit of the elites who founded them.

In the competition for memory and honor, the interests of the agonothete and benefactor did not always perfectly align. Festival organizers are often seen as potentially hostile to the endowment, and checks must be put in place to protect the endowment funds. This is because the success of the agonothete, unlike that of the benefactor, did not rely on the perpetual celebration of the festival, but on the success of the festival in a single cycle. Festival organizers are remembered because they put on a magnificent festival in a particular year, out-doing previous
permutations of the same festival. Without checks in place, it would be in the best interest of the festival organizer to over-spend the endowment funds, thus preventing the perpetual celebration of the contest planned by the benefactor.

Endowments had long been used for festival funding in some capacity, but only in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods do we find festivals funded primarily from endowments.\(^9\) The earliest perpetual endowment known from the Greek world takes place in the context of a festival, in the 5th century BCE. This was Nicias' consecration of some land at Delos at the close of the Delia, to fund feasts and sacrifices at future Delia. Many endowments we know only from passing references, which may include the name of the benefactor, the total amount of the fund, and a general outline of its purpose. This is the case for several endowed festivals known from Aphrodisias, the Callicrateia, Adrasteia, and Lysimacheia. In a few cases, the document establishing the terms of the endowment upon its foundation survives, as for the Demostheneia in Oinoanda.\(^10\) This type of document lays out how the endowment was budgeted, who was responsible for what, and what benefits they were promised. This allows us to see more clearly how responsibilities and benefits were divided between the benefactor and the agonothete, and how inter-related these responsibilities and benefits often were.

### 4.1 Festival Economics

From the earliest celebrations of the Dionysia in Athens, private contributions played a role in funding the festival. In the 470s BCE, private individuals took on the responsibility of

---

\(^9\) Festival endowments: Laum (1914) 87-96. Homer and Sylla (1996) situate endowments in the context of other types of loans in ancient Greece and Rome. On the funding of festivals and gymnasia in Roman Greece, including by endowments, see Camia (2014).

\(^10\) Georgiadis compares the endowment of the festival endowed by Callicrates to other known festival endowments: the Leonideia at Sparta, the Lysimacheia at Aphrodisias, and the Demostheneia at Oinoanda. Georgiadis (2009) 154-155 n. 17.
paying for the choruses, acting as *khoregoi*, chorus-leaders at the Dionysia.\(^{11}\) In his study of the Athenian *khoregia*, Wilson suggests that it was the scale of expense required for choral festivals, drama and dithyramb, as opposed to other, less elaborate festivals, which led to the funding of the chorus by private individuals.\(^ {12}\) He argues that private funding for festivals in Athens in the 5th c. BCE was focused on the city and the citizen body, pointing out that, at the Panathenaia, only the competitions restricted to Athenian citizens were funded by liturgies, whereas competitions open to non-Athenians were funded by the city.\(^ {13}\)

While necessary to support choral performance, the funding of choruses was not, strictly speaking, part of the festival budget. What the *khoregoi* paid for was not the prizes for the choruses to be awarded at the festival, but the expenses involved in preparing choruses for the competition, such as costumes, equipment, and training expenses. In return, the *khoregos* received intangible benefits (honor, prestige, and memory), but he did not expect to reap financial gain from his contribution.

Private individuals also paid for Athenians to attend festivals outside of Athens, such as the festivals of Delos and Delphi, and sometimes for Athenian choruses to compete in those festivals.\(^ {14}\) It was on such an occasion that the earliest known perpetual endowment in the Greek world was created.\(^ {15}\) In the 5th century BCE, at the close of the Delia, where he had brought a chorus to compete, Nicias consecrated land to Apollo worth 10,000 drachmas, "the revenues from which the Delians were to expend in sacrificial banquets, at which many blessings should

---


\(^{12}\) Wilson (2000) 12. Wilson estimates the cost of the choruses at the Dionysia at 100,000 drachmas per year, not including any other festival expenses (95).

\(^{13}\) His argument about the liturgy system is that "it was always directed towards activities involving the Athenian citizen-body as a collective." Wilson (2000) 36.

\(^{14}\) Wilson (2000) 44.

\(^{15}\) Nicias' endowment is not the first endowment in the Greek world, simply the earliest one known, as rightly observed by von Reden (2010) 180.
be invoked upon Nicias from gods," as reported by Plutarch in his *Life of Nicias*. Nicias' endowment was commemorated in stone, and accompanied by a bronze statue of a palm.

Plutarch's account of Nicias' endowment, and role as *choregos* and *theoros* at the Delia, ends with an explanation of his motives. Nicias, he says, was motivated not only by a desire to win popular favor (χάρις and δημαγωγία) by increasing his reputation through lavish public spending on choruses and banquets, but also by his piety towards the gods (εὐσέβεια).

In this course it is clear that there was much ostentatious publicity, looking towards increase of reputation and gratification of ambition; and yet, to judge from the rest of the man's bent and character, one might feel sure that such means of winning the favor and control of the people were rather a corollary to his reverent piety. This explanation of Nicias' motives, coming immediately after the account of the inscription recording his endowment, responds to the honorific language Plutarch would have seen on the inscription, where we would expect Nicias to be honored for qualities of character, such as εὐσέβεια and φιλοτιμία, as well as his reputation (δόξα). The interpretation of the relative weight of these different qualities is surely Plutarch's. Plutarch's interpretation of Nicias' motives takes for granted the intangible benefits he will receive among his contemporaries, by citing χάρις and δημαγωγία, but down-plays the role of memory in Nicias' foundation. He gives the impression that the monument was in ruins in the 1st century CE, describing how the bronze palm had been blown over by wind, but not explicitly mentioning the state of the inscription. Plutarch does not mention whether Nicias' endowment was still, in the 1st century CE, supporting such banquets. This draws attention to the transitory nature of the dedication, which we will see later in the chapter is a theme in Plutarch's work more generally. Whether or not they succeed in remaining

---

financially solvent, perpetual endowments are oriented to the future, as they are set up to provide a stable source of revenue for a certain cause for an indefinite length of time.

4.2 Changes in the 4th c. BCE

In the late 4th c. BCE in Athens, Demetrius of Phaleron replaced the *khoregia* with a new system, *agonothesia*. The date of this change was likely during the year he was archon in 309/8 BCE.\(^{18}\) The *agonothetes* took on the responsibilities of a *khoregos*, in being a major financial benefactor of the festival, and the responsibilities of the archon, who before had organized the festival, and provided some financial support, for sacrifices and feasts. According to Wilson, the move from *khoregia* to *agonothesia* was part of a broader attempt by Demetrius to increase the power of the aristocracy, and to promote aristocratic virtues.\(^{19}\) After the move to *agonothesia*, elites acting as *khoregoi* did not compete with each other in a given year. However, the fact that only one person was agonothete of a festival in a given cycle did not rule out competition among elite *agonothetai* over time. The agonothete was aware of what his predecessors had spent on the festival, and could still strive to out-spend them. Competition between *agonothetai* is thus spread over successive festival cycles.

Endowments were not the primary method of funding festivals in the 4th century BCE, but they do exist. The accounting for the revenue source for the Lesser Panathenaia is recorded

\(^{18}\) Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 91 is more cautious, dating the reform of the *khoregia* only to Demetrius’ regime (317-307 BCE), but Wilson (2000) 307-8 (appendix 4) provides a detailed argument for 309/8 BCE based on epigraphic evidence.

\(^{19}\) Wilson (2000) 271: "The most profound practical change seems to have been that competition between the *khoregoi* was removed: no longer the aggressive struggle for the glory of prestige and victory through spending for the demos on its *khoro*. The *agonothetes* did indeed continue to spend lavishly, but there was no longer a competition in out-spend: one's aristocratic virtue could be shown rather more serenely." For the move to *agonothesia*, see also Csapo and Wilson (2010) and (2015).
in a fragmentary inscription from the 4th c. BCE.\textsuperscript{20} The somewhat complicated accounting builds flexibility into the fund, which is a hallmark of endowment funds which are looking to secure financial stability. The inscription states that when the fund reaches 2 talents, ownership is transferred to Athena for the celebration of the Lesser Panathenaia. The revenue sources for this fund were (1) a contract to lease a property, called the Nea, (2) the rent from that property, and (3) the sale of a 2% tax on the Nea. Sosin calculates that even without the money from the contract, the Athenians would have raised 2 talents every 3 years, i.e. the interval between celebrations of the Panathenaia. This implies that the fund was designed to replenish every 3 years, i.e. in every fourth year, the Athenians would have spent the full 2 talents (or more) on the Panathenaia, rather than to support the festival from interest earned on the principal. Sosin's argument that the festival budget would have been reached with or without the contract is significant because it suggests that those who set up the fund built flexibility into the budget. This would have protected the festival from fluctuations in the amount of the contract, which was open to bidding, and shows that the legislators had the long-term health of the festival budget in mind.

4.3 Hellenistic festival economics

As dramatic festivals spread in the 4th c. BCE, the \textit{khoregia} system spread with them.\textsuperscript{21}

Outside of Athens, the \textit{khoregia} was a common system of funding choruses throughout the

\textsuperscript{20} IG II\textsuperscript{3} 447 (previous edition IG II\textsuperscript{2} 334). The reconstruction of the inscription has been much debated. Sosin summarizes the reconstructions and provides a new reading: Sosin (2002) 123-5. The third edition of IG II, published in 2012, adds a fragment to the inscription. Stephen Lambert's English translation of IG II\textsuperscript{3} 447 is available on Attic Inscriptions Online.

\textsuperscript{21} Wilson (2000) 279-302 discusses the sites where \textit{khoregoi} are attested outside of Athens. Sifakis (1967) 31-41 covers the \textit{khoregia} at the Hellenistic festivals of Delos. He notes that Athens abolished the \textit{khoregia} on Delos when they took possession of it in 166 BCE, imposing their own custom on the Delian festivals (37).
Hellenistic period. For example, *khoregoi* and *agonothetai* are both listed in the inscriptions in the theater at Iasos from the 2nd century BCE as funders of the Dionysia. In these early 2nd c. BCE inscriptions, each contributor funds one day's performances. Later in the 2nd century BCE, a specific amount was set for citizen contributions (200 drachmas) and metic contributions (100 drachmas). The role of admission fees in funding dramatic festivals, while known to exist, remains largely invisible. The phrase ἡ θέα ἐγένετο δωρεάν ("the viewing was free") is common in the inscriptions from the theater in Iasos, suggesting that an admission fee was not normally paid at the Iasean Dionysia, due to these contributions. The fact that it is noted in the Iasean inscriptions, however, indicates that admission fees were charged at other events, or in other places.

Festivals typically relied on multiple sources of funding, with the division of responsibilities differing depending on the festival. The Dionysia at Iasos must have been funded by another source, in addition to the contributions of citizens and metics, as the contributions (1000 drachmas total) do not account for enough to fund an entire agonistic festival. In the early 2nd c. BCE inscriptions, the contributors, the *khoregoi* and *agonothetai*, only fund performances, suggesting that the other expenses of the festival (sacrifices and feasts, for example) must have come from another source, such as an endowment, civic or sanctuary funds. At Delos as well as Iasos, *khoregia* was one of multiple funding sources for the festival. Three sources of funding are known for the Delian Dionysia and Apollonia, both dramatic festivals well attested in the

---

22 IGSK Iasos 164 (189/179 BCE), 165 (188/178 BCE), 166 (187/177 BCE). Migeotte (1993) divides the lists into two periods (c. 200-185 BCE, and 185/180-120/115 BCE).

23 For more on this expression, see SEG 4-225.
Hellenistic period. *Khoregoi* paid for choruses, the state paid for the prizes for the Technitai, and the archons paid for incidentals, such as costumes.²⁴

Perpetual endowments for festivals were also well known in the Hellenistic period. The inscriptions recording endowment foundations serve multiple purposes. One purpose is to guard against mismanagement by making the contract publicly accessible. In Plutarch's account of Nicias' endowment, the inscription recording the endowment acts a guard (φύλαξ) against mismanagement of the endowment. In later festival endowment documents, and literary accounts of such funds, we find more emphasis placed on the people tasked with managing the money. From the Hellenistic period onward, civic law governed endowments, with a failure to follow through on the intended purpose of the endowment punishable by stipulated penalties.²⁵ The inscribed endowment document was both an advertisement of the generosity and wealth of the founder, and also a warning against any who dared to break or change the terms of the contract. Unlike an honorific inscription for a benefactor, which commemorated their donation, and often their past accomplishments, offices, and qualities of character, endowment documents acted additionally as ongoing contracts between the benefactor and those responsible for the management of the funds.

The best example of the ongoing relationship between the benefactor, who wrote his intentions into the terms of the endowment, money-managers, and the festival organizer is an inscription attesting to the accounting of the Sarapieia at Tanagra. This late Hellenistic document (from before 86 BCE) demonstrates that the Sarapieia was funded by a perpetual endowment,

---

²⁴ Sifakis (1967) 31-41. Sifakis doubts that the expenses of the archons were regular, as the evidence is limited to two inscriptions (IG XI 110 and 118), though he does not explain why he thinks it would be "absurd" for the archon to regularly support the festivals. On the city's contributions to the Dionysia and Apollonia at Delos, especially regarding the hiring of performers: Linders (1992) 10.

with supplemental expenses paid by the agonothete.\textsuperscript{26} As the document concerns how the revenue from the endowment was spent in one year, not the initial foundation of the endowment, it provides valuable evidence for how the fund was administered post-foundation. Whereas the state paid for the prizes at the Delian Dionysia and Apollonia, the endowment took on the expense of victors' prizes at Tanagra, with certain expenses paid by the agonothete. The Sarapieia was funded by an endowment established by Charilaos. The inscription is the account provided by the agonothete, Glaukos, and the person responsible for managing the fund, Kaphisias son of Boukattes. Glaukos drew on the revenues from the endowment to pay for the victors' crowns, costumes, chorus members and chorus directors, sacrifices, and "feasting of those in the decree." He accounts meticulously for every obol spent from these endowment revenues, including what prizes were returned to the endowment, after no competitors appeared in those categories, and ends his account by mentioning what he paid for himself.

and other expenses for the daily oaths and the feasting of the daily participants, judges and [Technitai] and choruses and victors, and for the burnt sacrifices and libations, I do [not] account since I paid the money from my own resources.\textsuperscript{27} The note that the agonothete has not included the precise amounts of expenses paid from his own pocket in his account of the festival budget is important for two reasons. First, it implies that the agonothete's contributions are supplemental to the festival budget: he lists his contributions last, after the account of the prizes and other expenses paid by the revenues from the endowment, and

\textsuperscript{26} IG VII 540 (upper fragment); SEG 19-335; SEG 25-501; Roller (1989) 110-112, no. 92; Manieri Tan. 2. Several translations are available: Roller (1989); Csapo and Slater (1995) III.161. Pleket (1976) uses the Sarapieia budget to reconstruct how the budget for the Olympia might have operated. Slater (1991) and (1993) has the most detailed explanation of the accounting in this document, focusing on the prize amounts.

\textsuperscript{27} Roller (1989) 110-112, no. 92, l. 53-56 (text and translation).
passes over how much these things really cost. Second, the omission of the specific cost of the agonothete's contributions suggests that in other budgetary documents for festivals, the omission of expenses which we would expect to be part of the festival, may mean that those omitted expenses were paid by the agonothete. To put it another way, when we look at what appears to be a festival budget, what we are really looking at is only at the budget of the endowment.

In the second part of the inscription, the fund manager Kaphisias gives his account of the endowment and its revenues, the amount paid out to the agonothete for distribution for the various festival expenses, and the exact amount remaining in the account after these revenues and expenses. Kaphisias notes that there was a shortfall of 140 Attic drachmas, which Glaukos supplied. This adds another contribution to those Glaukos had previously mentioned. The agonothete was expected to contribute his own funds, should the revenues from the endowment fall short of the expenses for the festival. This is valuable for understanding how budget shortfalls were dealt with in a functioning endowment-supported festival, not just the ideal picture presented at the moment of the foundation of the endowment. As with the feasts mentioned earlier, the contributions of the agonothete are supplemental to the revenues from the endowment, and are contributions that would change depending on the particular celebration. Some years would require a larger contribution from the agonothete than others. The amount of his donation was malleable.

It can sometimes be difficult to differentiate an agonothete from a benefactor. One Boiotian benefactor, Epaminondas, paid for a festival entirely from his own funds. Epaminondas was agonothete of the Ptoia in Acraephium, and re-established the festival after a 30-year hiatus, due to a lack of funds. His honorific inscription was erected in Acraephium after 37 CE.²⁸ While Epaminondas paid for the entire festival, the expenses that the authors of his honorific inscription

focus on are those that would traditionally have been the responsibility of the organizer, namely, the feasts associated with the festival, and the distributions of money, food, and gifts to the spectators. Epaminondas is honored as a re-founder of the Ptoia, but the focus on expenses traditionally paid by the agonothete put an equal if not greater emphasis on this aspect of his role at the festival. This suggests that the office of agonothete was prestigious enough to be considered worthy of as much commemoration and honor as the role of benefactor.

4.4 Imperial festival economics

We know very little of how dramatic festivals were funded in the early imperial period (the late 1st century BCE and 1st century CE). One thing we do know is that the system of khoregia was revived in Athens in the first century CE. Wilson attributes this "khoregic renaissance" to "the growing impact of philhellenism among the Roman nobility in this age of neo-classicising tendencies." This development is localized to Athens, perhaps because the khoregia developed differently in non-Athenian contexts, and was not elsewhere so strongly associated with the classical past.

The picture of festival financing comes back into view in the 2nd century CE. Budgets for dramatic festivals survive from Oinoanda and Aphrodisias. The most important evidence for the operation of endowments, festival budgets, and festival administration in the imperial period is the dossier of inscriptions relating to the foundation of a festival by Gaius Julius Demosthenes in Oinoanda, his hometown, in 124 CE. Oinoanda was a relatively small city in a mountainous

---

29 One late piece of evidence, recounted in Malalas, for a festival endowment established in 3/4 CE in Antioch is discussed at the end of this section.
30 E.g. IG II² 3157 (Athens, 1st c. CE).
region of Northern Lycia. Demosthenes' may have had multiple reasons for establishing a festival, but they seem to have involved strong economic considerations, for himself, his family, and the city of Oinoanda. Demosthenes' benefactions repeatedly come back to the marketplace and economic activity. Previous to the endowment fund, Demosthenes had paid more than 15,000 denarii for the construction of a stoa and marketplace, and had paid for subsidies to keep prices in the marketplace down. The 6th day of the 22-day-long festival was reserved for a tax-free market: "There should be no taxes imposed on any of the purchases sold, sacrificed, imported, introduced or exported during the days of the festival." This festival market would have filled his marketplace with bustling activity, ensuring that his original donation (the marketplace) be well used during the celebration of the festival.

The festival may have been welcome to the people of Oinoanda. The inscription recording the Demostheneia documents also serves as an advertisement that a new capital fund has become available for borrowing. The interest rate quoted on the document allows festival organizers to budget for each festival. It also lets potential borrowers know what interest rate they can expect. The way the interest rate is advertised in the inscription leads one to think that 7.5% was a particularly attractive rate. It is set, says Demosthenes, at "the accustomed local levels—however, in accordance with my patriotic zeal in this matter also, on condition that 100

denarii yields (monthly) interest of 10 asses [=7.5 per cent per annum].” Demosthenes philotimia is relevant to the interest rate because he caps it at a level beneficial to borrowers, in keeping with his previous generosity in providing annual subsidies to keep prices in the market down.

Other endowments served this dual purpose of providing low-interest loans to borrowers, while also supporting a cause from the interest revenues. Perpetual endowments were used for the dual purpose of providing low-interest loans to Italian landowners and also to support children's education in Italy.\(^{34}\) 7.5% was well below the legal maximum of 12%. Homer and Sylla estimate that interest rates varied from 6-12% in Asia Minor in the 2nd century CE, though it is notable that in their table of known interest rates, it is the foundations which are consistently at the lower end of that spectrum (5-9%), while other types of loans, such as harvest loans and loans from professional money-lenders are far above the legal maximum, up to an interest rate of 100%.\(^{35}\)

The endowment itself, then, may have helped to stimulate the economy by providing low-interest loans to eligible borrowers, in addition to the economic stimulus of the tax-free festival market, and the influx of visitors to the city. The festival endowment complements Demosthenes' earlier investment in the marketplace, as the endowment would have provided loans to the Termessians, perhaps for business purposes, and the tax-free festival market would have filled the marketplace constructed with Demosthenes' funds with activity.

The Demostheneia did not only work to the benefit of the city, in providing food, entertainment, and a tax-free market, it also came with benefits for Demosthenes' own family. Demosthenes and the first agonothete of the Demostheneia, Gaius Julius Simonides, were not only both local elites, they were related, as the Simonides was Demosthenes' nephew. The agonothete enjoyed several other benefits before, during, and after the festival. The agonothete

\(^{34}\) Dignas (2002) 102.
\(^{35}\) Homer and Sylla (1996) 53-54.
could expect to enjoy a high standing in the community during his time as agonothete, during which he wore a conspicuous outfit, and after, when he would be awarded a front-row seat among the other *agonothetai* in the theater. In return for his participation as organizer, the organizer received an exemption from official duties for two years before the festival and three years after. One parallel for such an exemption is a benefactor of another festival in Oinoanda. Lucius Pilius Euarestus established an endowment for a new athletic and musical festival in Oinoanda, and Euarestus became agonothete for life of the Euaresteia. The agonothete for life could either be a benefactor of an existing festival, or a benefactor who founded a new festival. In either case, the title "agonothete for life" links an ongoing financial contribution, a perpetual endowment, with an official title and specific benefits. One benefit to being agonothete for life may have been freedom from liturgies. Euarestus is also designated in this inscription as free from liturgies, and while it is not specified how or why he received this freedom, one might suppose it was precisely because he was agonothete for life. Founding a festival and naming himself agonothete may have been a way to ensure that he would be exempt from liturgies in Oinoanda, just as the Demostheneia dossier established that there would be a period of time in which the *agonothetai* were exempt from other offices.

---

37 Perpetual endowments were not used only for newly founded festivals, as we saw with Nicias' endowment and the endowment for the Panathenaia. The office of eternal agonothete (δι᾽ αἰώνος ἀγωνοθέτης), or agonothete for life (ἀγωνοθέτης διὰ βίου) is not uncommon in imperial Greek epigraphy. This was not particular to dramatic festivals, but also appears in records of the *agonothetai* of athletic festivals. For example, Herod became agonothete for life when, as agonothete of the Olympia in 12 BCE, he established a perpetual endowment for sacrifices and feasts at the Olympia: Pleket (1976) 5. Pleket notes that this was the only time there was an agonothete of the Olympia, which the Hellanodikai normally presided over. Similarly, Tiberius Claudius Nysius was designated as ὁ δι᾽ αἰώνος ἀγωνοθέτης, agonothete for life, of an athletic festival: IGSK Ephesos 1117 (Ephesus, 2nd or 3rd c. CE).
38 Not every founder of a festival endowment was called an "agonothete for life." Demosthenes did not receive such a title.
According to the inscription, the agonothete did not pay any festival expenses from his own funds, but was responsible for accounting for how the revenue from the endowment was spent. Part of the funding for the festival was the rent from a certain property. It is the agonothete, Simonides, who promises to pay the 1,000 denarii rent for the first three years on this property. Given the rent arrangement, it is not exactly true that Simonides contributed nothing financially as festival organizer. This circular maneuver may have been a sneaky way of keeping the property in the family, while claiming the property as a tax-free donation. Effectively, Demosthenes' family retained control of the property, while appearing to give up their ownership of it for the benefit of the festival. Simonides may have been able to recoup the expense of the rent with revenue from the property (from working the land or in turn, renting it out to others). Furthermore, there are several expenses missing from the festival budget. No money is set aside for costumes, props, theater maintenance, the cost of feeding and housing the competitors, feasts and sacrifices during the festival. These incidental expenses may have been undertaken by the festival organizer at Oinoanda, as they were elsewhere, despite the claim made in the inscription that the organizer was not responsible for financial contributions.

Some of the managerial duties of the festival organizer were economic, which may have brought even more indirect financial rewards. Simonides was responsible for lending out the capital of the endowment and collecting interest, putting him in a position of power over the money and who it was lent to. In addition to the sacred personnel (sebastophoroi, magistophoroi) and someone to organize the boy's torch-race (the agelarch), the agonothete chose the panegyriarchs, "in order to take charge of the market and the supply of provisions at the festival, with the power to write up the prices for the purchase of provisions and to inspect

---

39 Sosin (2014).
40 SEG 38-1462, l. 28-29.
and organize the things which are offered for sale, and to punish those who disobey." This may have been a purely practical organizational process, ensuring that the festival was supplied with sacrificial animals, food, drink, and other necessaries. But it is not difficult to imagine a scenario in which the ability to appoint panegyriarchs friendly to the personal interests of the agonothete could have had financial benefit, as the panegyriarchs had the power to fix market prices. If the agonothete, who was certainly a wealthy individual, owned businesses in town, or sold goods in the marketplace, this price fixing could have worked to his benefit. The creation of the office of agonothete, staffed by a member of the benefactor's family, may then have been a strong motivation for Demosthenes to found the festival.

Demosthenes did not establish an endowment-funded festival merely for the purpose of a temporary tax shelter for his property, or only to benefit his nephew, as the endowment is carefully crafted to be a financially stable source of revenue for the festival over the long term.

The way the expenses are calculated leaves room for flexibility, protecting the endowment from over-spending. One section concerns the budget for the festival.


Since, together with the interest of the three-year period, without compound interest, 3450 denarii are collected along with the 1000 denarii of the year in which the festival is held, 4450 denarii in all, as large a sum shall be provided for the prizes of the competition

\[\text{SEG 38-1462, 1. 59-63.}\]
to each of the victors as is given by the province in the civic festivals held in the cities, excepting the penteteric games, that is 1900 denarii in all; and 600 denarii shall be given for hired shows and for theatrical displays; and for the gymnastic competitions in which only the citizens will compete, a total of 150 denarii shall be divided among the individual contestants; and the remaining 1800 denarii, and anything else that is remaining from the prizes of competitors who by chance do not appear, will be given as a judges' fee to the members of the council and to the sitometroumenoi [recipients of free corn], since the councilors should serve as judges and sitometroumenoi who are not members of the council should be picked by lot until a total of 500 is reached, so that each receives three denarii; and the remaining 300 denarii and anything else left over from the prizes shall be divided between the citizens who are not among the sitometroumenoi and the freedmen and the country dwellers (paroikoi). The first money to be allotted is the money for prizes, 1900 denarii total. This sum is a maximum amount, as some competitors may not appear. It is important, however, for the prizes to remain the same from year to year, as they are calibrated to the prizes in civic festivals of the region. These prize amounts would have been advertised to the Technitai in advance of the festival, so that they could decide whether it was worth it to travel to Oinoanda to compete. For these reasons, the first amount set aside is the prize money. The next sums to be allocated are the budget for paratheatrical entertainment, 600 denarii, and the prize money for gymnastic competitions, 150 denarii. The inscription instead states that this 150 denarii budget will be divided among the competitors, suggesting that the individual prizes were not the same each year. As the gymnastic competitors are local amateurs rather than traveling professionals, it is not important that the prize amounts be equal from year to year. After this point in the budgeting, there is more flexibility. The council members and the sitometroumenoi are to divide 1500 denarii, and the other citizens, freedmen, and paroikoi are to divide 300 denarii, but both of these amounts can be supplemented by "anything else left over from the prizes." The last 1800 denarii, then, was a minimum amount, unlike the prize budget. Demosthenes has crafted the budget of the festival such that it is sure not to deplete the endowment, relying only on the revenue, with a cushion built in in the flexibility about how much is paid out in distributions each year. The

participation of the Technitai, on the other hand, is ensured by keeping the prize amounts constant, and in line with other festivals in the region. The endowment-funded festival is envisioned as a cyclical event, protected for the future.

The endowment is also legally protected from financial mismanagement, another method of ensuring the stability of the fund for the future. There are safeguards in place to protect the festival from corruption on the part of the agonothete. While the first agonothete, Simonides, may have acted according to the best interests of Demosthenes because he was a family member, future agonothetai may have had agendas of their own. Mismanagement of the endowment funds was punishable by fines of 2500 denarii to the sanctuary of Apollo, 5000 denarii to the imperial treasury, and 1/8 of the total fines to whoever provided information leading to the discovery of the mismanagement. The fines amount to over half the capital of the endowment, a weighty penalty. The inscription does not lay out scenarios for such mismanagement of funds, but surely one possibility would be the manipulation of market prices for personal gain, through the panegyriarchs. For example, if the agonothete pressured the panegyriarchs to fix the price of sacrificial animals at a high rate, and then purchased those animals from a business owned by the agonothete, he could essentially use the market to siphon off festival funds into his own pocket. Another form of mismanagement would be over-spending the endowment (i.e. spending not only the interest revenue but also the capital) on one celebration of the festival. As the agonothete was remembered for his involvement in one cycle, not his impact on the festival over the long term, it would have been tempting to spend from the endowment more lavishly than was fiscally responsible. The benefactor put checks in place to ward off such over-spending.

Fines included in endowment documents show a concern about the authority of the festival organizer over the festival budget leading to corruption. We do not know if any
agonothete of the Demostheneia ever mismanaged the fund. We do, however, have reports of badly behaved *agonothetai* elsewhere. One such story of budgetary mismanagement is recorded in a later source. Writing in the 6th century CE, John Malalas recalls the mismanagement of a festival fund in Antioch some 500 years earlier. A benefactor, Sosibius, left 15 talents to the city of Antioch in the year 3 or 4 CE. Sosibius intended this donation to support a penteteric 30-day contest in the month Hyperberetaios (October), with dramatic, thymelic, tragic, athletic, equestrian, and gladiatorial contests (*σκηνικῶν, θυμελικῶν καὶ τραγικῶν καὶ ἀθλητῶν ἄγωνα καὶ ἵππικῶν καὶ μονομάχων*). This would have been an impressive festival, as it had contests in every category of Greek competitions (musical, dramatic, athletic, and equestrian contests), as well as Roman-style gladiatorial games. Sosibius' gift of 15 talents is a perpetual endowment, meant to support the festival indefinitely. The information which Malalas provides his readers with about the foundation of the festival resembles the information that we would find in the will itself, naming the amount of the endowment, when the interest is to be paid out and to whom, and the details of the festival program (what the contests will be, when it will be celebrated, and for how long). Malalas' story, however, continues after the foundation of the festival.

καὶ τὰς μὲν ἀρχὰς ἐπετέλεσαν οἱ αὐτοὶ πολιτευόμενοι, μετὰ δὲ ταύτα ὑπερετίθεντο τὰς προσόδους ἀποκερδαίνοντες, ἀπὸ θείας κελεύσεως οἱ αὐτοὶ πολιτευόμενοι Ἀντιοχείας μετὰ καὶ τῶν κητόρον ἡγόρασαν τὰ Ὀλυμπια ἀπὸ τῶν Πισάιων. καὶ ἤτισαν οἱ αὐτοὶ βουλεὐται τοὺς τῆς πόλεως πάντας, ὡς ἄν ἔτοιμοι ὄντες ἔνδοξα αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ τέως τὴν τῶν Ὀλυμπίων ἑορτὴν ἐπιτελείσθαι αὐτοῖς. καὶ πειθέντων τῶν κητόρων καὶ τοῦ δῆμου παντὸς καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν, ἐνεδόθη αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἐπετέλεσαν οἱ αὐτοὶ πολιτευόμενοι κατὰ τὸ πρῶτῳ ἑδοὺ πάλιν τὸν τῶν σκηνικῶν καὶ ἀθλητῶν, θυμελικῶν καὶ τραγικῶν καὶ ἵππικῶν ἄγωνα, καὶ λουπὸν τὰς λ’ ἡμέρας ἀπὸ τῆς νεομηνίας τοῦ ὑπερβερεταίου μηνὸς κατὰ πέντε ἔτη ἕως τοῦ καιροῦ τοῦ πενταετοῦς φθάσαντος. Καὶ πάλιν εὐρίσκοντες ἀφορμὴν εὔλογον οἱ αὐτοὶ πολιτευόμενοι, διαφόροι πολέμιοι κινηθέντων ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, οὐ μὴν ἄλλα καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως Ἀντιοχείας ληθείσης ὑπὸ ἐναντίων, ἔσοατος δὲ καὶ θεομηνίας γενομένης καὶ διαφόροις σεισμὸι καὶ ἐμπρησμοῖς, ἀνεβάλοντο καὶ τὴν κατὰ πενταετῇ χρόνον πάλιν ἐπιτελεῖν αὐτοὶ πολύτροπον ἀγώνος θέαν, ἀλλ’ ἐπετέλεσαν ἄλλας διαφόρους περιόδους ἐξ τῆς αὐτῆς προειρημένην πανήγυριν δι’ ἐναντίων ιε’ ἦ καὶ κ’, ὡς

---

ἐὰν αὐτοῖς ἐδοξε μετὰ τὸ τὴν πόλιν τῶν Ἀντιοχέων τῶν κακῶν ἀπαλλαγῆναι καὶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ διάγειν.

At first the officials celebrated the festival; later they deferred the games and pocketed the income. Then compelled by the sacred command, the officials of Antioch, together with the landowners, purchased the Olympic festival from the Pisaians. The councilors asked everyone in the city, since they were prepared to do so, to allow them for the time being to celebrate the Olympic festival for them. With the consent of the land-owners, the whole people and the priests they were allowed to do so. The officials celebrated once more according to the former custom the contests for drama and athletics, theatrical and tragic performances, and chariot-racing. And so this was done every quinquennium for 30 days from the time of the new moon in the month of Hyperberetaios, when the quinquennial cycle came round. Again the officials found an excuse, when various wars started in the East, or indeed the city of Antioch itself was occupied by the enemy, or equally when the wrath of God had occurred and sundry earthquakes and fires, and they put off celebrating the varied programme of spectacular contests every quinquennium; instead they celebrated six other different cycles for the above-mentioned festival, at intervals of 15 or even 20 years, as they saw fit, after the city of the Antiochenes was freed from misfortune and once more at peace.\(^{44}\)

While Malalas locates the source of the corruption in the administrators (πολιτευόμενοι Ἀντιοχείας), who have access to the festival funds, changes to the festival go through multiple parties. First, the administrators and land-owners co-operate in the purchases of the Olympia from the Pisaians. The purchase of the Olympia may have come with several advantages. The Olympia had sacred status, and therefore more prestige. It may have attracted larger crowds, and the visiting spectators and temporary festival market would have had economic benefits for Antioch. The involvement of the land-owners is presumably due to the need for extra funds for the purchase. The councilors (βουλευταί), land-owners, people, and priests must agree to the purchase. After the transfer of the Olympia to Antioch, Malalas emphasizes the continuity of the festival. The contests, he claims, are celebrated "according to the former custom," although he omits the gladiatorial games, which were part of Sosibius' original foundation. The story is ultimately about the disintegration of the festival, due to the corruption of the administrators, who steal money from the festival budget and celebrate the festival at improper times, changing

the festival cycle from five years to fifteen or twenty. Celebrating the festival on a fixed cycle was fundamentally important, and the account of the manipulation of the festival cycle on the part of the *agonothetai* for personal gain is meant to be shocking. No Greek festival was regularly celebrated on a cycle of 15 or 20 years. We cannot know for sure, based on Malalas alone, what details in this story are based on historical events, or what his sources may have been, but what is clear is the enduring anxiety about the mismanagement of festival funds by those in charge of handling the money. Many details in the story may very well be based on a reliable source, however, as his account of the foundation of the endowment by a benefactor, and the subsequent management of the festival and fund by the *agonothetai* map neatly onto the way in which we know that imperial-era festivals were funded and managed.

It has been suggested that under the Severans, festivals were a less expensive way for elites to display their wealth, generosity and good relationship to their hometowns than building projects. Mitchell claims that new festival foundations significantly increased under the Severans, rivaling the public building projects under Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius.⁴⁵ According to this model, spending on festivals under the Severans effectively replaced spending on public building projects. Zuiderhoek charts the donations of public buildings, distributions, and games and festivals in Asia Minor from the 1st to the 4th centuries CE, and the drop-off in public building projects in the 3rd century is striking. Foundations of festivals do not rise in the 3rd century, but simply decline less than public building projects and distributions, and thus

⁴⁵ Mitchell (1990) 191: "In general, increasing fiscal pressure under the Severans may have encouraged local notables to endow festivals as a more economical form of patriotism than public building. But this suggestion needs to be supported by a demonstration that competitions were indeed a cheaper way to win prestige. By the 250s, however, the case is more clear cut. Threatened by Sassanians and by Gothic raids, cities demolished their public buildings without compunction to provide building material for defensive fortifications. But to abandon public buildings must not spell an end to Greek civilisation; agonistic festivals offered a real alternative and no betrayal of civic values; in a time of instability and external threat, traditional culture held firm."
represent a greater percentage of the total donations. But were festivals more economical than building projects? The cost of Demosthenes' endowment for the festival was similar to the building project he had previously invested in, a marketplace costing 15,000 denarii. This requires some basic calculations. The foundation document specifies that the endowment will generate 3450 denarii for each celebration of the festival, at 7.5% interest (10 asses per 100 denarii, per year), without compound interest. Additionally, there is a 1000 denarii income from the property rented, in the first triennium, to Simonides. The Demostheneia was penteteric, which in modern reckoning means that it was celebrated every four years. During the years between celebrations of the festival, the endowment generates income. The amount of the capital of the endowment is, interestingly, not mentioned in the inscription, only that Demosthenes and his heirs "will contribute 1000 denarii every year in the month of Dios [January] from the coming year until we designate a property which is capable of maintaining an income of this size." However, the revenue anticipated (3450 denarii), term (3 years), and interest rate (7.5%) allows us to calculate the capital amount, which we will call C.

\[
C = \frac{3450 \text{ denarii}}{3 \text{ years}} \div \frac{0.075}{\text{year}} \\
= \frac{1150 \text{ denarii}}{0.075} \\
= 15333 \text{ denarii}
\]

An endowment of 15,333 denarii would generate 1150 denarii each year at a 7.5% interest rate. This is almost exactly the sum that Demonsthenes had earlier spent on the stoa and marketplace ("more than 15,000 denarii"). In Oinoanda in 124 CE, then, a building project and a festival endowment cost the benefactor the same amount. The Demostheneia was not a particularly expensive festival. While the inscription states that the prizes at the Demostheneia are on par with civic festivals, as stated in the inscription, they are much lower than at contests in

\[\text{Zuiderhoek (2009) 170 (Appendix 3).}\]
Aphrodisias, where the endowment of the Lysimacheia was nearly eight times as large (120,000 denarii). Furthermore, literary accounts of benefactors or trustees choosing whether to fund building projects or festivals suggests that they were both considered major investments.

4.5 Competing for the Big Bucks: Festivals and Public Building Projects

Endowments were used for a wide range of purposes, in addition to the funding of festivals: for upkeep of the tomb of the benefactor, sometimes including regular celebrations of rites at the tomb, for recurring feasts and distributions, for the maintenance of public buildings, monuments, and roads, and for children's education. Elite benefactors also sponsored public building projects, including gymnasia, theaters, and marketplaces. Several sources indicate a tension between spending on festivals and spending on public building projects, suggesting that there was real competition between these two forms of investment in the public life of the city.

The festival endowment was the latest in a series of benefactions that Demosthenes had provided for Oinoanda, and can be seen as part of a larger program of benefaction centering on the marketplace and economic activity. One motivation for establishing the Demostheneia may have been to fill Demosthenes' marketplace with activity. This begs the question of how often festival foundations can be seen as part of a larger program of benefaction, and what the relationship was between the physical buildings benefactors donated and the human activities they sought to support, such as festivals. Did people who gave money to build or renovate theaters also found festivals to fill those theaters with shows and spectators?

Spending on festivals and public building projects was not mutually exclusive, as we saw with Demosthenes' dual support of a marketplace and festival endowment, and can even be seen

\footnote{The interest rate on the Lysimacheia was close to that of the Demostheneia: see p. 72 n. 36 above.}

\footnote{Hillner (2007) 244.}

\footnote{Zuiderhoek (2009) studies distribution of elite benefaction in Roman-era Asia Minor.}
as part of programs of benefaction. One example of a benefactor whose program of benefaction repeatedly involved the theater is Titus Flavius Montanus, who served as agonothete of the koinon Asias in Ephesus, and was also twice eparch of the Technitai and high priest of Asia. As agonothete of the koinon Asias, a dramatic festival, Montanus would have been responsible for contributing funds for certain expenses. In addition to his involvement as agonothete, Montanus paid for improvements to the theater building in Ephesus, including the vaults of the theater. A dedication by Montanus to Artemis Ephesia and Trajan also survives on the architrave of the theater. Montanus left money in his will for the erection of a statue of Lucius Vibius Lentulus, who had previously left an endowment for the funding of the koinon Asias. As agonothete of the festival, Montanus paid for the competition from the revenues from Lentulus' endowment. The statue of Lentulus should be regarded as a statue of a benefactor of the koinon Asias, and the contribution for its erection from the will of Montanus can be regarded as part of a larger program of benefaction revolving around the theater. In this case, as in the Demostheneia inscription, we can see the close relationship of the founder of the endowment, Lentulus, with the agonothete of the festival he endowed, Montanus. Agonothetai and euergetai were members of a small group of elites in the city, whose activities were closely intertwined. Three statue bases of Titus Flavius Montanus have been found at the theater in Ephesus, the locus of his benefactions.

As Demosthenes weighed his options for what cause to donate money for, we might ask why he chose to support a festival rather than another building project. Both a building project

50 Ibid. See also Sturgeon in Chapin (2004) 424, who notes that the city paid for repairs and renovations to the theater in the 1st c. CE, but expenses relating to the theater building were typically paid by private donation in the 2nd c. CE.
51 IGSK Ephesos V 2037.
52 IGSK Ephesos V 2061.I.
53 IGSK Ephesos V 2061, 2062, and 2063. IGSK V 2062 may have been bilingual, as small fragments in Latin also survive. All date to between 103 and 116 CE, under Trajan.
and a festival were large-scale donations, which would benefit the city, and both serve to
memorialize the donor. Festivals and public building projects share some similarities. Both
festivals and public building projects altered the city in a lasting way. The festival was intended
to be a permanent event, celebrated at the same time of year on a fixed cycle. The foundation of
a new festival altered the city by adding an event to the local calendar, days during which
entertainment, food, and distributions were often provided, and residents and visitors crowded to
certain spaces within the city (the theater, gymnasium, sanctuary, processional route, and
marketplace). A festival filled spaces in the city with human activity. A building altered the
space of the city, and often created a new public gathering space. Buildings, likewise, were
intended to be permanent structures. Like a festival, there was no planned end point for a
building. This permanence is important for understanding why benefactors chose to sponsor
festivals and building projects, because they intended these forms of spending to bring not just a
momentary popularity, but a lasting memory of their generosity among present and future
residents and visitors. Festivals and public building projects were also similarly expensive: they
were both serious investments on the part of the benefactor.

Despite these similarities, or perhaps because of them, festivals and public building
projects are often regarded in ancient sources as competing investments, with elites forced to
choose between them. Concerns about spending money on buildings and festivals are central to
Cassius Dio's account of the advice of Agrippa and Maecenas to Octavian about monarchy. In
this case, the choice is not between whether to fund buildings or festivals, but whether there
should be any elite funding of public projects on this scale at all. Both Agrippa's and Maecenas'
arguments concern revenue sources for the Roman Empire. Agrippa advises Octavian against
monarchy, on the grounds that monarchy discourages elite benefaction, replacing the donations
of the wealthy (which are common, he says, in democracies) with the taxation of the masses.\textsuperscript{54}

Maecenas does not advise Octavian against monarchy, on the grounds that he is already acting like a monarch. His advice is to maximize revenue while minimizing expenses. In order to maximize revenue, Maecenas suggests that Octavian sell most state-owned property, and lend out the capital at interest, securing a permanent source of funding to supplement other state revenue sources, such as taxation.\textsuperscript{55}

Furthermore, Maecenas advises, cities should not waste their money on public buildings or games, spectacles, and festivals. These paired expenditures each require a significant budget, and are intended for public use or consumption. Maecenas speaks not only of Rome, but also of Greek cities in the provinces. His concern about the festivals is that cities will compete with one another, celebrating too many festivals, and spending too much on them. This inter-city festival competition may lead to war between cities.

εὔετωσαν μὲν γὰρ καὶ πανηγύρεας καὶ θεωρίας τινὰς, χωρίς τῆς ἰπποδρομίας τῆς παρ' ἡμῖν ποιουμένης, μὴ μέντοι ὡστε καὶ τὸ δημόσιον ἢ καὶ τοὺς ἰδίους οίκους λυμαίνεσθαι, ξένον τέ τινα ἀναγκάζεσθαι παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ὀτιοῦν ἀναλίσκειν, καὶ σίτησιν ἀθάνατον πᾶσιν ἀπλῶς τοῖς ἀγώναις τινα νικήσας δίδοσθαι. τοὺς τε γὰρ εὐπόρους ἄλογον ἐστιν ἔξω τι τῶν πατρίδων ἀναγκαστούς δαπανάν, καὶ τοῖς ἀγωνισταῖς ἀπόχρη τὰ ἄθλα τὰ παρ' ἐκάστοις τιθέμενα, χωρίς ἤ εἰ τίς αὐτῶν Ὀλύμπια ή Πύθια ἢ τινα ἐνταῦθα ἀγώνα ἀνέλοιπο·

They ought, indeed, to have their festivals and spectacles, — to say nothing of the Circensian games held here in Rome, — but not to such an extent that the public treasury or the estates of private citizens shall be ruined thereby, or that any stranger resident there should be compelled to contribute to their expense, or that maintenance for life should be granted to every one without exception who has won a victory in a contest. For it is unreasonable that the well-to-do should be put under compulsion to spend their money outside their own countries; and as for the competitors in the games, the prizes which are offered in each event are enough, unless a man wins in the Olympian or Pythian games or in some contest here in Rome.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{54} Cassius Dio, \textit{Roman History} 52.6.  
\textsuperscript{55} Cassius Dio, \textit{Roman History} 52.28.  
\textsuperscript{56} Cassius Dio, \textit{Roman History} 52.30.
Maecenas is concerned both about the immediate expense of the festival (during its celebration), and about the long-term expenses incurred (life-long maintenance of festival victors).  

Maecenas' complaints about the economic impact of the festival are directed at three different groups: the city, the local elites, and the xenoi. The three possible funding sources he identifies, in other words, are (1) funding from the public treasury, (2) benefaction from the local elites, and (3) contributions from xenoi. By xenoi, he perhaps means Romans living in the provinces, who emulated local Greek elites by supporting Greek cultural institutions. The rhetorical purpose of the inclusion of contributions by xenoi is to emphasize how financially ruinous festivals are, to suggest that festivals cause financial hardship to the community at large (the public treasury), one group within the community specifically (the local elites), and even those who have no business contributing to local festivals, because they are external to the citizen body (the xenoi).

As a solution to the problems caused by over-spending on festivals, Maecenas suggests banning a particularly expensive contest, horse-racing, from all cities except Rome, that other games be held in a moderate fashion, and that cities save money by putting on inexpensive shows rather than costly ones.

τοῦτο µὲν δὴ διὰ ταῦτ' ἀπαγορεύω παντάπασι µηδαµῶθι ὡλλοθι πλὴν ἑνταῦθα γίγνεσθαι, τὰ δὲ δὴ λοιπὰ ἐµετρίσασα, ἵν' εὐδαπάνους τὰς ἀπολαύσεις καὶ τῶν θεωρηµάτων καὶ τῶν ἀκουσµάτων ὡς ἐκαστὸι ποιούµενοι καὶ σωφρονέστερον καὶ ἁστασιαστότερον διάγωσι.

It is for these reasons, therefore, that I would altogether forbid the holding of such races anywhere else than here in Rome; as to the other games, I have proposed to keep them within bounds, in order that each community, by putting upon an inexpensive basis its entertainments for both eye and ear, may live with greater moderation and less factious strife.

---

57 For the practice of supporting victors in certain festivals for life, see Slater (2012), discussed further in chapter 2.
58 Cassius Dio, Roman History 52.30.
The "entertainments for eye and ear" (τὰς ἀπολαύσεις καὶ τῶν θεωρημάτων καὶ τῶν ἀκουσμάτων) refer to paratheatrical entertainment. Maecenas is advising that cities replace prize-winning contests with paratheatrical entertainment, which is cheaper both in the short term (because payments for paratheatrical entertainers cost less than prizes) and in the long term (because as non-prize-winning entertainers, they are not eligible for the lifetime maintenance of festival victors, which Maecenas has earlier complained about). To Greek readers, and Roman readers familiar with Greek customs, such a misreading of festival culture would surely have been darkly comical. Maecenas' idea that Greek agonistic festivals could be done away with and replaced with hired entertainment, corresponding more closely to the Roman concept of spectacle entertainment, disregards Greek cultural and religious life on a grand scale. As he discusses his plan for the systematic dismantling of Greek festival culture, Maecenas simultaneously elevates Roman festivals to the level of the most ancient Greek games, the Olympia and the Pythia. Writing in the late 2nd to early 3rd century CE, Cassius Dio was familiar with the Capitolia, Greek-style games in Rome, which had been incorporated into the periodos along with the Olympia and Pythia, but there was no such periodos festival in Rome in Maecenas' time. Cassius Dio figures Maecenas as sinister in his lack of respect for contemporary Greek culture, as he suggests only protecting the traditions (the support of victors for life) of the Olympia and Pythia, and aligning Rome only with these ancient Greek festivals, rather than the broader landscape of contemporary Greek festivals and local traditions. This characterization of Maecenas is particularly striking, because of his well-known patronage of the arts in Rome.

Despite his proposal that Octavian sell off state-owned property in order to create a perpetual endowment for state revenue, Maecenas suppresses perpetual endowments as a source of funding for festivals. Implicitly, endowments are hiding behind his mention of elite

---

59 This terminology for parat theatrical entertainment is covered in chapter 6.
benefaction in connection with festivals. Bringing up perpetual endowments would run counter to Maecenas' argument, as the point of a perpetual endowment was to secure funding for a festival without relying on year-to-year donations. A perpetual endowment was, therefore, a fiscally responsible way to fund a festival. Maecenas' goal is to stress the ways in which festivals are fiscally irresponsible.

We also have glimpses of elites deciding how to spend their money, and what types of public projects to direct this money to. Pliny the Younger calls attention to the question of whether supporting festivals or public building projects was a more worthwhile investment.

Writing to Trajan, Pliny asks whether he ought to spend the behest of Julius Largus of Pontus, left in his care, on a festival or a building.60

C. PLINIUS TRAIANO IMPERATORI
Iulius, domine, Largus ex Ponto nondum mihi visus ac ne auditus quidem - scilicet iudicio tuo credidit - dispensationem quandam mihi erga te pietatis suae ministeriumque mandavit. Rogavit enim testamento, ut hereditatem suam adirem cerneremque, ac deinde praeceptis quinquaginta milibus nummum reliquum omne Heracleotarum et Tianorum civitatibus redderem, ita ut esset arbitrii mei utrum opera facienda, quae honoris tuo consequarentur, putarem an instituendos quinquennales agonas, qui Traiani appellarentur. Quod in notitiam tuam perferendum existimavi ob hoc maxime, ut dispiceres quid eligere debeam.

TRAIANUS PLINIO
Iulius Largus fidem tuam quasi te bene nosset elegit. Quid ergo potissimum ad perpetuitatem memoriae eius faciat, secundum cuiusque loci conditionem ipse dispice et quod optimum existimaveris, id sequere.

Ep. 10.75, Pliny to the Emperor Trajan
Julius Largus of Pontus, Sir, a person whom I have never seen nor heard of until recently, but presumably relying on your opinion of me, has entrusted me with administering his last example of loyalty towards you. He has left me in his will his estate upon trust, and after receiving 50,000 sesterces for my own use, to pay over the remainder to the cities of Heraclea and Tium, either for the erection of public buildings to be dedicated in your honor or for the institution of athletic games to be held every five years and to be called by your name. I am to choose which scheme I think best. I thought I should bring this to your attention so that I may receive direction as to which alternative to select.

60 Burrell (2004) 371 puts this exchange between Pliny and Trajan into the context of guidance by Roman officials on how the imperial cult should be celebrated in the provinces.
Ep. 10.76, Trajan to Pliny
In his wise choice of trustee you would have thought that Julius Largus knew you personally. Consider then what will suit the conditions of both places, and also what will perpetuate his memory, and make your own decision accordingly.\(^\text{61}\)

Pliny uses the Greek *agon* in Ep. 10.75 when referring to the penteteric festivals, potentially to take place in the Bithynian cities Heraclea and Tium, because he is speaking of Greek festivals, which are characterized by their cyclical nature (quinquennales *agonas*) and competitions, here athletic. He draws out the connection of each potential investment, the festivals and buildings, to the emperor in his correspondence with Trajan, emphasizing that both the buildings and the festivals would be dedicated to the emperor. Trajan, offering little advice to Pliny, shifts the focus from himself to the memory of the benefactor and the needs of Heraclea and Tium.

Not all emperors were as comfortable with spending on festivals as Trajan. A letter of Antoninus Pius from 144/5 CE to Vedius Antoninus of Ephesus strongly urges against spending on festivals, in favor of spending on public building projects. The issue is that a benefactor, Vedius Antoninus, tried to give money for a building project, but the Ephesians objected.

Antoninus Pius steps in to resolve the dispute.

[\text{[Αὐτοκράτορ]ος Καῖσαρ Ἡσιασάρης ὁ Αἰτωλοῦς Ἀδριανός Ἐβραίος Πατρὸς Ἰκανός Ἰωάννης, θεὸς Τραϊανοῦ Παρθῆνας Ἰουριδικός Νέρους Ἀχιλλεύς Τίτος Ἀδριανὸς Σεβασίου Στῦλος, ἀρχιερεὺς ἡμᾶς ἐγίστας ὁ Φιλοτήμων Ἰαρίνος τῶν ἔμετρων γραμματίσται}] (2007)

Imperator Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus, son of the deified Hadrianus, grandson of the deified Trajanus Parthicus, great-grandson of the deified Nerva, pontifex maximus, holding tribunician power for the eighth time, twice hailed imperator, four times consul, father of his country, to the chief magistrates, council, and people of Ephesos, greeting. The generosity which Vedius Antoninus lavishes on you I have learned not so much from your letters as from his. Wishing to obtain assistance from me for the embellishment of public works that he had offered you, he informed me of the size and greatness of the buildings he is contributing to the city. But you do not appreciate him properly. Now I have granted him all that he asked, appreciating that he prefers to make the city more majestic not in the customary manner of public figures, who for the sake of immediate popularity expend their generosity on spectacles and distributions and the prizes of games, but in a manner that looks to the future. The letters were transmitted by his Excellency, the proconsul Claudius Julianus. Farewell. Vedius Antoninus offered to pay for certain buildings in Ephesus, but the people of Ephesus blocked his attempted benefaction. The mention of "prizes for games" demonstrates that Antoninus is not just talking about spectacles, but an agonistic, dramatic festival. The letter suggests that the Ephesians exerted pressure on Vedius Antoninus to provide spectacles, including theatrical shows, rather than building projects. Antoninus Pius does not say whether the Ephesians explicitly requested that Vedius Antoninus spend his money on spectacles, distributions, and festival prizes, but he implies that this is what the people would have preferred. He contrasts the fleeting nature of distributions, spectacles, and prizes with the long-lasting nature of a building project, refusing to see festivals as a Greek benefactor might see them, as cyclical, permanent events, with the same endurance as a building.

We also find the idea that spending money on the theater is wasteful, because of the fleeting nature of theater shows, in Plutarch. In Precepts of Statecraft, he argues against the value placed in honors given to benefactors. First, he disparages public commemorative display, saying

---

that honors "painted, modeled, or cast in bronze" are not needed, as the people who make statues and paintings deserve more praise than the people the statues represent. He then advises statesmen not to compete with the wealthy by providing spectacles and feasts, because these public entertainments are beyond their means. Instead, they should seek to win over the people by displaying their virtue, wisdom, and reason.

πρὸς ἃ χρὴ βλέποντα μὴ ταπεινοῦσθαι μὴ δ’ ἐκπεπλῆχθαι τὴν ἐκ θεάτρων καὶ ὀπτανείων καὶ πολυανδρίων προσισταμένην τοῖς ὁχλοῖς δόξαν, ὡς ὁλίγον χρόνον ἐπίζωσαν καὶ τοῖς μονομάχοις καὶ ταῖς σκηναῖς ὁμοῦ συνδιαλυομένην, ἐντιμον δὲ μηδὲν μηδὲ σεμνὸν ἔχουσαν.

So, observing these things, we must not be humiliated or overwhelmed by the reputation with the masses gained from theatres, kitchens, and assembly-halls, remembering that it lasts but a short time and ends the minute the gladiatorial and dramatic shows are over, since there is nothing honorable and dignified in it.

Plutarch subverts the expectation that providing spectacles and feasts to the people will result in the long-lasting commemoration of the benefactor, shifting the language of honor from spectacle (gladiatorial and dramatic shows) to character (the virtue, wisdom, and reason of the statesman). In both cases, it is the crowd (ὁ ὄχλος) that is the arbiter of honors. Zuiderhoek argues that Plutarch is critiquing euergetism, but Plutarch assumes that the wealthy will act as public benefactors. His advice is not aimed at the super-rich, but at less wealthy people who are pursuing political careers. He advises these people to win popular favor in ways that do not involve spending money on public benefactions, in order to avoid financial ruin. His critique, then, is not of euergetism in general, but of a specific group of people, who do not have the financial means, engaging in euergetic practices.

Antoninus Pius and Plutarch share the same concerns about the permanence of the memory of benefactions. Like Plutarch, Antoninus Pius, and perhaps also Vedius Antoninus, see

---

spectacles as providing a temporary benefit to the benefactor and the people, which will not be remembered. While Plutarch's suggestion for building long-term goodwill among the people involved displays of good character on the part of the statesman, Antoninus Pius sees the solution in the building of a permanent structure. As has been observed by scholars, the Ephesian people did not agree to honor Vedius Antoninus for five years after his initial benefaction, suggesting that the controversy continued for some time.\textsuperscript{67} He was, in the end, successful in securing permission for his building project, which may have included the gymnasium in Ephesus.

If the Ephesians were trying to re-direct Vedius Antoninus' funds away from the building project and towards spectacles, distributions, and festival prizes, as Antoninus Pius' letter suggests, they may have been trying to get Vedius Antoninus to use the funds to establish an endowment for a new festival. Antoninus Pius does not say why the people would prefer a festival to a building. Entertainment is one reason that the festival would benefit the citizens of Ephesus, and it is the role of the festival as popular entertainment that is most commonly written about in literary sources. However, we should not discount the economic benefits of festivals to the population more broadly. De Ligt has studied the phenomenon of festival markets, arguing that some festivals were more geared towards commerce than others, particularly the festivals of Delos, but that most festivals would have had a commercial aspect.\textsuperscript{68} Linders also stresses that festivals were embedded in the economy, costing money to put on but also providing employment and stimulating production.\textsuperscript{69} Dio Chrysostom writes that "where the greatest crowd is assembled, there also the most money will flow together."\textsuperscript{70} Festivals attracted buyers and

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{68} De Ligt (1993) 35-39.
\item \textsuperscript{69} Linders (1992) 11.
\item \textsuperscript{70} Dio Chrysostom 35.16. Cf. Klose (2005) 125.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
sellers to participate in festival markets. As these festival markets were exempt from taxation, they would not have generated any revenue for the city.\textsuperscript{71} The direct beneficiaries of the festival markets were not the elites who organized the festivals, but the stall-keepers, merchants, inn-keepers, food-sellers, and cart-drivers whose business depended on the crowds which flocked to the city. These small business owners were central to the life of the festival. In his \textit{Life of Pythagoras}, Diogenes Laertius writes that Pythagoras "compared life to the Great Games, where some went to compete for the prize and others went with wares to sell, but the best as spectators."\textsuperscript{72} This division of the crowd into three groups, all traveling to participate in the festival (competitors, sellers, and spectators) is no less applicable to Diogenes Laertius' own time as it is to the time of Pythagoras. Epaminondas of Acraephium provided a breakfast for the stall-keepers at the Ptoia, suggesting that the participation of the stall-keepers in the festival was both expected and valued.\textsuperscript{73} Lucian talks about the difficulty of finding a carriage as spectators are trying to leave after the Olympian games, a good day for the drivers.\textsuperscript{74} Others catering to the needs of traveling spectators, such as inn-keepers and restaurant owners, would clearly have benefited from the crowds.

\section*{4.6 Memory}

Festival organizers were honored with statues and inscriptions upon completion of their duties. These honorifics are oriented towards the future, advertising the benefactions of an elite

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{71} Zuiderhoek (2007) 202 collects evidence that cities and emperors were concerned about the negative financial impact of these tax-free (\textit{ateleia}) festival markets on cities, which lost tax revenue during the festivals.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{72} καὶ τὸν βίον ἐοικέναι πανηγύρει· ὡς οὖν εἰς ταύτην οἱ μὲν ἀγωνισώμενοι, οἱ δὲ κατ’ ἐμπορίαν, οἱ δὲ γε βέλτιστον ἐρχονται θεαταί. Diogenes Laertius, \textit{Life of Pythagoras} 8.8, trans. R.D. Hicks.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{74} Lucian, \textit{On the Passing of Peregrinus} 35.
\end{flushright}
person in a lasting way, and establishing how the benefactor's memory will be built into the city, through statues and inscriptions.\textsuperscript{75} Epaminondas of Acraephium, for example, was honored by the archons, council, and people of Acraephium with a golden crown and several statues and inscriptions, erected in different parts of the city. His image was displayed in the sanctuary of Apollo Ptoios, because of his support of the festival of Apollo, the Ptoia, and in the marketplace, and he was granted the best seat in the theater, among other \textit{euergetai} the successive \textit{agonothetai} of the Ptoia.\textsuperscript{76} These reserved seats may have been passed down within his family. Epaminondas' reputation, then, is tied not only to this single celebration of the festival, but also to successive celebrations, both during his lifetime and after his death. Another example of such honors given to a festival organizer comes from Ankyra. Ulpius Aelius Pompeianus was the organizer of a festival there, and in 128 CE, a decree of the Technitai of Dionysus was inscribed in Ankyra concerning the contest and its organizer. Part of the decree concerns the statues that should be erected of Pompeianus and the competitors at the contest.

25 \textup{[δεδόχθαι οὖν]} ἡ<µ> eius, ὑπὲρ τοῦ τετηρῆσθαι μὲν [τὰς τειμάς τῷ τε] Αὐτοκράτορι καὶ τῷ Διονύσῳ διασε-[σώθαι δὲ εἰς τόν] ἀγώνα τῇ πόλει, τόν ἄνδρα τετιμή-[σθαι ἄνδριάντι], ὡς ἀναστήσεται εἰς ἐπιφανεστά-[τῳ µὲν τόπῳ τῆς µητροπόλεως, ἱδίῳ δὲ τῶν ἀγω-]

30 [νιξομένων ἔν τῷ θεάτρῳ, παράδιγµα κάλλιστον [ἀρετῆς τοῖς µένοις, ὃ καὶ τὸν εἰσιόντα ἄγωνι-[στήν εἰς µυστικὸν ἀγώνα ἐγηρήθαι στεφάνους [εἰσφέρειν], εἰ δὲ µὴ εἴργεσθαι τοῦ ἀγώνος ἀχαρι-[στίας πρὸς τὸν ἄµεταν ἄνδρα ἐνεκεν καὶ ἀπειθε[ι]-

35 [ας τῶν ἐγηρήσεσθαι τῇ συνόδῳ ἀναστήσαι δὲ [τοῦ ἄνδρος ἄνδριάντα, καὶ ἐν νέᾳ πόλει τὸ [δὲ µε]-[γίστῳ Αὐτοκρά]τορι Κάισαρι Τραίανῷ Ἀδριανῷ Σ[εβα]-

\textsuperscript{75} Laum (1914) 40-52 emphasizes the importance of memory to benefactors who establish perpetual endowments.

Therefore, for the sake of preserving honors for both the emperor and Dionysus and maintaining the contest for the city, it was resolved by us to honor the man with a statue which will be set up in the most noticeable place in the metropolis, and a separate one for the competitors will be set up in the theater as a most beautiful model of virtue for the spectators. The competitor who enters into the contest involving mysteries should adorn it (i.e. the second statue) with the crowns that are brought in. But if a competitor does not do this, he is to be excluded from the contest because of his lack of gratitude towards a virtuous man and the competitor's failure to obey the things that have been decreed by the synod. Furthermore, a statue of the man is to be set up in Neapolis. The decree will display the greatness of the man and the proper thanksgiving of the synod to the greatest emperor Caesar Trajan Hadrian Augustus and the greatest governor Trebius Sergianus.

The three statues of Pompeianus are supposed to be placed in different places of the city, one "in the most noticeable place in the metropolis," (ἐν ἐπιφανεστάτῳ τῷ ἰτὴν τῆς μητροπόλεως), one in the theater, for the competitors to adorn with crowns, which will be seen by the spectators at future contests in the theater, and one in Naples. Each viewing context has a different purpose. The statue in "the most noticeable place in the metropolis," perhaps in the agora, suggests that Pompeianus' role as a festival organizer enhances his public profile within the city. The statue in the theater makes Pompeianus a part of the celebration of future festivals, because the competitors will acknowledge the statue and continue the memory of this festival organizer. The statue in Naples suggests that Pompeianus' organization of the festival does not only concern Ankyra, but will spread his good reputation abroad, to the most important city in Italy after Rome.

Conclusion

Funding for dramatic festivals came from various sources: temple treasuries and revenues, civic funds, and elite benefaction. Elite benefaction is particularly well attested as a

---

source of festival funding in the Roman period. In this chapter, our project has been to determine what benefactors and festival organizers sought to gain from supporting festivals, what responsibilities they had, and what pressures they faced. Festivals were expensive to put on and time-consuming to organize, but brought honor, prestige, and commemoration to the elites who funded and organized them, and no less importantly, financial rewards. The memory of the benefactor was perpetuated through monuments (statues and inscriptions), the name of the festival (typically after the name of the benefactor), and special privileges granted to him and his descendants (particularly the right of proedria, sitting in a reserved seat in the front rows of the theater). As festivals attracted crowds from the city and also from neighboring cities, and even from abroad, the public visibility for a benefactor at the festival he had founded, and potential for enhancing his reputation beyond his hometown, was significant.

Nevertheless, festivals brought a range of benefits to the cities where they were celebrated, leading people to urge benefactors to support festivals in addition to, or instead of, other objects of benefaction, such as buildings. Festivals were occasions of entertainment and distributions of food, wine, and money, but also economic stimuli, as tax-free markets took place during festival times. Both the markets and the festivals attracted large crowds, a boon to shop-keepers, inn-keepers, and other business owners who might take advantage of an influx of visitors. A festival endowment could serve multiple purposes, as a tax shelter for the elite benefactor and his family, as a source of low-interest loans to borrowers, and as an ongoing, stable source of support for the festival. Inscriptions recording these endowments also act as advertisements for the availability of funds for borrowing. The goodwill generated among the borrowers, perhaps business people or other elites in the city, could, in turn, be a benefit to the one responsible for setting up the endowment, i.e. the benefactor.
Chapter 5: Old and New at the Festivals

Festival organizers had an interest in asserting the ancientness and timelessness, the constancy, of their festivals: by reminding viewers of their ancient origins, by maintaining a traditional, set order of competitions, by re-performing classical plays which were hundreds of years old, even, in one interesting case, by adopting an archaizing dialect for a public festival document. Old drama was consistently awarded higher prizes than new drama at Greek festivals. This was not just a monetary value but an assertion of values. Festival organizers asserted a higher status for re-performed drama, as part of a larger trend to value oldness over newness at the festivals.

And yet, newness was a part of these festivals too: newly written tragedies, comedies, and satyr-plays were presented alongside the re-performances of the classical canon. Actors traveled to compete, and so each festival would have had new performers every year. Some festival organizers sought to out-do each other by adding days to festival calendars, hiring extra paratheatrical entertainers, or providing lavish gifts for festival-goers.

Even when adding something new to the program, however, festival organizers sought to make it appear as if little had actually changed. Additions seem to have been possible, as long they did not interfere with the pre-existing festival program. The most common additions were the days added to festivals in order to celebrate the imperial cult, a continuation of the earlier practice of "appending" festivals for Hellenistic monarchs.¹ In addition, some festival organizers expanded festivals by funding additional days. In Stratonikeia, where dozens of honorific inscriptions for benefactors of the Panamaria (the festival of Zeus Panamaros) have survived,

¹ This will be discussed at greater length in the following chapter.
two benefactors in the 2nd century CE "first increased the ten days of the festival to thirty." For these benefactors, adding extra days to the festival was a way of going above and beyond their duties, as they also provide the normal benefactions associated with the festival (feasting various groups, including the entertainers; providing gifts of money to attendees). Another example of an addition to the festival program is the way in which pantomimes were incorporated into the competitions in the Greek East in the late 2nd c. CE, a rare instance of the addition of a new form to the dramatic competitions, addressed in the next chapter.

The negotiation between old and new is intrinsically linked to questions of Greek identity in the Roman period, a topic of great interest to imperial Greek literary authors. The question of whether contemporary Greek festivals were being properly celebrated was live in the imperial period. I will focus particularly on Plutarch and Philostratus, who are both interested in this question, but approach it in different ways. Plutarch contrasts the variety of contests at contemporary festivals with the imagined austerity of festivals of the past. For Plutarch, changes that have happened throughout the history of the festivals have been due to popular influence. He aligns popular culture with newness, and elite literary culture with oldness. Philostratus, somewhat differently, uses the tension between old and new at the festivals to explore questions of Greek identity in his Life of Apollonius of Tyana. In the Life, Apollonius encounters people in his travels through the oikoumene who have varying degrees of knowledge of Greek culture, often evidenced by their knowledge of Greek festivals (or lack thereof). He also encounters Greeks who are not celebrating their festivals in the old and proper way, and attempts to correct them. Both Plutarch and Philostratus locate the correct celebration of festivals in the past, and

---

2 ηὔξη/σαν πρὸς τὰς τῶν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἡμέρας δὲ ἔκαθεν τῆς ἡμέρας ἕως τρίακοντα, IGSK Stratonikeia I 309 l. 17-19. The inscription does not say what events were added to the extra days of the festival. The benefactors are Claudius Ulpius Aelius Asklepiades and Ulpia Aelia Plautilla. Female benefaction was common at the Panamaria in Stratonikeia.
both are interested in the ways in which festivals could be more closely aligned with these past celebrations. Philostratus has an additional interest in the way that Greek festivals read to Greeks and non-Greeks. Understanding the fundamental importance of the repetition of the festival, the cyclical timing and the set order of the competitions, is essential to reading a Greek festival correctly. Over and over again, this is a point which characters in the Life fail to grasp, and it is these moments of misreading of festivals that Philostratus uses to delineate what it means to be Greek under Roman rule.

5.1 Terminology

Contests had various ways of distinguishing between old and new drama. The terms used for actors and poets of tragedy, comedy, and satyr-play in the imperial-era inscriptions are laid out in Table 2 (at the end of this chapter). Sometimes, the competition for new tragedy or comedy is marked simply by a prize for "poet of tragedy" (ποιητής τραγῳδίας) or "poet of comedy" (ποιητής κωμῳδίας). In other cases, the prize might be awarded to a "poet of new tragedy" (τραγῳδίας καινῆς ποιητής) or "poet of new comedy" (κωμῳδίας καινῆς ποιητής). This is distinct from New Comedy, i.e. Menander. New comedy in the sense of newly-written comedy is kainos, whereas New Comedy in the sense of Menandrian comedy is neos in Greek epigraphy of the Roman period. "Poet of tragedy" and "poet of new tragedy" are two ways of referring to the same thing, that is, poet of newly-composed tragedy.³

³ Both new and old plays were a regular part of the program of the Dionysia in Athens from the 4th century through the Hellenistic period. The standard term for old drama (tragedy or comedy) on the didaskalia in Athens is palaios: for example, one Neoptolemus won with Euripides' Orestes in 341/0 BCE: palaiāi: Νεοπτόλεμος[ζ] / Ὀρέστης Εὐριπίδο (IG II² 2320 l. 20). Competitions in old tragedy were introduced at the Dionysia in Athens in 387/6, and old comedy in 340/39 BCE (IG II² 2318 l. 201-3 and 316-18). Cf. Nervegna (2007) 15 n. 4.
The standard term for an actor of old tragedy in imperial Greek epigraphy was τραγῳδός, and for an actor of old comedy, κωμῳδός. In earlier Greek, τραγῳδός had a wide range of meanings, including "member of a tragic chorus," "tragic poet," and "performer of tragedy." Nervegna, however, has demonstrated that the meaning of the word narrowed over time, at least in epigraphic sources. For example, while all the members of a troupe of tragic performers (three actors, one aulete, and one didaskalos) are called tragoidoi on lists of performers at the Soteria at Delphi during the third century BCE, this broad use of the term had fallen out of practice by the 1st c. BCE. Looking more closely at the Boiotian evidence, we can see that tragoidos must mean "actor of old tragedy" and not simply "tragic actor." One first century BCE victory list for the Amphiaraia and Rhomaia at Oropos includes tragoidoi, komoidoi, poets of tragedy and comedy, and actors (ὑποκριταί).

4 Hesychius glosses τραγῳδός as χορευτής and τραγῳδεῖν as χορεύειν (Hesychius 1238-39).
5 Nervegna (2007) 14-42.
7 IG VII 416 l. 21-30.
poet of tragedy: Hermokrates son of Alexandros, Milesian  actor: Charias son of Charias, Athenian
poet of comedy: Ariston son of Poes, Athenian  actor: Straton son of Isidotos, Athenian

In this inscription, the actors are listed to the right of the winning poets, suggesting that the hypokritai were the lead actors in the new dramas. Only the leading actor in a play was awarded a prize, whether the play was newly written or a re-performed. If newly written, a prize went to the poet and to the lead actor in the winning play; if a re-performance, the prize was awarded to the lead actor. The fact that there are no poets alongside the tragoidos and komoidos indicate that they were performing old drama. The victory lists of the Charitesia at Orchomenos provide further evidence of this: tragoidoi, komoidoi, tragic and comic poets, and their leading actors are recorded. The tragoidoi and komoidoi must have been distinct, then, from the actors of new tragedy and new comedy. In the 2nd c. CE, the Mouseia at Thespiae had a competition for tragoidos of old tragedy and komoidos of old comedy, curiously redundant terms. 8

While the types of competitions and the order in which they were presented tended to remain constant, the particular terms used for competitions often change from year to year. In another victory list for the Amphiarai and Rhomaia at Oropos, from the same time period as the victory list above (80-50 BCE), the terminology for the contests is different. 9

8 I. Thespiai 177, 178.
9 IG VII 420 l. 23-36.
poet of satyr-play: Philoxenides son of Philippos, Oropian
actor of old tragedy: Philokrates son of Theophantos, Theban
actor of old comedy: Zoilos son of Zoilos, Syracusan
poet of new tragedy: Protarchos son of Antimenes, Theban
actor: Philokrates son of Theophantos, Theban
poet of new comedy: Chionnes son of Diogeitondes, Theban
actor: Polyxenos son of Andrytas, Opountian

In this list, the inscribers have attempted to make the names of the dramatic contests more parallel with one another. While the previous victory lists have competitions for poet of satyr-play, tragoidos, komoidos, poet of tragedy, and poet of comedy, in this case the tragoidos is instead called τραγῳδίας παλαιᾶς ύποκριτῆς (l. 25), the komoidos is called κωμῳδίας παλαιᾶς ύποκριτῆς (l. 27), and the poets are not called simply "poet of tragedy" and "poet of comedy" but "poet of new tragedy" and "poet of new comedy," τραγῳδίας καινῆς ποιητῆς (l. 29) and κωμῳδίας καινῆς ποιητῆς (l. 33). Poets of satyr-play are never said to be poets of new satyr-play, presumably because there were not competitions in re-performed satyr-play. This may have had a visually pleasing effect on the inscription, as each dramatic competition (with the exception of satyr-play) has been extended to three words, making these lines of roughly equal length. Or perhaps the Oropians wanted to emphasize that their festival included competitions in old and new drama, and therefore chose to write out the terms παλαιά and καινή where it had before been implied.

5.2 Old and New Plays on the Greek stage

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the epigraphic evidence for the imperial Greek theater is that inscriptions preserve evidence of the continued composition of new tragedies and comedies into at least the 2nd century CE. Accounts of the theater in imperial Greek literary
sources, which stress the decline of contemporary drama, have led some to (wrongly) conclude that there were no new compositions of plays, or even performances of drama at all. In the 2nd century CE, a satirist wrote that "the production of tragedies and comedies has ceased (ἐκλέλειπται)." Read alongside the epigraphic evidence, which so clearly shows that there were new dramas being written and performed in the imperial period, we should not take this passage to mean that there were no new plays, but that there were fewer at a given festival than there had been at the classical Athenian Dionysia.

Lucian poses a similar difficulty when he has Lycinus, a defender of pantomime, say that the actor "holds himself responsible for his voice only, for poets took care of the rest a long time ago." Lucian's text, On Pantomime, is a humorous exaggeration of the perfection of the pantomimic body contrasted with the grotesque of the tragic actor. Nobody reading Lucian at the time would have taken his meaning to be that there were no contemporary tragedies. His audience would have understood that the actor whom he satirizes is a tragoidos, an actor of old tragedy. Lucian uses neither tragoidos nor hypokrites to refer to this actor, but anthropos. Nor is this actor named; he is stripped of all identity, merely a man behind a mask. This is part of Lucian's rhetorical strategy to delegitimize tragic acting in favor of pantomime, the tragic dance. The fact that Lucian is making an argument for the superiority of pantomime over tragic acting explains why he focuses on the acting of old tragedy rather than the acting of new tragedy. For Lucian, pantomime is the contemporary art form on the Greek stage, tragedy made modern.

Contrasting pantomime to old tragedy allows him to make this contrast, as pantomime is clearly newer than old tragedy. Furthermore, he wants to make pantomime appear more respectable,

---

11 Ps-Lucian, Encomium to Demosthenes 27: καὶ τὸ Διονύσῳ τὸ μὲν ποιήσαι κωμῳδίας ἢ τραγῳδίας ἐκλέλειπται.
12 On Pantomime 27-32: καὶ μόνης τῆς φωνῆς ὑπεδόθουν παρέχον ἑαυτῶν· τὰ γὰρ άλλα τῶν ποιητῶν ἐμέλησεν πρὸ πολλοῦ ποτὲ γενομένοις.
more elegant and orderly, than acted tragedy. For this reason, he attacks the most respected form of tragedy, i.e. old tragedy. Because new tragedy was valued less than old tragedy, as we will see shortly, if he can show pantomime to be superior to old tragedy, he will have implicitly demonstrated that pantomime is also superior to new tragedy. New tragedy is written out of Lucian's account not because it did not exist, but because it does not fit his rhetorical purpose.

The balance between re-performed and contemporary drama at the imperial Greek festivals may be determined by examining lists of victors. The highest concentration of victory lists is from Boiotia, though they are also found elsewhere, so Boiotian festivals will be over-represented in the data (table 2). Looking only at festivals where the complete dramatic program is known (the Soteria at Acraephia, the Charitesia at Orchomenos, the Homoloia at Orchomenos, the Amphiaraia and Rhomaia at Oropos, the Sarapieia at Tanagra, the contest at Thebes, the Mouseia at Thespiae, "the musical contest of those from the synod" at Aphrodisias, the unknown contest at Aphrodisias, and the Lysimacheia at Aphrodisias), we can see that all contests with new drama also have contests for old drama. There are no instances of festivals with contests for new drama without contests for old drama. It is unlikely that festivals which did not have competitions in new drama specifically excluded it, and more likely that they simply had fewer dramatic competitions. If a festival had one dramatic competition, it would be for re-performed tragedy; if two, for re-performed tragedy and comedy. Satyr-plays seem to always have been newly written; that is, there is no epigraphic evidence of re-performed satyr-play in the Roman period.

The evidence for the content of imperial Greek drama, both re-performed drama and newly composed drama, is maddeningly elusive, because the practice of recording the titles of the winning plays on victory lists stopped in the 2nd century BCE. The evidence that we have for
the content of re-performed comedy in a festival context all points to Menander. However, the evidence is so thin on this point that we cannot rule out the possibility that non-Menandrian comedies were re-performed in the imperial period. That Menander remained popular on the Greek stage throughout the Roman period can also be supported by literary accounts, such as Plutarch’s discussion of the popularity of Menander at banquets, at readings, in textual instruction, and at dramatic competitions. A few inscriptions are of some meager help in this respect. An epitaph from Athens from the 2nd century CE refers to the performance of Menander by festival competitors.

I.1 τῆςδε Μενανδρείων ἐπέων δεδακτοῦ πάσας
2 τοῦξας ευιέροις ἁγιαν ἐν θυμέλαις
3 ἐκτέρισαν θεράποντες ἀερσίφρονος Διονύσου
4 αὐτοὶ κισσοφόρωι τοῦτο χαριζόμενοι.
5 τοιγάρ οἱ Βρόμιω Παρθήνῃ τε νεόι μεμέλησθε
6 δευάμονοι γεράων μὴ παρανεῖσθε τάφον,
7 ἄλλα παραστείχοντες ἡ σύνομα κλεινὸν ὀμαρτή
8 βοστρέετ’ ἡ ῥαδινᾶς συμπλαταγείτε χέρας.
8a vacat
9 προσεννέπω Στράτωνα καὶ τιμῶ κρότωι.
II.10 Κύιντος Μάρκιος
11 Στράτων καὶ Κύιν-
12 τος Μάρκιος Τιτία-
13 νὸς Χολλείδαι κω-
14 μοιδοὶ περιοδονεῖ-
15 καὶ.

The servants of heart-cheering Dionysus have buried here the one who knew all the artifices of the poetry (epoi) of Menander, splendid on the sacred stages, giving this as a gift to the ivy-wreathed one. So you young men who care about Bromios (Dionysus) and Paphia (Aphrodite), do not pass by the tomb which lacks gifts, but as you pass by, call upon this famous name together, or clap your slender hands.

I call Straton by name and I honor (him) with a clap.

---

13 On the status of Athenian comedy, including both Menander and Aristophanes, in the Roman Empire: Marshall and Hawkins (2016).
14 Nervegna (2013) is structured around this passage, Plutarch 854A.
Quintus Marcus Straton and Quintus Marcus Titianus, (of the deme) Cholleidai,\textsuperscript{15} komoidoi, circuit-victors.\textsuperscript{16} Straton was buried by his fellow komoidoi, presumably members of the Technitai of Dionysus, who have honored him by commemorating his expertise in acting Menander. The erectors of the tomb, Straton and Titianus, have cleverly made those who pass by the tomb both spectators and actors, as they are to clap and say the line, "I call Straton by name and I honor (him) with a clap," in iambic trimeter, like a line from Menandrian comedy.\textsuperscript{17}

Another inscription, from the 1st or 2nd century CE from Hierapolis Kastabala in Cilicia, attests to the continued composition of Menandrian-style comedy:

\begin{verbatim}
1 Ὄνησικλέα Διοδώρου
2 ἐπῶν καὶ κωμῳδίας τῆς νέας
3 ιαμβιδόν ποιητὴν καὶ λόγον
4 ἐγκωμιαστικῶν συγγραφέα,
5 νομικὸν ἐν τοῖς ἀρίστοις·
6 οἰ φίλοι τὸν προστάτην
7 τειμὴς ένεκα.\textsuperscript{18}
\end{verbatim}

Onesicles son of Diodorus, poet of epic and iambics of New Comedy, and composer of encomiastic speeches, outstanding lawyer. His friends (honor) their protector for the sake of his honor.

The word for "new" here is *neos*, not *kainos*: *kainos* is used for newly-composed comedies and tragedies in imperial-era inscriptions, while *neos* is reserved for "New Comedy" in the sense of Menander.\textsuperscript{19} However, Onesicles may not have composed plays for festival performance. No festival victories are listed in the inscription. The fact that his plays are imitations of New Comedy, and that his legal profession is named (i.e. he was not a professional poet), suggests

\textsuperscript{15} For the deme Cholleidai, see Traill (1975) 46.
\textsuperscript{16} IG II\textsuperscript{2} 12664.
\textsuperscript{17} With thanks to Emilio Capettini for pointing this out to me.
\textsuperscript{18} Hicks (1890) 249 no. 23. Translation adapted from Rusten and Henderson (2011) no. 46.
\textsuperscript{19} Rusten and Henderson (2011) follow Hicks (1890) in suggesting that Onesicles composed comedies in the style of New Comedy (i.e. Menander): "The nonstandard phrase 'iambics of new [neas rather than kaines 'contemporary'] comedy' might suggest nonperformed literary compositions. (Cf. Antonius Diogenes described as 'poet of past [palaias = revived rather than archaias 'Old'] comedy' in Photius, Bibliotheca Cod. 166 111A; Jones [1993] 50 n. 27" (Rusten and Henderson [2011] 730).
that his plays were literary exercises.

Re-performed tragedy seems to have been primarily Euripides, but again, we cannot rule out the possibility that other drama (even Hellenistic tragedy) was re-performed. The Technitai appear to have maintained their own library, which may have included the texts of old plays: in 141/2 CE, the Dionysiac Technitai honored Titus Aelius Alcibiades of Nysa for his bequest of a library to the Technitai in Rome, where they maintained a temenos for Hadrian. Alcibiades "adorned the temple of the Technitai from the whole world in Rome with marvelous books" (ἐτι καὶ βιβλίοις θαυμαστοῖ(ξ)/ [ἐπεκ]ό[ς]μησεν τὸ ἱερὸν ἐπὶ Ρώμης τέμενος/ [τῶν] ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης τεχνειτῶν). We do not know what these books were, but surely they were books that would have been relevant to the Technitai. It is certainly tempting to think that what he gave to the Technitai was a library of poetic, musical, and dramatic texts. This raises many interesting and perhaps unanswerable questions. Did it include texts of Hellenistic tragedy? Was he adding to a pre-existing library owned by the Technitai? What other books did they have at their disposal? To what extent did the education of an actor involve learning the texts of ancient drama? There may be precedent for a theatrical library in Rome, even before the library of the Technitai. Poets and actors in Rome were granted the Temple of Minerva in 207 BCE, and Affleck has argued that this included a library of dramatic texts, possibly funded by a patron. Writing about the use of specialized libraries by various groups of craftsmen (doctors, lawyers, and writers and actors), Martinez and Senseney point out that the collegium poetarum had a

---

20 SEG 4-418 l. 16-18.
21 Houston in König et al. (2013) discusses the sizes of various libraries in the Greek and Roman world, stressing the necessity for selectivity in libraries with limited space (187). Perhaps it is overly ambitious to think that the Technitai would have had space in their library for more than Euripides and Menander.
22 Affleck in König et al. (2013) 133-5, who suggests M. Fulvius Nobilior as a possible patron of the library. Affleck wants to explain how Plautus accessed Greek plays, given his poverty, and concludes that he must have had access to a library of plays housed in the Temple of Minerva. Casson (2001) 110 ff. discusses private donations of libraries more broadly.
library in the Temple of Hercules Musarum in Rome, "which acquired copies of theatrical works 
that its members could have accessed for inspiration, emulation or outright copying."23 In all of 
these cases, the library seems to be maintained by a group of craftsmen, organized in a synod or 
collegium, and housed in a temple. The existence of specialized libraries for Roman actors and 
poets suggests that Alcibiades' gift was an addition to a library maintained by the Technitai, 
which its members would have had access to for learning lines, copying plays for performance, 
and for the composition of new plays.

The scholarly discourse on re-performed tragedy in the imperial period has centered not 
on what the texts of the performance were, but on the way in which these plays were performed. 
Only actors of old tragedy are called tragoidoi, as we have seen above, while actors of new 
tragedy are called hypokritai. The question is whether a tragoidos was someone who put on 
performances of entire tragedies from the classical canon, performed excerpts from old tragedies, 
or sang the lyric sections from tragedies.24 When used with a form of ὑποκρίνω, τραγῳδός must 
mean a tragic actor. However, sometimes a verb of singing is used, pointing to the fact that some 
tragic performances in the imperial period consisted of sung "highlights" of old plays.25

If tragoidoi were singers of lyric sections of old tragedies, we would expect them to have 
trained as singers and perhaps to have competed in other singing categories, as cross-
specialization in categories which required a similar skill set was common in the imperial period.

---

23 Martinez and Senseney in König et al. (2013) 406.
24 This question is not new: Richards (1900) 201-14 collects many sources (including the Boiotian victory 
lists as well as literary sources from the 5th c. BCE to the 2nd c. CE) relating to the uses of tragoidos and 
komoidos, attempting to determine the precise meaning of the terms. He concludes that tragoidos and 
komoidos never meant "actor of tragedy/comedy" in Classical Attic Greek, but only in postclassical 
Greek outside of Attica (210), that the meaning "poet" is only attested in the 2nd c. CE, and that the more 
typical usage is not of people (the tragedian/comedian) but of the event (e.g. "at the tragedies," "at the 
comedies"). His primary interest is in the use of tragoidos and komoidos in 5th and 4th c. BCE Attic 
Greek.
25 Hall in Easterling and Hall (2002) 3-38. The LSJ judiciously combines these two possible meanings of 
τραγῳδός: "performer (actor and singer) of tragedy."
In an article on the specialization of Dionysiac artists, Angelos Chaniotis provides a table in which he lists what specialties are known to have been combined by festival performers.\(^\text{26}\) We find several examples from the 2nd century BCE of *tragoidoi* and *komoidoi* also winning as ϊδοι,\(^\text{27}\) and two examples from the 1\(^{st}\) c BCE.\(^\text{28}\) Additionally, there are a few examples of *tragoidoi* and *komoidoi* competing as kitharodes (singers to the kithara) in the imperial period.\(^\text{29}\)

The emperor Nero also competed as a *tragoidos* and as a kitharode, but he is clearly exceptional. This does not prove that all *tragoidoi* were singers, but it suggests that at least some of them were.

That Greek tragedy involved both spoken and sung parts in the Roman period may be demonstrated by a recently published epitaph for a tragic actor, Euelpistus of Byzantium, from Tomis from the second half of the 2nd c. CE. While Euelpistus does not cite specific victories, he claims to have won in festivals: "I was not slow in virtue nor uninitiated in crowns. But I learned to carry wreaths on my temples, which the divine Muse gave to me in every land" (οὐ βραδύς εἰς ἀρετάν οὐδ’ εἰς <σ>τε|φάνους ἀμπόητος· ἀλλ’ ἐδὰν μὲν ἐγ|ὸ χροτάφοις ἔπ’ ἐμοῖσι φορῆσαι στέμμαθ’, ἄ μοι πόρε Μοῦσα θεᾶ κατά γαῖν ἀ|πασαν, l. 3-7). Euelpistus then claims, "I recited the tragic line well, and I sang it well" (ἐὖ μὲν ἀπανγέλλων τραγικὸν στίχον, ἐὖ δὲ ἄείδουν, l. 7-8).\(^\text{30}\) We do not know whether Euelpistus performed contemporary tragedy or old tragedy, though Avram and Jones have noticed allusions to Euripides and Aeschylus in his epitaph. They suggest that Εὐναχίας in l. 1 is an allusion to Ps-Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound* 589-90, where Io is called Inachian. In l. 10, they read τέκνοιο γονήν as an allusion to Euripides, *Medea* 1136,

\(^{26}\) Chaniotis (1990) 89-108, esp. Table 2.
\(^{27}\) Stephanæs 253, 254, 583, 794, 2219.
\(^{28}\) Stephanæs 29 and 1339.
\(^{29}\) Stephanæs 2820 (2nd / 3rd c. CE, Bassos of Miletus), 3011 (1st / 2nd c. CE, no name), 3018 (2nd / 3rd c. CE, no name).
\(^{30}\) Avram and Jones (2011) 126-134; Staab (2011) 97-102.
τέκνων σὸν δίπτυχος γονή. On the basis of these two possible allusions, they suggest that Euelpistus may have written his own epitaph, because a tragic actor would have been familiar with the texts of classical tragedy. 31 These allusions may suggest that he is referring to performances of old tragedy. Of course, we cannot rule out the possibility that he performed in both contemporary and old tragedy during his career, so while the epitaph suggests that there were spoken and sung parts in tragedy at this time, this is not clear evidence against the idea that all old tragic performance consisted of sung lyric. If Avram and Jones are correct in their observation of the Aeschylean allusion, this would challenge the assumption that all re-performed drama was Euripidean, for why would Euelpistus, a professional actor, have known the plays of Aeschylus if not because he had learned them for performance?

Because only eight lines of Greek drama from the imperial period have survived, it is impossible to know what newly composed tragedies, comedies, and satyr-plays were like. What we can say is how contemporary drama and dramatists were represented. One tragic poet from the 2nd c. CE, Gaius Julius Longianus, is praised in a collection of three honorific decrees inscribed in Aphrodisias in 127 CE. 32 Text (i) is a decree of an unidentified city. It is too fragmentary to translate, but line 2 mentions recitations (διὰ τὰς ἀκρό[ασις]), presumably of Longianus' poetry. Text (ii) is a decree of Halicarnassus, and text (iii) is a decree of the Technitai of Dionysus. 33 Longianus was a citizen of Aphrodisias, which is why all three decrees were inscribed in his home city. Longianus wrote tragedies (τραγῳδίων ποιής, text [iii] l. 6), and probably other types of poetry as well: the decree of Halicarnassus says that he "gave

31 Avram and Jones (2011) 126-134.
32 MAMA VIII 418.
33 The three texts were inscribed on the same stone, but Roueché suspects not at the same time, because they are not aligned.
demonstrations of poetry of every kind, and the first decree mentions recitations. It seems likely that these demonstrations and recitations were of his non-dramatic poetry, though it is possible that he performed some excerpts from his plays as well. That he was honored by the Technitai suggests that they performed his plays in festival competitions. The decrees of Halicarnassus and the Technitai both present Longianus as one who will educate the youth, in the present and future, through his poetry and the statues of him. Both decrees also include some mention of his skill: the Halicarnasseans say that he "delighted (εὔφρανεν) the older and improved (ὡφέλησεν) the younger," while the Technitai praise his eloquence (λογιότητα).

For the Technitai, the skill and education of the poet reflects back on the synod, enhancing its reputation. The Halicarnasseans are primarily interested in representing Longianus' poetry as valuable for education, but the verb εὔφραίνω suggests pleasure as well. The decree of Halicarnassus, unlike the decree of the Technitai, repeatedly sets Longianus next to the authors of classical antiquity: Longianus, recently made a citizen of Halicarnassus, will stand in bronze next to the most famous Halicarnassean, "ancient Herodotus," and his books archived in the library of Halicarnassus with "the writings of the ancients." This juxtaposition of ancient and modern makes Longianus part of a tradition of Greek writers who are worthy of being housed in libraries and used to educate young men, but the specific juxtaposition of Longianus and Herodotus makes Longianus a part of the local history of Halicarnassus. The Halicarnasseans have claimed him as their own.

5.3 Valuing Oldness

34 ποιημάτων παντοδαπῶν ἐπιδείξεως, MAMA VIII 418 ii l. 2.
35 MAMA VIII 418 ii l. 3-4.
36 MAMA VIII 418 iii l. 8.
Some inscriptions record the prizes that were awarded in various competitions, and from these we can see how different competitions were valued relative to one another. All of the imperial-era prize lists are compiled in Tables 3 through 9 (at the end of this chapter). In these tables, the prizes are ranked by amount (highest to lowest prize); in the inscriptions, the prizes are not ranked from highest to lowest but listed in the order in which the competitions would have occurred. In terms of prize amounts, tragedy is always valued above comedy, and comedy above satyr-play. Satyr-play ranks at the bottom of the dramatic competitions, with the lowest prize amount awarded to the poet of satyr-play, and typically, no prize allotted for the actors. Furthermore, re-performed drama gets higher prize amounts than new drama (i.e. re-performed tragedy is awarded higher prizes than newly composed tragedy, and re-performed comedy is awarded higher prizes than newly-composed comedy). The only exception is the Lysimacheia at Aphrodisias (Table 9), where the actors of re-performed tragedy and comedy were awarded the same amount (1500 denarii).

This holds true in the inscription relating to the endowment of the Sarapieia at Tanagra, though the accounting is more complicated.\(^\text{37}\) This inscription records the incredibly detailed accounting for the festival, and sets prize amounts in precise ratios to one another, a calculation which William Slater has explained.\(^\text{38}\) At this festival, there are four first-prize levels: 168 3/4 Attic silver drachmas, 135 drachmas, 112 1/2 drachmas, and 101 1/4 drachmas, all multiples of 11 ¼ drachmas. If we calculate the difference between these prize amounts, we can see that the differences between the prizes are in the ratio 3:2:1.

1. 168 ¾ dr. = 15 x 11 ¼ dr.
2. 135 dr. = 12 x 11 ¼ dr. = (15 x 11 ¼ dr.) - (3 x 11 ¼ dr.)

\(^\text{37}\) IG VII 540 (upper fragment); SEG 9-335 and 25-501; Mette (1977) IIC 2; Roller (1989) 110-112, no. 92; Manieri Tan. 2.
3. \( 112 \frac{1}{2} \text{ dr.} = 10 \times 11 \frac{1}{4} \text{ dr.} = (12 \times 11 \frac{1}{4} \text{ dr.}) - (2 \times 11 \frac{1}{4} \text{ dr.}) \)

4. \( 101 \frac{1}{4} \text{ dr.} = 9 \times 11 \frac{1}{4} \text{ dr.} = (10 \times 11 \frac{1}{4} \text{ dr.}) - (1 \times 11 \frac{1}{4} \text{ dr.}) \)

While the first prizes for poet of new tragedy, poet of new comedy, and *komoidos* were at the same level, 135 drachmas, the festival organizers have differentiated between the relative value of each of these competitions by awarding different second prizes. We can, therefore, rank the dramatic competition prizes from highest to lowest value, taking into account both the first-prize amount and the second-prize amount.

1. *tragoidos* (first prize 168 \(\frac{3}{4}\) dr., second prize 50 dr.)
2. poet of new tragedy (first prize 135 dr., second prize 50 dr.)
3. *komoidos* (first prize 135 dr., second prize 40 dr.)
4. poet of new comedy (first prize 135 dr., no second prize)

Even when working with a less flexible system of prize amounts than festivals which did not set their prizes in such ratios, the festival organizers of the Sarapieia have made sure to award re-performed drama higher prizes than newly-written drama. Furthermore, old tragedy is the only dramatic competition with the first prize set at the highest level at the festival. Since the prizes were awarded not in money but in gold crowns, this difference in the value of the prize would have been visually represented in the size or fullness of the crown (assuming that a crown of a heavier weight of gold would have also appeared larger).

The fact that actors of re-performed tragedy and comedy (*tragoidoi* and *komoidoi*) were awarded higher prizes than actors of newly composed tragedy and comedy might suggest that they were also of higher status. If this were true, we would expect actors of old tragedy and old comedy to appear more frequently in honorific inscriptions than other dramatic specialists. Although the data is very limited, this does seem to be the case. Of the 14 honorific inscriptions
from the 1st c. BCE to the 3rd c. CE for dramatic specialists (actors and poets of tragedy, comedy, and, in theory, satyr-play), six are for komoidoi, 39 five are for tragoidoi, 40 two are for poets of tragedy, 41 and only one is for a hypokrites (actor) whose precise specialty is not noted. 42 There are no honorific inscriptions for actors or poets of satyr-play. 43

5.4 Displaying Oldness

One fascinating example of the attempt to represent the ancientness of festivals is the use of Boiotian dialect rather than koine in a victory list for the Charitesia at Orchomenos in the first century BCE. 44 Commentators generally agree that the purpose of this use of this archaic dialect was to add some kind of solemnity and antique glory to the remembrance of the festival: Boeckh thought it was the expression of a local nationalistic movement, 45 while for Reisch, its purpose was to add an archaic solemnity to the festival. 46 Manieri agrees that the use of dialect was meant to add solemnity to the occasion, and adds that this may have been done on the model of the Agrionia in Orchomenos, where use of the local dialect was standard for victory lists. While it is true that the inscriptions relating to the Agrionia employ features of Boiotian dialect, such as a-

39 Komoidoi: Rufus of Rhodes (IG XII 1.84, Rhodes, 1st c. CE); T. Flavius Sarpedon, Akmonean and Ephesian, child komoidos (IGSK Ephesos V 1606, 117-211 CE); Titus Aelius Auphelius Apollonius, citizen of Tarsus and Athens (IG III 120, Athens, 138-161 CE); Marcus Julius Sophron (SEG 35-1381, Phrygian Hierapolis, 2nd/3rd c. CE); Marcus Aurelius Philoxenos, komoidos and herald (IGSK Side im Altertum II 130, after 212 CE); Publius Publilius Ingenuus, comoedus (IGSK Parion 12, imperial).

40 Tragoidoi: Gaius Julius Julianus (IGSK Smyrna II 1.656, Sparta, copy of a decree of Smyrna, Augustan age); Gaius Aelius Themison (Broncner [1953] 192, Miletus, 2nd c. CE); Bassus of Miletus, tragoidos and herald (I. Didyma 256, 1st/2nd c. CE); Bassus, tragoidos and herald (Vollgraf [1919] 258-60, Argos, 2nd/3rd c. CE); Marcus Aurelius Nikephoros, Cyzican, child tragoidos (IGSK Ephesos 3814, Ephesus, after 212 CE).

41 Poets of tragedy: Pompeius Capito (IG II 1.3800, Athens, 1st c. CE); Gaius Julius Longianus (Roueché [1993] no. 88, Aphrodisias, 127 CE).


43 The closest we come to this is an honorific inscription for a satyr-dancer, Aemilianus Geminus, from Amastris from 155 CE (SEG 35-1327).

44 IG VII 3195.

45 CIG 1583.

46 Reisch (1885) 116 no. 1.
vocalism and the 2nd declension genitive singular in -ω (though not the use of digamma), most of them date to the 3rd century BCE, and only three to the 3rd or 2nd century BCE.\textsuperscript{47} So while the Agrionia may have provided a model for this inscription for the Charitesia, the authors of the Charitesia inscription have gone much farther in their use of dialect, and are doing it at a time when it was highly unusual to be writing in anything other than koine.\textsuperscript{48}

\begin{verbatim}
Μνασίνω ἀρχοντος, ἄγωνο-
θετίοντος τῶν Ἑληκείων
Εὐάριος τῷ Πάντωνος, τύδε ἐνίκοσαν τὰ Ἑληκείσια:

5  σαλιγκτάς
Φιλίνος Φιλίνω Αθανείος
κάρουξ
Εἰρώδας Σωκράτιος Θειβείος
ποειτάς

10  Μήστωρ Μήστορος Φωκαίος
ῥαγμυδός
Κράτων Κλίνων Θειβειός
αὐλειτάς
Περιγένεις Ἡρακλίδαο Κουζικηνός

15  αὐλαμυδός
Δαμήντως Γλαύκω Αργίος
κιθαριστάς
Ἀγέλοχος Ἀσκλαπιογένιος Αἰολεύς ἀπὸ Μουρίνας
κιθαραβύδος

20  Δαμάτριος Ἀμαλωὼς Αἰολεύς ἀπὸ Μουρίνας
τραγμυδός
Ἀσκλαπιοδόρος Πουθέαο Ταραντίνος
κομαμυδός
Νικόστρατος Φιλοστράτω Θειβείος

25  τὰ ἐπίνικαι κομαμυδός
Ἐὐάρχος Εἰροδότῳ Κορωνεύς.
\end{verbatim}

In the archonship of Mnasinos, when agonothete of the Chariteisia was Euarios son of Panton, these won the Chariteisia:

trumpeter

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{47} Manieri collects the Agrionia inscriptions, Manieri Orc. 2-22. \textsuperscript{48} Though there are other examples of archaizing dialects in epigraphic sources. On the archaizing use of Doric in Hadrianic inscriptions at the temple of Artemis in Sparta: Woodward (1929) 43. As at Orchomenos, the archaizing inscriptions were displayed alongside contemporary inscriptions in koine. Cf. Swain (1996) 74.}
Philinos son of Philinos, Athenian
herald
Heirodas son of Sokrates, Theban
epic poet
Mestor son of Mestor, Phokian
rhapsode
Kraton son of Klion, Theban
aulete
Perigenes son of Herakleides, Cyzican
aulodos
Damenetos son of Glaukos, Argive
kitharist
Agelochos son of Asklapiogeneis, Aeolian from Myrina
kitharode
Damatrios son of Hamaloios, Aeolian from Myrina
tragoidos
Asklepiodoros son of Pytheas, Tarantine
komoidos
Nikostratos son of Philostratos, Theban
for the epinician, the komoidos
Euarchos son of Heirodotos, Koronean

The Boiotian dialectical features in this inscription are as follows: 49

1. 2nd declension genitive singular in -ω: Μνασίνω (l. 1), τῶ (l. 3), Φιλίνω (l. 6),
   Φιλοστράτω (l. 24)

2. nominative plural masculine τοίδε (l. 3) for τοίδε. This is the typical Boiotian form from
   the 3rd c BC, by which time οι had been monophthongized to υ. 50

3. a-vocalism: κάρους for κήρυξ (l. 7)

4. [e:] written ευ: Εἰρώδας, Θείβειος (l. 8, 12, 24), ποειτάς (l.9), αὐλειτάς (l. 13), Εἰροδότω
   (l. 26)

5. intervocalic digamma: ῥωσαρυδός (l.11), κιθαραφυδός (l.19), τραγαφυδός (l.21),
   κωμαφυδός (l. 23).

50 On Boiotian monophthongization of diphongs, see Buck (1955) 153, Colvin (1999) 132, and Miller
The inscribers are consistent in their application of dialect: if they use υ for οι they do so in every place that οι would appear. Likewise for ει representing [e:], and intervocalic digamma between α and υ (where υ represents οι: intervocalic digamma is not used between α and υ where υ does not represent οι, as in ούλειτάς or ούλαφυδός).

While word-initial digamma is common in the Orchomenos inscriptions in the 3rd century BC, intervocalic digamma appears only once, in a very short, undated inscription: ἐπὶ Βακεύαυ/ ἐπὶ Δέξσον. Here the digamma occurs between υ and α (in the reverse of the -αφυδός compounds). A Boiotian inscription from Koroneia from about 150 BCE has "τραγαμφωδία/ [ον ποειτάς κή σατο]ύρων," suggesting that less than 100 years before, τραγαμφωδός and possibly other -αφυδός compounds were still in use. The use of υ for οι in Boiotian is standard in the epigraphy from Orchomenos from the third century BCE until the adoption of koine, when it stops. The same is true of the Boiotian masculine genitive singular in -ω, which is extremely common in the 3rd century BCE, and stops with the adoption of koine.

This list of victors is not an "accurate" representation of Boiotian dialect, but a hodgepodge of archaising features. In some places, the inscribers chose not to use the old forms. They form all patronymics with the genitive singular of the father's name, not the patronymic adjective (as in earlier Boiotian inscriptions). Additionally, there is no intervocalic digamma in ποειτάς (l. 9), though in early Boiotian inscriptions this would actually have been expected. We can only speculate as to how the inscribers of this document came upon the dialectical features which they use here. They would have had access to many more inscriptions than survive today, and it is possible that earlier victory lists for the Charitesia used forms such as τραγαμφωδός. As

---

51 e.g. IG VII 3166-8, 3171-4, 3179-80, 3187, 3193, 3198-9, 3200-1, 3203-4, 3206.
52 IG VII 3229.
54 For Boiotian patronymics, see Morpurgo-Davies (1968) 86-7. Boiotian used patronymic adjectives, except when the father's name was a patronymic, in which case the genitive was used.
Manieri suggests, they would also have had access to victory lists in dialect in nearby Boiotian cities. It is also likely that people in Orchomenos were familiar with Boiotian poetry in dialect (e.g. Corinna), most of which is entirely lost to us. If Boiotian was known for exceptional retention of digamma, it seems likely that the digamma was chosen both for its archaism and for its particularly Boiotian flavor. While the inscription may be seen as a moment of archaism, it can also be seen as innovative and experimental: Orchomenos did not adopt this archaising dialect in other victory lists for the Charitesia, evidenced by the fact that two more lists from shortly afterwards are in koine.\(^{55}\)

5.5 Old, New, and Greek Identity in the Literary Imagination

The proper celebration of festivals, and the anxiety about whether contemporary festivals have changed and are therefore not being celebrated properly, is a theme that occurs repeatedly in imperial Greek literature. One interesting aspect of the discussion of dramatic festivals in Greek literature is the negotiation of the tension between the literary disparagement of the theater and the idea that part of being Greek involved celebrating festivals properly, including dramatic festivals. Plutarch and Philostratus are interested in the ways in which festivals were "originally" celebrated, and comparing those imagined celebrations with contemporary festival culture. Even ancient competitions can be accused of being too new.

While comparisons between contemporary festival culture and the festivals of the ancient past are a recurring theme in Plutarch, it is not always the classical past that Plutarch has in mind

---

\(^{55}\) In koine: IG VII 3196 and 3197. Gossage (1975) 121-2 argues for a relative dating of the three victory lists for the Charitesia of IG VII 3195, then 3196, then 3197. This relative chronology would suggest that the use of dialect in IG VII 3195 was not adopted in subsequent victory lists for the festival. Schachter (1981) vol. 1, 142 n. 3 would place IG VII 3195 after 3196/7.
as a point of comparison. In On Love of Wealth, Plutarch claims that the Dionysia used to be a modest celebration.

Our traditional festival of the Dionysia was in former times a homely and merry procession. First came a jug of wine and a vine branch, then one celebrant dragged a he-goat along, another followed with a basket of dry figs, and the phallos-bearer came last. But all this is nowadays unregarded and vanished, what with vessels of gold carried past, rich apparel, carriages riding by, and masks: so has what is necessary a wealth been buried under what is useless and superfluous. But we are most of us like Telemachus. In his innocence, or rather want of taste, when he saw Nestor's house with its couches, tables, clothes, coverlets, and pleasant wine, he expressed no admiration for one provided with all that was necessary or useful; but when he visited Menelaüs and beheld ivory, gold, and amber, he was struck with amazement and cried: Olympian Zeus, methinks, has halls like this: / What riches past all telling! I behold / And marvel. Socrates or Diogenes would have said: What rubbish past all telling and superfluous and vanity! I behold / And laugh. Fool! You should strip your wife of her purple and adornments, that she may get over her fine airs and her infatuation with foreign guests, and do you trick out your house instead like a theatre or stage for visitors? The simple, rustic festival of the past which Plutarch describes is not the classical Dionysia, but a Dionysia of some earlier, indeterminate time. While we can assume that he refers to the Athenian Dionysia in the past, he could be referring to the Boiotian Dionysia of his present. The Dionysia "nowadays" includes displays of wealth and luxury. Theater masks serve both as an example of lavish expenditure at the festival and as a metaphor for wealth, in the sense that both cover up true things. Like the masks, the theater itself is both a metaphor for and a literal example of the

---

display of wealth. Plutarch's complaint is that Greeks do not celebrate the Dionysia in the way that he imagines it to have been celebrated originally. Both the time of the past Dionysia and the place of the contemporary Dionysia are indeterminate: Plutarch refers to it as πάτριος, but who does he mean by this? Boiotians? Athenians? All Greeks? The comparison of "most of us" to Telemachus suggests that "most of us" are impressed by the image of wealth; Plutarch does not specify who he has in mind. The learned reader is one of the enlightened few, able to appreciate the artificiality of the display from a distance, and so perhaps "most of us" refers not to the readership but to the masses. This would make sense in light of his characterization of "most of us" as innocent and tasteless, like the childlike Telemachus. In this way, he associates contemporary festival culture with the masses, and the festival culture of the past with the enlightened few. Festivals have declined into luxury because of popular influence.

In another passage in the Convivial Questions, Plutarch pinpoints the beginning of the decline of the Pythia at the introduction of tragedy to the competitions. As in the discussion of the Dionysia, he is concerned with the question of what the proper celebration of the contemporary festival should be, and points to a pre-classical past as the ideal.

At the Pythian games there was a discussion whether the newer competitions ought to be eliminated. For, once having accepted the tragic competitor as an addition to the original three (the Pythian piper, the lyricist, and the singer to the lyre), the authorities found that

---


---

as if the gate had been opened, they could no longer withstand the massed attack and incursion of all manner of entertainments addressed to the ear. This gave a pleasing variety and popular appeal to the festival at the cost of its severe and strictly musical character; it also made trouble for the judges and naturally created much animosity because the defeated in the competitions were many.

Plutarch compares the new competitions to an attack on the traditional festival, coming from the outside in, manipulating the language of victory and defeat typically used of festival competitions. He contrasts the Pythian games of the past, which only had three competitions, with the variety of the newer (presumably contemporary) competitions. As in his discussion of the decline of the Dionysia into luxury (On Love of Wealth, 527D), Plutarch imagines the earliest celebration of the Pythia to have been a modest, austere affair. He pinpoints the beginning of this decline into luxury as the introduction of tragedy to the festival, the first dramatic competition added to a previously only musical program, and styles the introduction of new entertainments as a popularizing trend. When he remarks that the modern Pythian games have lost their "strictly musical character," he must be referring to the introduction of tragedy to the competitions. This is a somewhat surprising comment, given that he seems to be complaining about the introduction of new musical contests (παντοδαποῖς ἄκροάμασιν). If such a discussion took place, it did not result in the elimination of tragedy from the Pythian games. In the mid-2nd c. CE, the Delphians honored an actor who had won many victories at the Pythia.

Plutarch aligns newness with popular entertainment, and oldness with the canonical textual tradition. Lamprias advises that when we find ourselves falling for the dangerous

58 This is a question that he takes up again in reference to the Olympia and Pythia, where he discusses competitions which have been added and subtracted: τά μὲν γὰρ Πόθια τῶν μουσικῶν ἐσχή τρεῖς ἢ τέτταρας ἐπεισοδίους ἄγωνας, ὁ δὲ γυμνικὸς ἀπὸ ἄρχης ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον ὦτως κατέστη, τοὺς δὲ Ὀλυμπιοῖς πάντα προσθήκη πλῆθος τοῦ δρόμου γέγονεν· πολλὰ δὲ καὶ θέντες ἐπειτ' ἀνείλον, ὡσπερ τὸν τῆς κάλπης ἄγωνα καὶ τὸν τῆς ἀπίνης· ἀνηρέθη δὲ καὶ παισὶ πεντάθλοις στέφανος τεθείς· καὶ ὅλως πολλὰ περὶ τὴν πανήγυριν νενεωτέριστα. δέδω δ' εἰπέν ὅτι πάλαι καὶ μονομαχίας ἄγων περὶ Πῖσαν ἦτετο μέχρι φόνου καὶ σφαγῆς τῶν ἦτομέων καὶ ὑποπατέοντος, μὴ μὲ πάλιν ἀπαιτήτε τῆς ἱστορίας βεβαιωτὴν κἂν διαφύγῃ τὴν μνήμην ἐν οἴνῳ τὸ ὄνομα καταγέλαστος γένομαι (Plutarch, Convivial Questions, 675C).
59 FD III 4.86.
pleasures of music, we should "flee to the Helicon of the ancients" (καταφεύγειν εἰς τὸν Ἑλικώνα τῶν τῶν παλαιῶν).\(^6\) Someone who enjoys mimes and music too much should be led back to Euripides, Pindar, and Menander, he says. Euripides, Pindar, and Menander represent not just old poets, but high poetry, as opposed to mimes. Lamprias does not specify whether he has in mind performances or texts of Euripides and Menander, but the inclusion of Pindar in his list suggests he is thinking of texts. If this is correct, he is also contrasting entertainments enjoyed through performance (mimes and music, which do not have a textual tradition) with the canonical texts of ancient Greek poetry, which are known both through text and performance. The order of the poets does not follow their chronological order (Euripides, Pindar, Menander, not Pindar, Euripides, Menander) suggests that they are all treated as one group of old poets, that they are all relatively equally old, all part of the Helicon of the ancients, τῶν παλαιῶν.

Philostratus takes up similar questions about contemporary festival culture, but draws out the question of Greek identity more than Plutarch does. Knowledge of Greek drama and the proper celebration of festivals are markers of Greek cultural identity throughout Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. Composed in the early 3rd century CE, the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* (hereafter *VA*) is a biography of a Neo-Pythagorean philosopher-sage who lived in the 1st century CE. Apollonius travels to every area of the known world, speaking to many people about his philosophy, and seeking out wise men in various cultures to converse with. Throughout his travels, Apollonius encounters people reading and misreading Greek festival culture. Some Indians know Greek drama, but only as text; the Ethiopians have heard about Greek festivals, but do not understand the purpose of musical and dramatic contests; even the Athenians have made too many changes to the Dionysia, which Apollonius attempts to correct. In the West, the Celtic tribes have very little knowledge of Greek drama, though some of them seem to take to it in

\(^6\) Plutarch, *Convivial Questions* 706D.
some fashion. It is Nero, however, to whom Apollonius directs most of his vitriol. Nero's most serious offense is not the quality of his acting or his singing, though Apollonius has no end of criticisms on that front too, but the reorganization of the festival calendar, which disrupts the traditional festival cycle, and the introduction of contests which were not traditionally part of the festival program, most notably at the Olympia, the most ancient Greek festival, which recurs throughout Apollonius' travels. The entire *Life* may be seen as an extended meditation on Greekness. Philostratus uses the knowledge of Greek festivals, as well as Greek dramatic performance, as a testing ground for questions of Greek identity in the imperial period.

When Apollonius travels to India, he finds not only that the Indians know Greek, but also that they know the texts of Greek drama. Phraotes, the philosopher-king of the Indians in Taxila, has had a Greek education (τὰ Ἑλλήνων παιδεύσας, *VA* 2.31) and has read Euripides' *Children of Hercules* (*VA* 2.32), and the Indian sage Iarchas is familiar with the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (*VA* 3.22). The Indians do not perform drama, though there are choral performances in India (*VA* 3.17). Implicit in the interaction between Apollonius and the earlier Euripides-loving Indian king Phraotes is that Phraotes, despite the depth of his learning, knows Euripides only as text, not through performance, as opposed to Apollonius, who knows both the texts and performance context. In the case of the Indians, questions of ethnicity are complicated. In many ways, the Indians resemble Greeks. Apollonius admires the Brahmans, whose philosophy is markedly similar to Pythagoreanism: they are vegetarians, wear simple clothing, worship Memory, and believe in the transmigration of souls. The Indians know of Dionysus (*VA* 2.9), whose travels in India pre-dated Alexander's conquest. Alexander's influence is strong too. Taxila is built on a grid plan (τετειχίσθαι δὲ ξυμμέτρως, ὡςπερ αἱ Ἑλλάδες, *VA* 2.20), with a temple decorated with paintings of the deeds of Alexander and Porus (*VA* 2.20). Knowledge of the Greek language in
India is so common that Apollonius expects it when he enters a village beyond the Hyphasis: "He ran up to Apollonius and greeted him in Greek, which was not in itself surprising since everybody in the village talked Greek" (προσδραμόντα δὲ τῷ Ἀπολλωνίῳ φωνῇ Ἑλλάδι προσείπειν αὐτόν, καὶ τούτῳ μὲν οὕτω θαυμαστὸν δόξαι διὰ τὸ καὶ τοὺς ἐν τῇ κόμη πάντας ἀπὸ Ἑλλήνων φθέγγεσθαι, VA 3.12).\footnote{All translations of Philostratus' VA are by C.P. Jones.}

For all their similarity to Greeks, however, the Indians are not Greek. During a visit with another Indian king, a rather boorish character, who, unusually, does not know Greek, Iarchas tells Apollonius that the king will be better if he sees a real Greek man (ἀνδρὰ Ἑλληνα, VA 3.23). As they dine together, the king asks Apollonius what his reputation is among the Greeks.

"περὶ ἐμοῦ δὲ," ἔφη "ὁ ξένε, τίς λόγος ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλησίν;" "δὸςι γε" ἐπε "καὶ περὶ Ἑλλήνων ἐνταῦθα." "οὐδὲν," ἔφη "τῶν παρ᾽ Ἑλλησίν ἐγώγε λόγου ἄξιῶ." "ἀπαγγέλω ταῦτα," ἐπε "καὶ στεφανώσουσί σε ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ."\footnote{Philostratus VA 3.29.}

"And what is my reputation among the Greeks, stranger?" said the king. "As high as that of the Greeks is here." "I do not value anything belonging to the Greeks," said he. "I will tell them that," said Apollonius, "and they will crown you at Olympia." Apollonius' responses are cryptic to the king. The reputation of the Greeks in India has been generally quite good, so by "here" Apollonius means in the court of the non-Greek-speaking king; we know both that the Greeks have no idea who this king is, and that the king has no idea who the Greeks really are. Of course, the Greeks will not crown this king, who has insulted them (though we might also suspect a sly reference to another foreign ruler who was crowned at Olympia, i.e. Nero). The king does not respond, presumably because he does not understand the reference: he has no knowledge of this most famous Greek festival, nor of its practices.

Even non-Greeks who do have knowledge of Greek festivals are open to criticism. The importance of proper celebration of festivals as markers of Greek identity comes to the fore in Apollonius' encounter with the Ethiopian gymnosophists in book 6. Thespesion, the oldest of the
gymnosophists, is familiar with Greek festivals, but misreads them. He accurately describes the festival program at Delphi (musical contests, comedy, tragedy, and the "naked competition," i.e. athletic events), but betrays his misunderstanding of the meaning of the Greek festivals when he implies that the musical program is merely a distraction; he is only interested in the nakedness of the athletes, who are like the gymnosophists in their nakedness.

They say too that Delphi greets its visitors with pipes, songs, and lyre music, and treats them to comedy and tragedy, and only after all this presents the athletes competing naked. Olympia, however, avoids such preliminaries as unbecoming and improper there, and presents its visitors merely with naked athletes, following the arrangements of Heracles. You may consider our life like that, as compared with the philosophy of the Indians. They, as if inviting you to Delphi, beguile you with various enchantments, but we are naked, as if we were at Olympia.

Music and drama are aligned with luxury and compared to Eastern philosophy, while "naked competitions" stand in for the simplicity of the Ethiopian philosophical lifestyle. Thespieson privileges athletic competitions over musical and dramatic competitions, praising Olympia for not including music in the program. He knows the origin of the festival program at Olympia (arranged by Hercules), but passes over the origins of the musical program at Delphi, which he seems to regard as merely a distraction. It is not coincidental that Thespieson knows the origin of the contest associated with Hercules but not Apollo, as it was Hercules and Dionysus who appear in the *Life* as travelers among foreign peoples, and therefore, Hercules and Dionysus whom foreigners know more than any other gods.

---

63 Philostratus *VA* 6.10.
Apollonius responds by demonstrating his superior knowledge of Greek drama, lecturing Thespies, and any other gymnosophists who are listening, on the proper response to tragedy, starting with Aeschylus (VA 6.11). Apollonius stresses tragic performance in his lecture, particularly Aeschylus' involvement with set design and costuming. It was because of Aeschylus' innovations in staging, Apollonius claims, that "the Athenians called him the Father of Tragedy" (VA 6.11). Even after his death, Aeschylus' plays were revived at the Dionysia, "and he won all over again" (ἐνίκα ἐκ καινῆς, VA 6.11). Apollonius does not say when these revivals took place. The phrasing ἐκ καινῆς is a wink at the idea that Aeschylus, the Father of Tragedy, the oldest of the three canonical tragedians, was once kainos, new. The idea that Aeschylus was called the Father of Tragedy because of his innovations in the theater, not his archaism, also points to the play between old and new in the passage. Apollonius goes on to contrast philosophy with tragedy on the grounds that the charis of a well-produced tragedy lasts only for the duration of the performance (καίτοι τραγῳδίας μὲν εὖ κεκοσμημένης ὀλίγη χάρις, VA 6.11) while the charis of Pythagorean philosophy is eternal. Transferring the same language of stage production to philosophy, Apollonius claims that the philosophy of the Indians is well-produced, εὖ κεκοσμημένης, and "that the Indians have supplied with the appropriate decor, and bring on with lofty, inspired stage machinery," ἣν ἐς τὸ πρόσφορον Ἰνδοί στείλαντες ἐφ' ὑψίλης τε καὶ θείας μυχανής ἐκκυκλοῦσιν, (VA 6.11). Apollonius uses the technical vocabulary of the stage (μυχανής ἐκκυκλοῦσιν) to make his point, building upon his argument that Aeschylus was so admired for the staging of his plays. He does not mention the texts of Greek drama as enduring or eternal; in this passage, drama is performance. A full understanding of the comparison between Indian and Ethiopian philosophy, which Apollonius is making, relies on knowledge of performed drama that the Ethiopians do not have, despite their familiarity (through report) of Greek festivals.
These moments of intercultural misunderstanding of Greek festival culture are closely related to Apollonius' dissatisfaction with the ways in which Greeks are celebrating their own festivals: at the Dionysia in Athens, for example, Apollonius finds that the festival-goers are dancing in the theater, not appreciating the music of tragedy and comedy with the seriousness he expects (VA 4.21), and even bringing Roman-style gladiatorial games into the theater (VA 4.22).

Even the Greeks of the imperial period, in Apollonius' eyes, have ceased to be truly Greek. Philostratus is defining Greekness, then, not only as a cultural marker but also as a temporal one.

Ἐπιπλήξει δὲ λέγεται περὶ Διονυσίων Αθηναίων, ἂ ποιεῖται σφισίν ἐν ὀρᾷ τοῦ ἀνθεστηρίδος· ὃ μὲν γὰρ μουρίδια ἀκροασσόμενοι καὶ μελοποιίας παραβάσεων τε καὶ ῥυθμῶν, ὁπόσοι κοιμωδίας τε καὶ τραγῳδίας εἰσίν, ἐς τὸ θέατρον ξυμφορεῖν ὄφελος, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἠκουσαν, ὅτι αὐλὸν ὑποσημηνάντος λυγισμοὺς ὀρχύνεται καὶ μεταξὺ τῆς Ὀρφείως ἑποποιίας τε καὶ θεολογίας τὰ μὲν ὡς Ὁραι, τὰ δὲ ὡς Νύμφαι, τὰ δὲ ὡς Βάσχαι πράττουσιν, ἐς ἐπιπληξίν τοῦτον κατέστη καὶ ἄπτεν “παύσασθε” εἰπεν ἐξερχούμενοι τοὺς Σαλαμίνιους καὶ πολλοὺς ἐτέρους κειμένους ἀγαθοὺς ἀνδράς.

He is said to have rebuked the Athenians over the Dionysia, which they celebrated at the time of Anthesterion. He thought that they were frequenting the theater to hear solos and lyrics, addresses to the audience, and the meters appropriate to tragedy and comedy. But when he heard that they were dancing sinuously to the call of the pipe, and in between the lofty verse and religious poetry of Orpheus were acting now as the Seasons, or the Nymphs, or as Bacchants, he undertook to denounce all this. "Stop burlesquing the men of Salamis," he said, "and any other brave souls, now buried." (VA 4.21)

From the outside, Apollonius thinks that the festival is being celebrated correctly: it takes place at the proper time of year (Anthesterion) and Apollonius assumes that the appropriate contests are being taking place, namely poetry and music. He thinks that the audience is watching tragedies and comedies, though his description is somewhat elliptical: the Athenians, he thinks, are listening to monodies and lyric, parabases and rhythms, "the sort which are appropriate for comedies and tragedies" (ὁπόσοι κοιμῳδίας τε καὶ τραγῳδίας εἰσίν). Ὁπόσοι could refer to the pair παραβάσεων τε καὶ ῥυθμῶν, as both are pertinent to drama. It seems unlikely that he imagines that parabases and music from dramatic works would be performed independently of plays; rather, παραβάσεων τε καὶ ῥυθμῶν stands in for the performance of plays. Apollonius
does not find drama in the theater of Dionysus, however; he finds mimetic dancers. This novel entertainment is an insult to the Athenians of the past, the brave fighters at Salamis, who he makes clear (after the passage quoted above) are more masculine than the effeminate dancers of the contemporary Athenian stage, tainted with Eastern luxury in their saffron- and purple-dyed costumes. Unfortunately, the epigraphic records for the imperial-era Dionysia are so deficient that it is impossible to say whether Philostratus' account has any truth to it, nor does Philostratus say whether Apollonius successful in his restoration of the ancient customs of the Dionysia. It is likely a fiction, or at least an exaggeration, of the drastic difference between contemporary festival practice in Athens in the 1st c. CE (the time of Apollonius) and the Dionysia of the past.

The account of dancing at the Dionysia is one example among many of the way in which Apollonius corrects Greek religious rituals, restoring them to the ancient custom, during his travels. Philostratus suggests that it is not just that the Athenians have changed their festival practice, but that they have forgotten how to correctly celebrate their festival. Forgetfulness and remembrance is a theme running throughout the Life. Apollonius has a special connection to memory of the past: he has exceptional powers of memory (his memory is better than Simonides', even at 100: *VA* 1.14), he has been reincarnated and remembers his past lives, he is the continuator of Pythagoras, and he seems to be the only one in the world who fully remembers how to practice Pythagorean philosophy. It is Apollonius' exceptional powers of memory which make him so mindful of the correct celebrations of festivals. He is the only one who remembers what it means to be truly Greek: he is more Athenian than the Athenians, in his perfect command of Attic Greek as well as his superior knowledge of the Dionysia, and more Spartan than the Spartans, whom he also corrects, with a letter more concise than a Spartan saying (*VA* 4.27).
Greekness, then, is not defined by birthplace, upbringing, or education, but by memory of the Greek past and the continuation of ancient Greek customs in the present.

Apollonius is sometimes successful in his attempts to restore Greek customs (as in Sparta, *VA* 4.27) and sometimes not (as in Ephesus, where he finds the Ephesians intractably devoted to pantomime and pyrrhic dancing, and therefore abandons his efforts to avert plague from Ephesus, *VA* 4.2-4). Apollonius approves of the administration of the Olympia by the Eleians, though when questioned about it, he gives the curious reply, "I do not know if they are wise, but they certainly pretend to wisdom" (εἰ μὲν σοφοὺς, ἐφη οὐκ οἶδα, σοφιστὰς μέντοι, *VA* 4.29). Even the Eleians, who are careful to celebrate the festival properly, thinking that they are being judged for the way in which they administer it no less than the athletes who are competing (*VA* 4.29), are criticized for only going through the motions. Apollonius' critical remark may refer to a moment a few chapters earlier, when the Eleians invite him to participate in the Olympia. He takes offense at this, because he was already on his way to the festival. "You seem to me," he says, "to degrade the repute of the Olympics if you need embassies to those coming by their own choice" (δοκεῖτε οὖν ἐφη “διαβάλλειν τὴν Ὀλυμπίαν δόξαν πρεσβειῶν δεόμενοι πρὸς τοὺς αὐτόθεν ἡξοντας, *VA* 4.24). Any deviation from what is considered normal or expected practice leaves the organizers open to charges of degrading the festival, even something as seemingly insignificant as sending a letter of invitation to a noteworthy visitor. Apollonius judges the Eleians by observing the administration and operation of their festival, the Olympia, as he judges the Athenians by witnessing the shows at the Dionysia, and the Ephesians by their behavior in the theater (though at Ephesus, the shows are not specified as part of a festival).
The greatest transgressor of appropriate festival behavior is, of course, Nero, and it is Nero's misreading of Greek festival culture that Philostratus is setting us up for with Apollonius' nitpicking about the appropriate celebration of the Olympia. Philostratus builds upon a long literary tradition of criticizing Nero's involvement in the theater, by pointing out the ways in which he did not behave traditionally or appropriately at the festivals. Standing at the Isthmus of Corinth, Apollonius makes a prediction about the conception and failure of the digging of the Isthmus, which took place during Nero's tour of Greece in 66 CE. Philostratus explains Apollonius' prediction with a succinct but significant account of Nero's trip.

Nero conceived of the idea seven years later, when he left his capital and arrived in Greece, intending to subject himself to the rules of the Olympic and Pythian games, though he also won at the Isthmia. His victories were in the lyre-playing and heraldic divisions, and even in tragedy at the Olympics. (VA 4.24) Philostratus singles out Nero's victory in tragedy at the Olympia by setting it apart in a separate clause; this was a particularly exceptional victory because tragedy was not a part of the program at the Olympia, as any of Philostratus' readers would have known. Even the Ethiopians, as we have seen, at the edges of the known world, know that the Olympia was an athletic, not a musical or dramatic festival. The fact that Nero's tour of Greece, including his victory at the Olympia, was seven years after Apollonius's visit to the Olympia points to Nero's reorganization of the festival calendar. The Olympia was celebrated every four years, but Nero changed the festival calendar in 66 so that he could compete in all four of the games of the classical periodos in the same year. Later, Apollonius comments explicitly on the reorganization of the festival calendar, saying that Nero will win in Olympia, but not at the Olympia, "since they are not even being held
at the proper time” (ἅτε μηδὲ ἐν ὀρφ ἁγουσί, VA 5.7). A festival held at the wrong time is not even a festival, according to Apollonius.

Seven years after Apollonius' trip to Olympia, while Nero is competing at the Greek games, Apollonius finds himself in Gadeira, at the westernmost extremity of his travels. In Gadeira, knowledge of Greek games represents knowledge of Greek culture. When news of Nero's victory at Olympia travels to Gadeira, Philostratus tells us that the Gadeirians "understood what victory meant and that there was a celebrated competition in Arcadia, since, as I said, they are eager for Greek culture" (τὰ μὲν Γάδειρα ξυνίει τῆς νίκης καὶ ὅτι ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ τις εἶ ᾗ γόν εὐδόκιμος, ἐπειδὴ, ὡς εἶπον, ἐς τὰ Ἑλλήνων σπεύδουσιν, VA 5.8). Those in the villages around Gadeira, however, misinterpret the announcement, thinking that Nero has conquered the Olympians in war, because they have no knowledge of the Olympia or Greek games; nor have they ever seen a tragedy (VA 5.8). Similarly misunderstood, a tragic actor (τραγῳδίας ὑποκριτής) visiting Hispola causes great distress to the citizens, who are terrified of his high boots, gaping mask, and loud mouth (VA 5.9). This actor has been successful among other barbarian peoples, because they are unable to discern a good actor from a bad one, due to their lack of experience of drama. In all of these instances, lack of knowledge of Greek tragic performance is a sign of non-Greekness. In two of these cases, the barbarians who have no knowledge of tragedy or festival victories react by taking them overly literally: those in the villages around Gadeira think Nero has literally conquered the Olympians, and those in Hispola are afraid of the tragic actor, unable to understand that it is a show. The comment about some barbarians being unable to distinguish good acting from bad acting should make us think of Nero's audiences. The entire episode is clearly a foil for Nero's acting, as the actor claims to be performing Nero's parts, but performs for pay. That the Roman Nero is unable to tell that he is acting poorly is not surprising: he is a
barbarian. But if a sign of barbarism is the inability to discern between good and bad acting, the process of selection which defines an *agon*, what does this say about Greeks who clap for Nero?

**Conclusion**

Epigraphic sources present festivals as unchanging, and therefore celebrated correctly. Festival organizers asserted the priority of old drama by awarding higher prize amounts, and not staging new plays unless there were also old plays on the program. When they did innovate, festival organizers did so in ways that they sought to represent as traditional; even change was presented as constancy. The higher value placed on re-performed drama is one example among many of the ways in which Greeks publicly asserted the ancientness of their own festivals and festival customs. By presenting ancient plays at the festivals, Greeks maintained a connection with their ancient past, a shared cultural identity that linked them to a wider Greek world.

Literary sources, on the other hand, focus on anxieties about change and decline in contemporary festival culture. While the association may be more clear in the literary sources, epigraphic sources also tie oldness to Greek identity. We saw how the citizens of Halicarnassus honored the tragic poet Longianus by associating him with the authors of the past, particularly Herodotus, thus situating him in the tradition of ancient Greek literature and also identifying him with the local area of Halicarnassus. In their victory list, the organizers of the Charitesia in Orchomenos also asserted their local identity through the use of archaizing Boiotian dialect. In the literary sources which we have selected to look at in this chapter, Plutarch and Philostratus, there is a recurring concern about the mutability of festivals, and a sense that only an enlightened few (Plutarch's readership, Philostratus' Apollonius) are able to remember how to celebrate festivals in the old and proper way. Philostratus in particular uses this perception as a way of talking about
Greek identity in the Roman period. Epigraphic and literary sources present different perspectives, but are engaged in the same discourse about the role of oldness and newness at the festivals.
Table 2. Dramatic competitions at Greek festivals, 1st c. BCE-3rd c. CE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Old tragedy</th>
<th>Old comedy</th>
<th>New tragedy</th>
<th>New comedy</th>
<th>Satyr-play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>Panathenaea in Athens</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>τραγωδίαν.. καινήν</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiotia</td>
<td>Soteria at Acraephium</td>
<td>τραγωδός²</td>
<td>κομῳδόν ιερός³</td>
<td>ποιητής τραγωδίων⁴</td>
<td>ποιητής κομῳδίων⁵</td>
<td>π[οηη]τ[ζ οετ]ρον⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charitesia at Orchomenos</td>
<td>τραγωδός⁷</td>
<td>κομῳδός⁸</td>
<td>ποιητής τραγωδίων and υποκριτής¹¹</td>
<td>ποιητής κομῳδίων and υποκριτής¹²</td>
<td>ποιητής σατύρων and υποκριτής¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homoloia at Orchomenos</td>
<td>τραγωδός¹⁴</td>
<td>κομῳδός¹⁵</td>
<td>none¹⁶</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ IG II² 3157 (1st c. CE), an honorific for a choregos who "directed a new tragedy at the Panathenaea." Csapo and Slater (1994) note, “This is our only evidence for drama at the Panathenaea” (206). While it cannot be proven that there was old drama at the Panathenaea in the 1st c. CE, comparison with other festivals, where new drama was only put on as part of a program that also included old drama, suggests that there was likely old drama at the Panathenaea. An honorific for Bassos of Miletus cites a victory at the Panathenaea, but does not specify the competition; he competed elsewhere as herald, tragoidos, and komoidos (Moretti 74, 2nd or 3rd c. CE, Argos).
² IG VII 2727 l. 22 (86 BCE).
³ IG VII 2727 l. 24.
⁴ IG VII 2727 l. 25.
⁵ IG VII 2727 l. 27.
⁶ IG VII 2727 l. 20.
⁷ IG VII 3195 l. 21 (1st c. BCE).
⁸ IG VII 3196 l. 19 (1st c. BCE) and IG VII 3197 l. 20 (1st c. BCE).
⁹ IG VII 3195 l. 23.
¹⁰ IG VII 3195 l. 25 and IG VII 3197 l. 22.
¹¹ IG VII 3197 l. 28.
¹² IG VII 3197 l. 32 and 34.
¹³ IG VII 3197 l. 24 and 26.
¹⁴ IG VII 3196 l. 33 and IG VII 3197 l. 46.
¹⁵ IG VII 3196 l. 35 and IG VII 3197 l. 48.
¹⁶ We can tell that there were no dramatic contests after the competitions in old tragedy and comedy, because these are followed by the epinician (in both IG VII 3196 and 3197), i.e. the over-all competition, which closed the competitions in a given category.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old tragedy</th>
<th>Old comedy</th>
<th>New tragedy</th>
<th>New comedy</th>
<th>Satyr-play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amphiaraia</strong> and Romaia at Oropos**</td>
<td>τραγωιδός(^{17})</td>
<td>κομωδόδ(^{20})</td>
<td>ποιητής τραγωδίας and ύποκριτής(^{22})</td>
<td>ποιητής σατύρων(^{28})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τραγωδίας παλαιάς ύποκριτής(^{18})</td>
<td>κομωδίας παλαιάς ύποκριτής(^{21})</td>
<td>ποιητής τραγωδίων and ύποκριτής(^{23})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[τραγωδίας] παλαιάν(^{19})</td>
<td></td>
<td>ποιητής κομωδίας καινής and ύποκριτής(^{24})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{17}\) IG VII 416 l. 23 (80-50 BCE).

\(^{18}\) IG VII 420 l. 25 (80-50 BCE). The same terminology is reconstructed on a small fragment of a victory list for the Amphiaraia and Romaia at Oropos (I. Oropos 531 l. 1, 80-50 BCE).

\(^{19}\) IG VII 419 l. 35 (80-50 BCE).

\(^{20}\) IG VII 416 l. 25.

\(^{21}\) IG VII 420 l. 27 and I. Oropos 531 l. 3.

\(^{22}\) IG VII 416 l. 27.

\(^{23}\) IG VII 419 l. 27 and 29.

\(^{24}\) IG VII 420 l. 29 and 31.

\(^{25}\) IG VII 416 l. 29.

\(^{26}\) IG VII 419 l. 31 and 33.

\(^{27}\) IG VII 417 l. 2 (80-50 BCE). The top of the inscription is lost, so we only have the end of the dramatic competitions, followed by the complete athletic program (as well as a small fragment listing an encomiographer and rhapsode, IG VII 415). The same terminology is used in IG VII 420 l. 33 and 35. Another victory list for the Amphiaraia and Romaia at Oropos is fragmentary, but the dramatic competitions have been reconstructed on the basis of the previous lists (IG VII 418, 80-50 BCE).

\(^{28}\) IG VII 416 l. 21, IG VII 419 l. 25, and IG VII 420 l. 23.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old tragedy</th>
<th>Old comedy</th>
<th>New tragedy</th>
<th>New comedy</th>
<th>Satyr-play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarapieia at Tanagra</td>
<td>τὴν παλαιάν τραγῳδίαν&lt;sup&gt;29&lt;/sup&gt; τὴν κομῳδίαν&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt; τραγῳδοῦς&lt;sup&gt;30&lt;/sup&gt; κομῳδοῦν ποιητῆς and ύποκριτῆς&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt; ποιητάς&lt;sup&gt;33&lt;/sup&gt; σατυρῶν ποιητῆς&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown contest at Thebes</td>
<td>τραγῳ[δὸς]&lt;sup&gt;36&lt;/sup&gt; none none none none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>29</sup> IG VII 540 l. 16 (before 86 BCE).
<sup>30</sup> IG VII 542 l. 8 (after 85 BCE) and IG VII 543 l. 2 (after 85 BCE).
<sup>31</sup> IG VII 540 l. 17.
<sup>32</sup> IG VII 540 l. 12-13.
<sup>33</sup> IG VII 543 l. 4. The type of poetry is not specified, but there is reason to believe that "poet of tragedy" is meant. The victorious poet Eiranos won at the Sarapieia as tragoidos, and as a komoidos at the Amphiaraiia and Romaia at Oropos (IG VII 416 l. 26). Given that he had a theatrical career, it is likely that he wrote drama (actors often did), that ποιητάς here means "poet of tragedy," and the shorthand was used due to space limitations on the stone.
<sup>34</sup> IG VII 540 l. 14-15.
<sup>35</sup> IG VII 540 l. 11.
<sup>36</sup> IG VII 2449 l. 3-4 (Imperial period). This very small fragment of a victory list has epic encomium, the tragoidos, the choral aulete, and the aulode. This probably means that the tragoidos was the only dramatic competition, because it comes between the encomium and the musical contests.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old tragedy</th>
<th>Old comedy</th>
<th>New tragedy</th>
<th>New comedy</th>
<th>Satyr-play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mouseia at Thespiae</td>
<td>ύποκριτῆς παλαιᾶς τραγῳδίας</td>
<td>ύποκριτῆς καινῆς τραγῳδίας</td>
<td>ύποκριτῆς καινῆς κομῳδίας</td>
<td>σατύρων ποιητής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ύποκριτῆς παλαιᾶς</td>
<td>ύποκριτῆς καινῆς τραγῳδίας</td>
<td>ύποκριτῆς καινῆς κομῳδίας</td>
<td>ύποκριτῆς καινῆς κομῳδίας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ύποκριτῆς καινῆς</td>
<td>ύποκριτῆς καινῆς κομῳδίας</td>
<td>ύποκριτῆς καινῆς κομῳδίας</td>
<td>ύποκριτῆς καινῆς κομῳδίας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κομῳδίας</td>
<td>κομῳδίας</td>
<td>κομῳδίας</td>
<td>κομῳδίας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κομῳδίας</td>
<td>κομῳδίας</td>
<td>κομῳδίας</td>
<td>κομῳδίας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 IG VII 1760 l. 29 (after 84 BCE). Only the upper part of the stone survives.
38 IG VII 1773 l. 21 (150-160 CE).
39 SEG 3-334 l. 33 (150-160 CE).
40 I. Thesp. 179 l. 19 (161-9 or 176-80 CE). No komoidos is listed on this victory list; it seems there was no competition for komoidoi at the Thespiae in this year. As both earlier and later victory lists have komoidoi, the lack of a competition in old comedy this year was probably due to a lack of competitors, and not to a change in the festival program. The τραγῳδός also appears in IG VII 1776 l. 24 (after 212 CE).
41 IG VII 1760 l. 31 and IG VII 1773.
42 SEG 3-334 l. 31.
43 IG VII 1776 l. 25.
44 IG VII 1761 l. 3 and 5 (mid-1st c. BCE). This is a fragment of a victory list; the upper and lower parts of the stone are lost.
45 IG VII 1773 l. 24-27 and SEG 3-334 l. 39 and 41.
46 I. Thesp. 179 l. 22 and 24.
47 IG VII 1761 l. 7 and 9.
48 IG VII 1773 l. 22-24 and SEG 3-334 l. 35 and 37.
49 I. Thesp. 179 l. 26. The lower part of the stone is lost; an actor may have been listed on the portion which did not survive.
50 IG VII 1760 l. 27.
51 IG VII 1773 l. 29 and SEG 3-334 l. 47.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Old Tragedy</th>
<th>Old Comedy</th>
<th>New Tragedy</th>
<th>New Comedy</th>
<th>Satyr-play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phocis, Delphi</td>
<td>Winter Soteria at Delphi</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>κωμωιδος52</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contest of Claudius Adrastus at Aphrodisias</td>
<td>τραγωδο53</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;the musical contest of those from the synod&quot; at Aphrodisias</td>
<td>τραγωδο54</td>
<td>κωμωδο55</td>
<td>none56</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown contest at Aphrodisias</td>
<td>τραγωδο57</td>
<td>κωμωδο58</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lysimacheia at Aphrodisias</td>
<td>τραγωδο59</td>
<td>κωμωδο and ἄρχαίᾳ κωμωδίᾳ60</td>
<td>καὶνῃ τραγωδίᾳ61</td>
<td>καὶνῃ κωμωδίᾳ62</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52 Syll3 690 (140-100 BCE). This inscription records members of the Isthmian and Nemean Technitai sent to compete at the Winter Soteria at Delphi. This must not have been the complete list of competitors, however, as it lacks (a) enough competitors to actually have competition within the categories, and (b) lacks competitors essential to the competition (neither a herald nor trumpeter are listed). Therefore, while it demonstrates that there was a competition in old comedy (the Technitai have sent a komoidos), it cannot be used as evidence that the Soteria lacked a competition in old tragedy.

53 Roueché (1993) no. 51 l. 27 (180-189 CE).
54 Roueché (1993) no. 52 (block A) l. 11 (ca. 100 CE). The inscription is a list of prizes, not a victory list, which is why the competitions are in the dative.
55 Roueché (1993) no. 52 (block A) l. 12.
56 The musical contests follow the tragoidos, suggesting that the entire dramatic program was the tragoidos and komoidos.
57 Roueché (1993) no. 52 (blocks D and E) l. 10 (ca. 100 CE).
58 Roueché (1993) no. 52 (blocks D and E) l. 7.
59 Roueché (1993) no. 53 col. ii l. 11 (late 2nd c. CE).
60 Roueché (1993) no. 53 col. ii l. 8 and col. iii l. 6.
61 Roueché (1993) no. 53 col. iii l. 8.
62 Roueché (1993) no. 53 col. iii l. 5.
Table 3. Prizes at the Sarapieia in Tanagra, sorted by prize amount (Manieri Tan. 2, Tanagra, before 86 BCE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>First Prize (Attic silver drachmas)</th>
<th>Second Prize (Attic silver drachmas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aulete</td>
<td>168.75</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tragoidos</em></td>
<td>168.75</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epinician (over-all competition)</td>
<td>168.75</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitharode</td>
<td>168.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poet of tragedy</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poet</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitharist</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>komoidos</em></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poet of comedy</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aulode</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rhapsode</td>
<td>101.25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poet of satyr-play</td>
<td>101.25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trumpeter</td>
<td>101.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herald</td>
<td>101.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor of tragedy</td>
<td>101.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor of comedy</td>
<td>101.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Prizes at the Demostheneia at Oenoanda, sorted by prize amount (SEG 38-1462, Oinoanda, 124 CE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>First Prize (denarii)</th>
<th>Second Prize (denarii)</th>
<th>Third Prize (denarii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kitharode</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poet of tragedy</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poet of comedy</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dia panton (over-all competition)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choral aulete</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writer of prose encomia</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poet</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Prizes for an unknown contest at Aphrodisias, sorted by prize amount (Roueché [1993], no. 52, block A, Aphrodisias, ca. 100 CE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>First Prize (denarii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>tragoidos</em></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adult kitharode</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>komoidos</em></td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cyclic aulete</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writer of encomia</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poet</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pythian aulete</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dia panton</em> (over-all competition)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trumpeter</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herald</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boy kitharode</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Prizes for an unknown contest at Aphrodisias, sorted by prize amount (Roueché [1993], no. 52, block C and F, Aphrodisias, ca. 100 CE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>First Prize (denarii)</th>
<th>Second Prize (denarii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kitharode</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choral aulete</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kithara with chorus</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhic dance</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dia panton</em> (over-all competition)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
satyr (dance?)        | 150                   |                        |

Table 7. Prizes for an unknown contest at Aphrodisias, sorted by prize amount (Roueché [1993], no. 52, block D and E, Aphrodisias, ca. 100 CE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>First prize (denarii)</th>
<th>Second prize (denarii)</th>
<th>Third prize (denarii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>tragoidos</em></td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>komoidos</em></td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cyclic aulete</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pythian aulete</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trumpeter</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herald</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Prizes at the contest of Claudius Adrastus at Aphrodisias (Roueché [1993], no. 51, Aphrodisias, 180-189 CE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>First Prize (denarii)</th>
<th>Second Prize (denarii)</th>
<th>Third Prize (denarii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>tragoidos</em></td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Prizes at the Lysimacheia at Aphrodisias, sorted by prize amount (Roueché [1993], no. 53, Aphrodisias, late 2nd c. CE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>First Prize (denarii)</th>
<th>Second Prize (denarii)</th>
<th>Third Prize (denarii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>choral aulete</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kithara with chorus</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>komoidos</em></td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tragoidos</em></td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tragic chorus</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pythian aulete</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solo kithara</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhic dance</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contemporary tragedy</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boy kitharode</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writer of encomia</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poet</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trumpeter</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herald</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contemporary comedy</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ancient comedy</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koinon of <em>komoidoi</em></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adult kitharode</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koinon of <em>tragoidoi</em></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 6: Mimes and Magicians, Puppeteers and Pantomimes: Paratheatrical Entertainment at the Greek Festivals

Agonistic events (competitions in classical and contemporary tragedy, comedy, and satyr-play, musical competitions, and gymnastic events) took center stage at the festivals, but these were not the only performances on display. Festival organizers regularly hired paratheatrical entertainers, such as mimes, pantomimes, magicians, puppeteers, jokers, and acrobats, to fill out the festival program. These hired entertainers were not side-shows, nor did they perform in the intermissions between the dramatic competitions. From inscriptions evidence for festival programming, we can tell that there were days set aside especially for hired entertainment, and that the regular time for the hired entertainment was at the close of the dramatic competitions. With the exception of mimes and pantomimes, who have attracted a great deal of attention in recent years,\(^1\) paratheatrical entertainers have been almost entirely neglected in classical scholarship.\(^2\) Although they could not compete for prizes and were of a lower social status than the professional actors and poets competing in the dramatic events, paratheatrical entertainers were as much a part of imperial festival culture as the prize-winning performers. In this chapter, I

---


\(^2\) Notable exceptions are the valuable studies of epigraphic evidence for paratheatrical performance by William Slater, esp. Slater (1993), on the meaning of *akroamata*. Chaniotis has usefully collected the terminology used of paratheatrical entertainers in his study of theater specialties, Chaniotis (1990). Also invaluable is Stephanos’ 1988 prosopography of theater people, titled *Dionysiakoi Technitai* but including some paratheatrical entertainers as well. The recent Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theater includes an essay by Hugh Denard (2007) on "Lost theatre and performance traditions in Greece and Italy" which introduces some types of paratheatrical performers but does not delve deeply into any category. Despite its initial claims, the primary focus of the chapter is on the influence of Greek performance traditions on Latin comedy and the act of translating performance from one culture to another, not on the role of paratheatrical performance in the Greek world.
situate para-theatrical entertainment in the context of the festival, establishing where para-theatrical entertainment fit in the festival program. The place of para-theatrical entertainment in the festival program reveals some of the attitudes of spectators and festival organizers towards it and how these attitudes changed over time.

6.1 Scheduling Para-theatrical Entertainment

One venue for para-theatrical entertainment was as paid entertainment at festivals. There was a certain stigma attached to being hired and paid in the Greek world, particularly at the festivals. The Greeks proudly traced the histories of their festivals to their origins, some stretching back to the 8th century BCE. In the archaic and classical period, festival competitors were elites competing for crowns and glory, to make a reputation, not to win money. As we saw in the last chapter, festival organizers sought to emphasize continuity at the festivals. Using language of victory rather than payment was a way to maintain the idea that competitors were not motivated by the financial rewards of winning festival victories. As we saw in chapter 2, the theater was fully professionalized by the imperial period. Festivals which gave money prizes were less prestigious. The more prestigious festivals awarded prizes in crowns, which nevertheless were made of metal in precise amounts, for example, by melting down a set number of coins, so as to be worth an exact amount of money. The conceit remained, however, that money never changed hands if prizes were awarded in crowns. Hired entertainers were, of course, paid, which set them apart from the festival competitors.

---

3 Evidenced by the placement of festivals with money prizes at the end of lists of victories in competitors' honorific inscriptions and epitaphs. For example, a list of victories of Philoxenos of Side, a tragic actor and herald, begins with local contests in Side, then lists sacred contests, and finally contests with money prizes, the half-talent and 1000-drachma games (και ἕμιταλα[ντιαίους καὶ χειλιοδραχμιαίους). See Bean (1965) no. 149 (=IGSK Side im Altertum II 130).

4 Slater (1991) discusses this in the context of the Sarapieia at Tanagra.
In the late 2nd century CE, however, some paratheatrical entertainment categories, particularly mime and pantomime, were integrated into the prize-winning competitions at Greek festivals in the East. The introduction of mime and pantomime to festival competitions is the single most radical change to the Greek dramatic festivals in the imperial period. Adding a new competition which had previously been considered a low form of entertainment, suitable for hire but not for competition at the festival, is unprecedented. And yet, there are aspects of continuity as well. The popularity of pantomime was a constant, and the pantomime competitions which were introduced in the late 2nd century CE were a continuation of the presence of pantomimes as hired entertainment at the festivals. Ruth Webb has recently demonstrated that there were competitive aspects of pantomime from its earliest attestations.\(^5\) There was much continuity for the dancers themselves. Pantomimes still were not members of the guilds of actors, open to all other musical and dramatic festival competitors. Many victorious pantomimes were honored by cities, but there are examples of the same types of honors being awarded to pantomimes before they could win competitions.\(^6\)

At stake is the question of the relationship between old and new at the festivals. While festival organizers sought to portray the festivals as unchanging, as we saw in the last chapter, the introduction of new competitions, particularly in an art form without an ancient history, challenges the appearance of immutability. There is reason to believe that pantomime competitions were scheduled at the same time in the festival program as the hired entertainment had previously appeared, in order to maintain a certain similarity in the order of events, even

---

6 Pantomimes awarded citizenship and other honors, who are not known to have been festival victors: Aurelius Neikon (FD III 1.469), Claudius Pylades (TAM V 2.1012, CIG 3207), Lucius Furius Celsus (L.Cret. IV 222), Publius Aelius Crispus (IGLS 4.1349), Pylades son of Pylades (FD III 2.106), Tiberius Claudius Myrismos (I. Magnesia 165), Ulpius Augustianus (TAM V 1016), an unnamed pantomime at Delphi (FD III 2.105).
with the changed program. There is much less evidence for mime competitions, and it is not at all clear how common they were, or whether mime was incorporated into the competitions at the same time as pantomime.

Two inscriptions suggest that the place for hired entertainment at the festival was at the close of the dramatic competitions. An inscription from Delos from 169 BCE includes _thaumatopoioi_, a dancer, puppeteers, and a _rhomaistes_, a rare word which appears in a late antique glossary as some sort of trapeze-artist.\(^7\) These performers appear at the end of a list of victors from the Delian festival. An interesting aspect of this list of paratheatrical performers is that they are listed by name, like the victors of the competitions. Victory lists typically list competitions in the order in which they occurred, so grouping these entertainers at the end suggests that the hired entertainment was reserved for the conclusion of the festival. This would be in keeping with a later record of hired entertainment at a Greek festival, the Demostheneia at Oinoanda, in Northern Lycia.

We know from the extensive records which survive on stone for the Demostheneia that the festival organizers hired entertainers to perform at the festival in addition to the competitive performances. One section of the will of Demosthenes lays out when the various competitions will occur, and what days are reserved for hired entertainment.


The 19th, 20th and 21st hired performances, among which will be mime artists and performances for eye and ear; for which prizes are not provided, and the other acts that benefit the city are hired for these days, for which 600 denarii will be paid.\(^8\)

This inscription does not explicitly say what entertainers will be hired to perform, in addition to the mime artists. The "performances for eye and ear" (ἀκροάματα καὶ θεάμα[τα]) most likely

\(^7\) IG XI 2.133.

refer to pantomimes, since they were, along with mimes, the most popular performers of the imperial period, but may have included any other paratheatrical entertainers.\textsuperscript{9} The amount which was set aside for hired entertainment at the Demostheneia is quite substantial in comparison with the amounts awarded to prize-winning competitors at the same festival.\textsuperscript{10} In total, the hired performers will be paid 600 denarii. Since we do not know how many of them there were, this does not tell us much about what payments they would have received individually. We can, however, compare this amount to the rest of the festival budget (table 10). In comparison to other festivals, the Demostheneia awarded fairly low prize amounts. At the Lysimacheia in Aphrodisias, for example, the prize for tragedy was 2500 denarii, ten times as much as it was at Oinoanda (250 denarii). Taking into account the relatively low budget for prizes, setting aside 600 denarii for hired performances would not have been insignificant.

The Demostheneia inscription also tells us where the hired entertainment fit in the festival program (table 11). Hired entertainment was reserved for two separate days of the month-long festival. The days set aside for the hired entertainment came at the end of the theatrical and musical competitions and before the single day of gymnastic competitions. It may be that the hired entertainment provided some sort of close to the dramatic and musical events, or a transition between the dramatic and musical competitions and the athletic competitions. The hired entertainment may have been particularly exciting to festival-goers, an incentive to stay for the whole month. The festival organizers of the Demostheneia may have wanted the spectators to

\textsuperscript{9} For ἀκροτριόπαμα as a term for paratheatrical performers more generally, see Robert (1936) 235-254.
\textsuperscript{10} For payments to paratheatrical entertainers in Egypt in the 2nd c. CE, see P.Oxy 519, a contract for the hiring of entertainers, trans. Johnson (1936), and P.Oxy 7.1025, a contract for the hiring of entertainers for a festival, which does not list the amount of their payments.
stay not just for the success of the festival but also for economic reasons, to encourage people to stay and spend money in Oinoanda.\textsuperscript{11}

The excitement leading up to the paratheatrical entertainment at the close of the festival can be seen in Lucian's letter \textit{On the Death of Peregrinus}. This letter is not about paratheatrical entertainment \textit{per se}, but alludes to the place of paratheater at the festival. Peregrinus was a sophist who adopted the name Proteus, and burned himself alive at the close of the Olympic games, because he knew that the Olympics would attract the largest crowds. Peregrinus plans to burn himself at the height of the festival. The moment he identifies as the height of the festival is the very end, after dark.\textsuperscript{12} While Lucian styles Peregrinus as a playwright and the festival as a whole as a play, Peregrinus' self-immolation is also reminiscent of the pyrotechnics of paratheatrical entertainers, as is the placement of the spectacle at the close of the festival.\textsuperscript{13}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Budgeted amount (denarii)</th>
<th>Percentage of the total budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total thymelic prizes</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hired entertainment</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total gymnic prizes</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges' fees and gifts for citizens, freedmen, \textit{paroikoi}</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total budget</td>
<td>4450</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Prize amount (denarii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>trumpeters</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>heralds</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{11} De Ligt (1993) examines the phenomenon of festival markets, arguing that some festivals were more geared towards commerce than others (e.g. Delos), but that most festivals would have had a commercial aspect (35-39).

\textsuperscript{12} Lucian, \textit{On the Death of Peregrinus} 21.

\textsuperscript{13} Pyrotechnics are attested in many types of paratheatrical entertainment. Trick magic: fire flaming up spontaneously (Athenaeus, \textit{Deipnosophistai} 1.19e); acrobatics: fire-breathing while tumbling (Athenaeus, \textit{Deipnosophistai} 4.129d); automata: torch lit with real fire on the miniature stage of an automaton (Heron, \textit{Peri automata poietikes} 22). Pyrotechnic spectacles would have been more impressive at night, when the fire could be seen more clearly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Prize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 5</td>
<td>prose encomia</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 6</td>
<td>no competitions (market day)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 7</td>
<td>poets</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 8-9</td>
<td>chorauloi</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 10-11</td>
<td>old comedy (ἀγών κωμῳδόν)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 12</td>
<td>no competitions (sacrifice for Apollo)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 13-14</td>
<td>old tragedy (ἀγών τραγῳδόν)</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15</td>
<td>no competitions (sacrifice for Apollo)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 16-17</td>
<td>kitharodes</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 18</td>
<td>dia panton (overall competition)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 19-21</td>
<td>hired entertainment</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 22</td>
<td>gymnastic contests</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.2 From Hired Entertainment to Prize-winning Competition

The introduction of pantomime to the competitions at the Greek festivals happened gradually. Pantomime seems to have first become a festival competition in the West, most likely at the Sebastea in Naples. The Sebastea was founded in 2 CE, but pantomime was probably added to the competitions later. Until the 160s CE, the Sebastea may have been the only festival with a competition for pantomimes, as Lucian's interlocutor Lycinus claims that only the games in Naples allowed pantomime competitions in the dialogue *On Pantomime*, written probably in the 160s CE. The earliest attested pantomime festival victory is that of Marcus Ulpius Apolaustus under the reign of Trajan (table 12). The festival where this victory occurred is not named, but if we trust Lucian, it must have been at the Sebastea, as Leppin has

---

A 2nd c. CE inscription from Olympia lists the rules, contests, and prizes for the Sebastea in Naples, because the Sebastea was ἱσολόμπιος, equal to the Olympics (IVO 56). In this inscription, one of the thymelic prizes is for something ending in -σταί. The editors originally reconstructed [κιθαρι]σταί, but Geer suggested [ὀρχη]σταί. If Geer's reconstruction is correct, the victorious pantomime would take the highest prize of the thymelic competitions (4,000 drachmas), above comic and tragic actors (3,000 drachmas each). In 2004, in advance of the subway construction in Naples, the temple of Augustus was excavated, and fragments of victory lists for the Sebastea from the Flavian were uncovered. Some are on display in the archaeological museum in Naples, but the texts have not yet been published. These texts may help to clarify the chronology of pantomime at the Sebastea. See De Martino (2008) 209 and for a popular account, Banyasz and Rose (2008).

suggested. Publius Aelius Pylades' and Lucius Aurelius Apolaustus Memphius' places of victory are also not named, but again, the Sebastea is highly likely. If the Sebastea was the only festival with a pantomime competition in the early-mid 2nd c. CE, this might explain why victors do not cite a specific festival. It would have been obvious to anyone at the time.

In the Greek East, the introduction of pantomime to the competitions must have happened after Lucian's dialogue. Epigraphic evidence that pantomimes were allowed into competitions in the East also appears in the late 2nd century CE, when pantomimes begin to show up in inscriptions listing their festival victories. A few of these inscriptions can be surely dated. The earliest datable, epigraphically attested festival victory for a pantomime is from 176-180 CE. This pantomime won at the Eusebeia in Puteoli, the Sebastea in Naples, the Ephesea, the Leukophrynea in Magnesia on the Maeander. Once pantomime was incorporated into festival programs in the Greek East, it does not seem to have been localized to one place or region, though the attestations of pantomime competitions concentrate at the Sebastea in Naples (table 12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Festival</th>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98-117 CE</td>
<td>Unknown, poss. Naples</td>
<td>Unknown, poss. the Sebastea</td>
<td>Marcus Ulpius Apolaustus¹⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117-138 CE</td>
<td>Unknown, poss. Naples</td>
<td>Unknown, poss. the Sebastea</td>
<td>Publius Aelius Pylades²⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161-169 CE</td>
<td>Unknown, poss. Naples</td>
<td>Unknown, poss. the Sebastea</td>
<td>Lucius Aurelius Apolaustus Memphius²¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160s CE</td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>Sebastea</td>
<td>N/A²²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176-180 CE</td>
<td>Magnesia on Leukophrynea</td>
<td>Unknown²²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁸ I. Magnesia 192 (honorary inscription, Magnesia on the Maeander). For extended discussion of this inscription, see Slater (1996a) 195-204.
¹⁹ CIL 6.37841, 6.10114.
²⁰ CIL 5.7753.
²² Lucian, On Pantomime 32.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location 1</th>
<th>Location 2</th>
<th>Location 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>176-180 CE</td>
<td>Puteoli</td>
<td>Eusebeia</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176-180 CE</td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>Sebastea</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176-180 CE</td>
<td>Ephesus</td>
<td>Ephesea</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-192 CE</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Lucius Aurelius Pylades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-192 CE</td>
<td>Pergamum</td>
<td>Olympiea Commodeia</td>
<td>Tiberius Julius Apolaustus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-192 CE</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Tiberius Julius Apolaustus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198-217 CE</td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>Sebastea</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198-217 CE</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Palatine games</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>Sebastea</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd/3rd c. CE</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Crispus of Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd c. CE</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Parthenopaeus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pantomime may have been incorporated into the festival competitions through the setting of the program for days appended to the festival for the celebration of the imperial cult. This practice of appending days for the imperial cult to pre-existing local festivals has been studied in depth by Kostas Buraselis. The practice began in the Hellenistic period. Hellenistic kings appended festivals named in their honor to existing festivals. The original festival continued to be celebrated as it had been, with the same competitions, and the new festival for the ruler cult was celebrated directly after. The two festivals were linked, in that they shared a common procession and title, but the festival for the ruler cult was added to the original festival, rather

---

23 I. Magnesia 192.
24 Ibid.
25 Ibid.
26 Ibid.
27 EAOR VIII 16, CIL 5.7753.
28 FD III 1.551, FiE II 70 and 71.
29 Ibid.
30 Sordi (1953) 104-121.
31 Ibid.
32 IV O 56.
33 SEG 31-1072.
34 TC medallion from Arausio (S. France), St. Germain museum no. 31673.
35 Slater (1995) 281-2 suggests that pantomime entered the competitions at *koina* contests, such as the *koina Asias*, which also included gladiatorial contests. Hunt in Hall and Wyles (2008) 182 further elaborates on the connection between pantomime and Augustus.
36 Buraselis (2012) 247-266.
than replacing it. The practice of appending festivals continued in the Roman imperial period. Festivals in honor of the Roman emperors were appended to existing local festivals, rather than replacing them. So, for example, the pantomime Tiberius Julius Apolaustus won a victory at a festival called the Olympeia Commodeia Sebastea *koina Asias.* "Koina Asias" refers to the fact that this was a regional festival common to all of Asia Minor. The title Olympeia likens it to the festival of Zeus at Olympus. "Commodeia Sebastea" has been appended to this festival, suggesting that there were some days set aside for celebration of the imperial cult, and specifically, of the emperor Commodus. When days of competitions in honor of the emperor were added to the festival, there would have been an opportunity to set the program for the new days. It is then possible that pantomime competitions were added to festivals which appended days of celebration of the emperor.

This hypothesis is appealing for several reasons. Pantomime had strong ties to the Roman imperial family. Many pantomimes were imperial freedmen. Festival organizers may have chosen to include pantomime as a competition on festival days celebrating the imperial cult not just because of its popularity, but because of its association with the emperors. The days of the appended imperial cult festival provided a chance for new competitions to be incorporated into the festival without interfering with the traditional order of competitions. As we saw in the Delian inscription and the records of the Demostheneia at Oinoanda, the hired entertainment came at the end of the dramatic competitions, on separate days. If the days of the imperial festivals came after the days of the original festival, the pantomime competitions could have come at exactly the moment during the festival that they would have as hired entertainment, at the end. Even before the introduction of pantomime to the competitions, hired entertainment was a kind of appendage at the end of the festival.
6.3 Attitudes Towards the New Festival Victors: The Fluidity of Status

The most extended treatment of pantomime is Lucian's dialogue *On Pantomime*. Lucian's interlocutor Crato problematizes the gender of the pantomime, *theludrian anthropon*, "a girlish man," who mimes *erotica gunaia*, "womanly love stories," such as Phaedra, Parthenope, and Rhodope. In his reply, Lycinus does not contradict Crato's association of pantomime with Eros, but changes the terms. Dance is not the province of silly love songs, but of the primordial, creative force of Eros. He sees proof of this in the rhythmic movements of the cosmos, echoed in the rhythmic movements of dancers. He points not only to a past moment, but to the most ancient past, the origin of the universe. Lycinus turns the traditional hierarchy of the tragic art over the less prestigious pantomime upside-down by idealizing the body of the dancer while shifting the grotesque onto the body of the actor. He ridicules the bodily modifications of actors, who distort their appearances with masks, boots, and stomach padding, and, he claims, merely recite lines provided by a poet. The themes of tragedy and pantomime are the same, according to Lycinus: they both deal with stories of the mythical past. It is their bodies he differentiates: the body of the tragic actor lacks realism, and therefore the *kosmos* (order) of the mimetic dancer. It is difficult to pin down what Lucian himself thought of pantomime, because pantomime is so open to different interpretations in the text. Is it a high art form, as Lycinus suggests, or a low form, as Crato would have us believe? Or does it manage to slip between high and low?

Lucian, *On Pantomime* 2. This portrayal of the pantomime as a source of eroticism on and off the stage can be paralleled in many accounts of this period and later. Galen, for example, tells a story in *On Prognosis* about an elite woman who was lovesick for a pantomime dancer, Paris, and the list of elite Romans said to have fallen in love with pantomimes includes Maecenas, Caligula, Messalina, Trajan, and the empress Domitia.

"You seem to me to be totally ignorant of the fact that this practice of dancing is not new—it didn't begin yesterday or the day before, say at the time of our grandfathers, or of theirs, but the most truthful historians of dance would tell you that dance emerged together with the first genesis of the universe, appearing together with the that ancient Love." (Lucian, *On Pantomime* 7)
The terminology used of pantomimes reflects this dual status: at once low entertainment, associated with entertainment for hire, popular among the crowds, and yet among hired entertainers, of relatively high status. Literacy authors refer to pantomimes as "dancers (orchestai). In epigraphic sources, however, they are called "actors of the rhythmic, tragic movement" (tragikes enrythmou kineseos hupokrites). The epigraphic convention of referring to pantomimes not as dancers but as actors, and specifically, as actors of a tragic dance, must be an attempt to style them as similar to the actors of tragedy, who were of higher status. In imperial Greek victory lists, there are two ways to say "tragic actor": tragoidos ("actor of old tragedies") and tragoidion hupokrites ("actor of tragedies"). The term for pantomime must have been based on this actor of X-in-genitive construction, especially when we consider that the beginning and ending words are almost exactly the same. That is, tragoidion hupokrites has been expanded to tragikes enrythmou kineseos hypokrites. Visually aligning the parallel words in these two phrases may make it easier to see the similarity between them:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tragoidion} & \quad \text{hypokrites} \\
\text{tragikes} \quad \text{enrythmou kineseos} \quad \text{hypokrites}
\end{align*}
\]

In epigraphy, pantomime competes not with other forms of dance, not with music, but with acted tragedy.

Our term pantomime comes not from Greek but from Latin. In Latin, male pantomimes were pantomimi, and female pantomimes were pantomimae. The Latin word is clearly formed from Greek parts, but Greeks did not typically call pantomimes pantomimoi. In fact, there are only two attestations of παντόμιμος in Greek, one from 84-60 BCE and the other from 181 CE.\(^{40}\)

---


\(^{40}\) Philistion of Dyrrhachion (Pomtow [1920] 177 no. 161 = I.Apollonia D525) and Phibammon son of Achilles of Hermopolis (P. Flor. 74).
Latin speakers may have used a Greek-sounding word for this new type of dance because it was brought to Rome by two dancers from the East, Bathyllus and Pylades, endowing the dance with a foreign-ness by using a Greek term. Pantomime and tragic acting were similar in that the content of their performances was the same, though the form was different. Literary sources highlight the difference between tragic actors and pantomimes by calling attention to the form rather than the content. Calling pantomimes dancers emphasizes that they are formally different from actors. It is a notable fact that we do not actually know what ordinary people called pantomimes. It seems unlikely that they called them "actors of the rhythmic, tragic movement": this is too clunky for everyday speech. Spectators may have called the pantomimes dancers, tragic dancers, or something else altogether.

Lycinus' argument in Lucian's On Pantomime as to why pantomime is part of the festival competitions in Naples but not elsewhere reveals some of the elite attitudes towards this new competition.

Εἰ δὲ μὴ ἔναγώνιος ἡ ὄρχησις, ἐκείνην εἶναι φημι αἰτίαν, τὸ δόξαι τοῖς ἀγωνοθέταις μεῖζον καὶ σεμνότερον τὸ πράγμα ἢ ὡστε εἰς ἐξέτασιν καλεῖσθαι. ἐω λέγειν ὅτι πόλις ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ, τοῦ Χαλκιδικοῦ γένους ἡ ἀρίστη, καὶ τούτο ύστερ τι κόσμημα τῷ παρ᾿ αὐτοῖς ἀγώνι προστέθεικεν.

If the dance does not feature in contests, I maintain that it is because the governors of the games thought the thing too important and too grand to be called into competition. I forbear to mention that a city in Italy, the fairest that belongs to the Chalcidian race, has added it, by way of embellishment, to the games that are held there.41 "The dance" (ἡ ὄρχησις) is pantomime, which is clearly established from the beginning of the dialogue. This is the normal term for pantomime in imperial Greek literature, as we will see below. Lucian makes great use of the ambiguity inherent in calling pantomime "the dance," by tracing the history of pantomime seamlessly back to the origins of Greek dance in the motions of the heavenly spheres, the cosmic dance. The claim that Naples added pantomime to the games

(the Sebastea) as a κόσμημα picks up on this theme of the κόσμος of dancers which runs through the dialogue. Calling pantomime a κόσμημα, however, makes it sound somewhat frivolous, a pretty adornment rather than a central and important part of the festival. Lycinus emphasizes that pantomime is something added to pre-existing festival competitions. Interestingly, rather than claiming that the spectators pushed for pantomime to become a competition, Lycinus pins the change in the festival program on the contest presidents, the agonothetai. This passage is tongue-in-cheek, as Lucian's audience surely knew that it was not because pantomime was "too important and too grand" (μεῖζον καὶ σεμνότερον) that it was not a festival competition outside of Naples, but that it was traditionally part of the hired entertainment.

Pantomimes who competed at festivals and won victories were honored by cities with honorific inscriptions, statues, and grants of citizenship and the status of bouletes, which allowed them the right (formally, at least) to participate in the local council. The qualities which pantomimes are celebrated for in honorific inscriptions, both before and after the introduction of pantomime to the competitions, are piety, moderation, character, and orderliness in their way of life. These qualities are common to all types of Greek honorific inscriptions, and by calling attention to the qualities of character of the performer, the cities which erected these inscriptions were instructing their citizens to model their own behavior on the behavior of the honoree.

---

42 The piety (eusebeia) of dancers was often celebrated, as in this inscription from Delphi from the first half of the 2nd century CE, "The most holy city of Delphi...made (him), Athenian councilor, actor of the tragic, rhythmic dance, her citizen and councilor, and honored (him) with the erection of a suitable bronze, on account of his piety and the holiness of his character" (FD III 2.105). For the use of the language of piety in relation to Hellenistic actors, see Lightfoot in Hall and Easterling (2002) 211-26.

43 In North-west Lydia (166-169/180 CE), roughly contemporaneous with Lucian's composition of the dialogue On Pantomime, the Thyatireans honored the pantomime Ulpius Augustianos "for the moderation of his way of life, while he was living in the city and adorning (it) through the tragic, rhythmic movement" (IGRR IV 1272).

44 I.Magnesia 165.
The pantomime who is most lavishly represented in the epigraphic record is Tiberius Iulius Apolaustus, who danced in the late second century CE and won festival victories from Asia Minor to Boeotia. His name, Apolaustus, "the enjoyable one," is a stage name adopted for its appropriateness to his craft. He, like many other pantomimes, was celebrated on stone for qualities of character (piety and the orderliness of his way of life). In two inscriptions from Ephesus, we learn that Apolaustus was honored with the status of *bouleutes* (councilor), had statues erected on his behalf, and was granted citizenship in many cities in Asia Minor and mainland Greece (Ill. 4).\(^{45}\) In another honorific inscription from Delphi we learn that he also competed in festivals.


\(^{45}\) IK Ephesus 6.2070 and 2071 (180-192 CE).
λεων ἐν δόσαις ἐπεδήμησεν ἐπαρχείας
dιὰ τῇν τῆς τέχνης ἁκρίβειαν καὶ τήν
tοῦ βίου κόσμ[ίου ἀνασ]τροφήν.

Tiberius Iulius Apolaustus, actor of the tragic, rhythmic dance, circuit-victor, sacred victor, who won alone and first of men from all time, who first attempted the sacred contest in Pergamum, open to the whole world, celebrated with a triumphal entry, the Olympeia Commodeia Sebastea koina Asias, winning likewise the distinct contest and the over-all (contest) and the same (contest) celebrated with a triumphal entry. Councilor of the Magnesians on the Maeander, the Athenians, the Pergamenes, the Trallians, the Laodiceans, the Milesians, the Nicomedians, the Niceans, the Caesareans, the Nicopoliteans opposite Actium, the Mytileneans, the Hierocaesareans, the Magnesians by Mt. Sipylos, the Cumaeans, the Septeneans, the seven-gated Thebans, the Plataeans, the Charoneans, the Messeneans, and in as many cities he was honored with erections of statues: Ephesus, Athens, Pergamum, Magnesia, Laodicea (two), Miletus, Hierocaesarea (three), Thyateira (two), Corinth, Nicopolis, Patra, Sardis, Messene, Nysa, Cyme, Thebes, Platea, Setta (two), citizenship in Antioch near Daphne, Ephesus, Smyrna, Cyzicus, the Troad, Sardis, and of many other cities, in so many provinces in which he stayed, because of the precision of his skill and the orderly way of his life.

In this inscription from Delphi, Apolaustus' festival victories are particularly highlighted. He competed on the periodos, the circuit of prestigious, international Greek games, which had sacred status. Apolaustus won at the Koina Asias in Pergamum. He also performed in Athens, Smyrna, Ephesos, and Corinth (as evidenced by the honors bestowed on him by these cities), but it is not clear from the inscription whether these were festival competitions or paid performances, or in what order and over what span of time they occurred. If they were festival competitions, it is possible that he was following the periodos and filling in the time between the large festivals with other appearances. The expense undertaken by so many cities to erect statues and accompanying inscriptions for this dancer shows most vividly the popularity of pantomime and the celebrity status that successful dancers could achieve. In fact, Apolaustus is not only the most well-documented pantomime from the imperial period. We know of no other imperial theatrical professional, no comic or tragic actor, with as successful a career.

46 FD III 1.511.
Ill. 4. Map of the activities of the pantomime Tiberius Iulius Apolaustus. Yellow = city in which a statue was erected in honor of Apolaustus; Cyan = city in which Apolaustus held citizenship; Red = city in which Apolaustus won a festival victory.

As with pantomimes, mimes received civic honors and public recognition in the High Empire, after the adoption of mime as a festival competition. While mimes are depicted in literary sources as of the lowest social status, it was possible for some mimes to achieve a high level of success. Tiberius Claudius Philologos Theseus (surely a stage name) won festival contests and was honored with citizenship in three cities and the status of bouletes in a number of others. He traveled at least between mainland Greece (Athens and Marathon) and Asia Minor (Ephesus and Magnesia).

[Ti]β. Κλ. Φιλόλο[γον]
[Θη]σέα, μόνον καὶ πρῶτον
[βι]λόγον Ἀθηναίοιν π[ατέρα],
[Μ]πραβόνιον καὶ Ἐφέσι[ον]
[κα]ὶ Μάγνητα ἀπὸ Μαιά[νδρου]
[καὶ] ἄλλων πολλῶν π[όλεων]
[π]ολείτην καὶ βουλε[υτήν],
[νε]ικήσαντα ἄγ[άς]
(The Ephesians honored) Tiberius Claudius Philologos Theseus, only and first father of Athenian mimes, citizen of Marathon, Ephesus, and Magnesia on the Maeander, and citizen and councilor of many other cities, who won the contests inscribed below: in...12 times, in B...  

This was inscribed on a statue base found near the theater in Ephesus. Tiberius Claudius Philologos Theseus was not the only biologos to win festival victories. In the 2nd or 3rd century CE, the citizens of Tralles honored a mime, Flavius Alexandros Oxeidas of Nicomedia, with a statue. The statue base with its inscription survives.

The council and demos honored Flavius Alexandros Oxeidas, Nikomedian, mime, member of the council of Antioch and Herakleia, and member of the elder council of Miletus, Asian victor, for the superiority of his work, and the orderliness of his character, who won at the contests in Asia 18 times, and in Lycia and Pamphylia 26 times.

The number of Oxeidas' festival victories suggests that mime was a festival competition at many festivals in Asia Minor during his career. The citizens of Tralles use the same honorific vocabulary that we would expect of any honored notable, praising his skill, character, and accomplishments. The question is how typical Oxeidas and Philologos were. On the one hand, we know of only these two mimes who won festival victories in the 2nd and 3rd centuries CE. There were certainly many more mimes who did not compete in festivals, and did not receive

---


48 Robert (1936) 244-5 (=LBW 1652b).
honors from the cities where they performed. On the other hand, both Oxeidas and Philologos won multiple victories, suggesting that mime competitions were fairly widespread. What these honorific inscriptions show is not that mimes in general were of higher status in the 2nd and 3rd centuries CE, but that it became possible for some mimes to rise to prominence, and be commemorated by their audiences.

Conclusion

By the imperial period, paratheatrical entertainment had long been a part of the festivals, but only in the late second and early third centuries CE did pantomimes and mimes compete alongside actors and playwrights of tragedy, comedy, and satyr-play, musicians, and athletes in the Greek East. While the incorporation of mime and pantomime into the competitions can be seen as a radical change to the festivals, it was also a continuation of a long-standing practice of festival organizers hiring paid entertainers to perform. The place of paratheatrical entertainment in the festival program seems to have remained constant, and the transition from paid to prize-winning entertainment does not seem to have had a great effect on the social status of paratheatrical performers. Of the many kinds of paratheatrical entertainment, only mime, pantomime, and acrobatics are known to have become prize-winning competitions at the Greek festivals. One reason for this is surely popularity. Mime and pantomime were by far the most popular paratheatrical entertainment categories, evidenced by the sheer number of mimes and pantomimes we know by name as opposed to the paucity of evidence relating to most other types of paratheatrical entertainment. There may also have been practical reasons, as mime, pantomime, and acrobatics would have been more visible to the entire theater audience than magic shows, puppet shows, and automata. Lastly, pantomime seems to have had a special
relationship to the imperial family, as many pantomimes were imperial freedmen and many emperors seem to have been enthusiastic pantomime fans. The mechanism for the incorporation of pantomime into the competitions may have been through the imperial cult. The next chapter continues this investigation into the role of paratheatrical entertainment at the festivals, but turns to the aesthetic of paratheater, and what it can tell us about popular culture in the Empire.
Chapter 7: The Culture and Aesthetic of Paratheater

The aesthetic of paratheatrical entertainment was one of *thauma*. *Thauma* runs through literary and epigraphic sources on paratheatrical entertainers, who are all *thaumatopoioi*, "marvel-makers." *Thauma* is the wonder experienced at things which the viewer cannot comprehend, things which seem impossible or defy expectation. *Thauma* is therefore associated with surprise. For example, puppets are inanimate objects, and yet, they appear to move as living beings in the miniature theater, which causes *thauma*. *Thauma* at imitation (mimesis) characterizes not only puppet shows, but also automatata, mime, and pantomime. Acrobats, on the other hand, cause *thauma* by appearing to defy death (routines involving knives were popular), while magicians cause *thauma* by performing tricks that the audience cannot explain. The aesthetic of *thauma* explains the variety and malleability of paratheatrical entertainment, as *thauma* is often a reaction to the new or unexpected. We can situate paratheatrical entertainment in a broader cultural context of fascination with *thaumata*, indicated in the theater, by the innovation of stage devices meant to cause *thauma* in the audience, and in literature, by the popularity of paradoxography in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods.

Whereas Plato criticizes the audiences of puppet shows (*thaumata*) for being mindless, Aristotle says that intellectual inquiry began with *thauma*.¹ Aristotle claims that men began to philosophize by experiencing *thauma* at that which they did not understand, "wondering first at obvious perplexities" (ἐξ ἀρχῆς μὲν τὰ πρόχειρα τῶν ἀπόρων θαυμάσαντες), and then advancing to more complex questions about the natural world.² The difference between philosophical *thauma* and the *thauma* caused by puppets or other paratheatrical shows is that *thauma* provokes

---

¹ Plato, *Laws* 658c, discussed further in the section on puppeteers below.
philosophical men to ask questions and seek answers, to gain knowledge of how the universe works. The spectator at a puppet show is simply meant to experience *thauma*, not to be provoked to understand the mechanism of the puppet. Imperial Greek authors repeatedly return to the question of who is experiencing *thauma* and at what, and characterize the masses as being overly amazed or amazed at the wrong things. As we will see, literary authors make various attempts to re-direct *thauma* away from paratheatrical entertainers to objects of their choosing. We might also see something similar at play in the erection of statues and honorific inscriptions for paratheatrical entertainers which praise their virtue and quality of life. By emphasizing certain qualities of character of entertainers in inscriptions, cities could exert some control in directing spectators’ admiration.

In this chapter, I trace some of the reactions to the popularity of paratheatrical entertainment in imperial Greek culture in literary sources, looking at how two imperial Greek authors, Athenaeus and Philostratus, respond to *thaumatopoioi* and their audiences. Athenaeus embeds criticism of those who experience *thauma* at spectacular shows in his valuable collection of information about *thaumatopoioi* in the *Deipnosophistai*, or *Sophists at Dinner*. With much more complexity, Philostratus brings together paratheatrical, paradoxographical, and philosophical *thauma* in his *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* as a way of delineating what is truly worthy of admiration. This picks up on the discussion of Philostratus’ *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* which closed chapter 5. While *thauma* is the audience response which the *thaumatopoioi* intend, those who experience *thauma* at these entertainers are subject to criticism by Apollonius (and implicitly, by Philostratus).

### 7.1 Paratheatrical Entertainment Categories
Pantomime was only one of many types of paratheatrical entertainment. In this section, I provide an account of what we know about each category of paratheatrical entertainment: (1.1) puppeteering, (1.2) automata, (1.3) trick magic, (1.4) jesting, (1.5) acrobatics, (1.6) mime, and (1.7) pantomime. While there was great variety in the types of performances, all types of paratheatrical entertainment share a strong association with *thauma*, and many have close relationships to other categories of performance and bodies of cultural knowledge. Pantomime is first attested in the 1st c. BCE, but all other paratheatrical entertainment categories were well established in the Greek world before the imperial period. Paratheatrical entertainment included puppeteering and perhaps also automata, performances of illusion (magic tricks, pebble tricks), funny and parodical performances (jesting, joking, clowning, mime), acrobatics, and dance (pantomime). Most of these paratheatrical performances were humorous, with the notable exception of pantomime, the tragic dance. All of these performance types can be classed as *thaumatopoia*, "marvels," or *akroamata* and *theamata*, "pleasures for ear and eye," as in the Demostheneia inscription. Because the evidence for some types of paratheatrical performance is limited (particularly puppeteering, automata, trick magic, and acrobatics), we must also consider non-festival performance contexts, such as symposia and more informal marketplace performances. While the performance context of the symposium was very different from a public theater performance, in many cases, the same people may have performed in both venues. One example of such a public-private crossover is the story that performers from the festival of the pots in Athens performed at the wedding feast of Caranus in Macedon (4th c. BCE), followed by

---

3 Appendix 2 is a set of tables which collect the known paratheatrical entertainers in each category. Musicians, who also participated in paratheatrical entertainment, by accompanying mime and pantomime shows, for example, are largely outside of the scope of this chapter.

4 For *akroamata* and *theamata* used for paratheatrical entertainment, see Plutarch, *Convivial Questions* 711a; Cassius Dio, *Roman History* 52.30; Xenophon, *Symposium* 2.1. It is also common in epigraphy.
Just as these performers brought something of the prestige of their festival performance to Caranus' wedding, perhaps also paratheatrical entertainment could bring some taste of private performance onto the public stage. Some paratheatrical performances did bring a more intimate viewing experience into the theater, as many shows seem to have required a close-up view.

Paratheatrical performers share some affinities with actors of tragedy, comedy, and satyr play. Similarly disdained by literary sources, they spent their careers on the road, some in troupes (particularly mimes. Unlike actors of tragedy, comedy, and satyr play, paratheatrical performers were not members of the Dionysiac synod, even those who competed in festivals. We should also keep in mind that while hired entertainers were of lower status than competitors at festivals, it must have been a point of pride for the entertainers to have been hired for festival shows. They performed on the same stages as the actors, and many became famous in their own right, as we will see. Performances in the theater were a significant step up from the more informal marketplace shows, for which crowds gathered in a circle around the ὀχλαγωγοί. Stobaeus mentions the marketplace and the theater as the two places where thaumatopoioi performed.

Athenaeus tells a story about a 4th century BCE mime, Ischomachus, making this transition from marketplace entertainer to the stage: "originally, he did impersonations in the marketplace (ἐν τοῖς κύκλοις), but after he got a reputation, he changed course and performed mimes in stage-

---

6 Andreas Fountoulakis (2000) has argued on the basis of two inscriptions from Syracuse from the 1st c. BCE that mimes had their own guild, the synod of Technitai of Cheerful Aphrodite. The idea is interesting, though the evidence is thin.
7 See Dickie (2001) 602 for discussion of these marketplace entertainments.
8 καὶ ὀδὸν καθάπερ ἐπὶ σκηνής ἡ τυχώρας, ἐκ ἡ δεικνύουσιν οἱ θαυματουργοὶ τὰ θαύματα:"And just like on the stage or some market-place in which the marvel-makers display their marvels..." Stobaeus 4.50c.95.
shows (ἐν τοῖς θαύμασιν). This Ischomachus had such a reputation that he could be cited by name by Athenaeus some six centuries after his time. The performers we tend to hear about, both in literary and epigraphic sources, tend to be the successful ones: those who were honored by cities with statues or remembered for being especially famous. For all of the performers we are about to meet, we must remember that there were many more who did not leave a trace.

7.1.1 Puppeteers

We know very little of what puppeteering was like in antiquity, though some aspects may be deduced. The most well-known attestation of puppeteering in antiquity is in Plato's parable of the cave, where the images in the cave are compared to shadow-puppets behind a screen. He calls these shadow-puppeteers *thaumatopoioi*, the general term used of all paratheatrical entertainers. Shadow-puppets must be two dimensional, so that they cast a clear shadow onto the screen. Clearly, shadow-puppets require darkness in order for the light cast behind them to create a shadow. This would be easily accomplished inside, in a dark or darkened room, at any time of day, but if shadow-puppet shows were also given outdoors, they must have been at night. Because only their shadows are seen, a light-weight material would work best. A thin material casts a crisp shadow. If the material is too thick, the edges of the shadow are blurred. These light-weight materials lend themselves better to manipulation by sticks, because a flimsy puppet

---


10 There is very little scholarship on ancient puppeteering. Denard (2007) mentions puppets in passing, but does not discuss them, in his short chapter on paratheatrical entertainers. Maya Muratov, however, has several articles on ancient puppeteering in the works, which should fill this gap in scholarship.

11 Plato, *Republic* 514b, discussed by Gocer (1999). Gocer makes too strong a claim, that Plato's puppets are directly linked to Turkish Karagoz shadow puppets. The basic operation of shadow puppets may have more to do with the physical requirements of the medium than the direct continuation of one type of performance from antiquity to the present.
cannot be controlled by flexible strings, as the puppet is not heavy enough to create the tension required for strings to move it accurately.

 Plato's shadow puppets, however, may not have represented the most common type of puppeteering in antiquity, since the analogy from the Republic is the only example of shadow-puppeteering in ancient sources.\(^\text{12}\) More commonly, references are to the type of puppeteering practiced by the *neuropastai*, who operated stringed puppets. Modern stringed puppets are typically three-dimensional, made of a heavier material than shadow-puppets, and jointed at the shoulders, elbows, hips, and knees. More elaborately, they may be jointed at the neck, wrists, and ankles. The more joints the puppet has, the more closely it can mimic the motions and gestures of real humans (or animals). The jointing mechanisms of ancient Greek puppets, however, may have been similar to jointed dolls, which are jointed only at the shoulders, elbows, hips, and knees. There are many surviving examples of these dolls.\(^\text{13}\) Rather than using ball-and-socket joints, which would allow for a full range of motion, the dolls' joints are like hinges, allowing the limb to move only on one plane (up and down, rather than side-to-side). Some painted terracotta dolls have holes at the top of the head and in each of the hands, indicating that they were manipulated by strings, though they still were most likely toys, rather than performance puppets.\(^\text{14}\) The clearest description of how these puppets operated is by Aristotle, in *On the Cosmos*, where he compares the divinity to a puppeteer.

\(^{12}\) Plato was certainly familiar with stringed puppets, as he uses an elaborate stringed puppet analogy at *Laws* 644d-645b, where the Athenian compares men to puppets of the gods, drawn by different strings (representing various goodness and badness).

\(^{13}\) Some Roman examples are illustrated in Dolansky (2012), figs. 1-3. Elderkin (1930) has photographs of many examples of Egyptian, Greek, and Roman jointed dolls, made of a wide variety of materials (including terracotta, bone, and wood). Words for "doll" in Greek (κόρη, κόρος, νανίον) are also used of puppets.

\(^{14}\) At least three from the 5th/ 4th c. BCE are in the National Archaeological Museum in Athens, room 56. Object numbers needed here.
In the same way too [i.e. as the operators of machines, οἱ μηχανοτέχναι] the men who run puppet-shows, by pulling a single string, make the creature’s neck move, and his hand and shoulder and eye, and sometimes every part of his body, according to a rhythmical pattern.\(^\text{15}\)

The single string (µήρινθος) that Aristotle refers to as controlling all the motions of the puppet may be the one that attached to the top of the puppet's head, which acts as a sort of anchor for the puppet's movements. Modern Sicilian puppets work similarly, with a metal rod anchoring the head of the puppet. Of the motions that Aristotle describes, only that of the shoulder would have been possible with the terracotta jointed dolls which survive, which suggests that performance puppets did have more joints than the dolls, and were able to move in a more realistic fashion. It is the puppet's realism which Aristotle emphasizes, as he refers to minute motions (the hand, the eye, every part of his body).

There is practically no evidence as to what exactly puppet shows were like, and what stories they told. In his description of the festival of Dionysus in Egypt, Herodotus tells a story about religious puppets. He says that women carried cubit-long puppets with phalluses as large as the body of the puppet in the procession, accompanied by a flute-player and female singers.\(^\text{16}\)

Herodotus claims that Melampus taught the Greeks how to worship Dionysus, based on this Egyptian ritual, and that the Greeks substituted carrying the phallus for the Egyptian puppet-phallus.\(^\text{17}\) This Egyptian puppet does not get us any closer to understanding the Greek puppet theater, as there is no indication that the Egyptian Dionysiac puppet had a narrative form, or a theatrical existence at all.

\(^{15}\) Aristotle, *On the Cosmos* 398b, trans. E.S. Forster and D.J. Furley.

\(^{16}\) Herodotus, *Histories* 2.48.

\(^{17}\) Herodotus, *Histories* 2.49.
We know the names of only three professional neurospastai (table 21, Appendix 2): Potheinas, and perhaps Eurycleides,\(^\text{18}\) who performed in Athens in the 4th c. BCE, and a puppeteer whose name ended in -sion from the end of a list of victors on Delos (169 BCE).\(^\text{19}\) In addition, Diodorus Siculus claims that Antiochus IX Philopator, who ruled from 115 to 95 BCE, practiced puppeteering:

> Ὄτι ὁ Ἀντίοχος ὁ Κυζικηνὸς ἄρτιως παρεεληφὼς τὴν βασιλείαν ἐξέπεσεν εἰς μέθας καὶ τρυφὴν ἁγεννὴ καὶ ζηλώματα βασιλείας ἄλλοτριῶτα. ἔχαρε γὰρ μίμοις καὶ προδείκταις καὶ καθόλου πάσι τοῖς θαυματοποιοῖς, καὶ τὰ τούτων ἐπιτηδέματα μανθάνειν ἐφιλοτιμεῖτο. ἐπετήδευσε δὲ καὶ νευροσπαστεῖν καὶ δὲ αὐτὸν κινεῖν ζῴα πενταπίχεα κατάργυρα καὶ κατάχρυσα καὶ ἕτερα πλείονα τοιαῦτα μηχανήματα. οὐκ εἶχε δὲ ἔλεπόλεον οὐδὲ ὀργάνων πολυρκητικῶν κατασκευὰς, ἀρκεῖας δὲ καὶ δόξαν καὶ χρείας ἀξιολόγους οὖν παρέσχετο.

Shortly after Antiochus Cyzicenus gained the throne he lapsed into drunken habits, crass self-indulgence, and pursuits utterly inappropriate to a king. He delighted, for example, in mimes (mimoi) and pantomimic actors (prodeiktai), and generally in all showmen (thaumatopoioi), and devoted himself eagerly to learning their crafts. He practiced also how to manipulate puppets, and personally to keep in motion silver-plated and gilded animals five cubits high, and many other such contrivance. On the other hand, he possessed no store of "city-takers" or other instruments of siegcraft that might have brought him high renown and performed some service worth recording.\(^\text{20}\) Walton, following the LSJ, mis-translates προδείκται as "pantomimic actors," but this is too early for pantomimes. Προδείκται must be some other type of exhibitor, though exactly what is not clear. In this passage, as elsewhere, thaumatopoioi describe any type of paratheatrical entertainer: mimes, prodeiktai, puppeteers, and builders of automata. For Diodorus, the paratheatrical hobbies of Antiochus are equivalent to his neglect of his imperial duties, a criticism leveled against many rulers in Greek and Latin literature.\(^\text{21}\) Antiochus has no business

---

\(^{18}\) Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 1.19e. Athenaeus does not mention what entertainment Eurycleides provided, but since he is sandwiched between a puppeteer (Potheinas) and a string of magicians, fire-breathers, jokers, and performers of tricks, we can assume that Eurycleides also provided some sort of popular entertainment. Stephanes lists him as a puppeteer.

\(^{19}\) IG XI 2.133, 1. 83.

\(^{20}\) Diodorus Siculus, Library 34/35, 34.1, trans. Francis R. Walton.

\(^{21}\) E.g. Athenaeus says that another Antiochus honored a mime, Herodotus, and a dancer, Archelaus, more than his friends (Deipnosophistai 1.19d). Suetonius' Caligula is overly interested in theatrical shows,
playing with puppets and engineering automata (the silver- and gold-plated animals) while he could be devoting himself to *mechanemata* of a different sort, siege-engines.

Puppets are associated in literary sources with frivolity and mindlessness. The Syracusan in Xenophon's *Symposium* calls those who watch his puppet-shows witless.\(^{22}\) Similarly, in Plato's *Laws*, the Athenian suggests that if little children judged contests, they would give the prize to puppeteers.\(^{23}\) Older children would give the prize to comedians, educated women and adolescents would give the prize to tragedies, and old men would prefer rhapsodes, he says, and Clinias agrees. It would be absurd to deduce from this passage that, in actuality, puppet-shows were primarily frequented by small children, in the same way that we are not to imagine that comedies were primarily attended by older children, and tragedies by women and their teenage sons. Small children stand in for the mindless, those who are delighted by *thaumata*.

7.1.2. Automata

singing along to the tragedies he watches and dancing to flutes and castanets; Suetonius suggests that he wanted to have an all-night festival at his death so that he could have his stage debut (i.e. as the mime wearing his death mask, Suetonius, *Caligula* 54; Caligula ruled by charioteers, gladiators, dancers, theatrical performers: Cassius Dio, *Roman History* 59.5, who attributes his murder to the fact that the people cannot stand his acting and dancing, 59.29); Claudius enjoys the games too much (Suetonius, *Claudius* 34); Nero competes as a citharode, tragic actor, and herald, and wants to compete as a pantomime: he vowed "he would perform at the victory games on the water-organ, the flute, and the bagpipes and that on the last day he would appear as an actor and dance the story of Vergil's *Turnus*" (Suetonius 54; cf. Cassius Dio, *Roman History* 63.18, where Nero has his pantomime instructor killed because he is not able to learn to dance quickly enough; Nero disdained by Cassius Dio for neglecting his imperial duties while on his acting tour of Greece: Cassius Dio, *Roman History* 63.6-9); Vitellius' advisors were actors and charioteers (Suetonius, *Vitellius* 12); Titus loves his pantomimes so much that he cannot bear to watch them when they go from being his private dancers to performing on the public stage (Suetonius, *Titus* 7); Trajan was in love with a pantomime (Cassius Dio, *Roman History* 68.10). Cf. Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, *To Himself* 7.3, where Marcus Aurelius groups puppeteering with empty enthusiasm for processions, stage dramas, "flocks and herds," mock battles, bones thrown to dogs, crumbs in a fish pond, the labors of ants, and fearful mice, all distractions that the philosopher must rise above. Interestingly, Marcus Aurelius uses the Latin term for puppet, *sigillaria*, modified by the Greek *neurospastoumena*.

\(^{22}\) Ἐπὶ νὴ Δία τοις ἀφροσιν. οὕτοι γὰρ τὰ ἑμὰ νευρόσπαστα θεώμενοι τρέφονσι με (Xenophon, *Symposium* 4.55).

\(^{23}\) Εἴ μὲν τοίνυν τὰ σμικρὰ κρίνοι παιδία, κρινοῦσι τὸν τὰ θαύματα ἐπιδείκνυντα (Plato, *Laws* 658c).
Ancient automata are sometimes erroneously referred to as puppet theater. They should be considered distinct forms: puppets are manipulated by a puppeteer, whereas true automata must be entirely self-moving. We do not know whether automata were typically exhibited in public, along with other partheatrical entertainments, or whether they were built primarily for private amusement, and the names of few makers of automata are known (table 22, Appendix 2). However, due to their clear relationship (in content) to staged drama, connection to thaumata, and occasional mention alongside other partheatrical entertainments, they deserve mention. One attestation of a public automaton is in the description of the Grand Procession of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, preserved in Athenaeus. One of the spectacles in the procession is an 8-cubit-tall statue of Nysa, which stands, pours a libation of milk, and sits again. The statue moves mechanically, not by human hand (μηχανικῶς οὐδενὸς τὰς χεῖρας προσάγοντος). The statue does not require humans to aid its movement, and therefore may be considered an automaton, although it is not so named. This automatic statue has a religious dimension, as it depicts the thauma of the movement of the goddess. In addition to the moving statue of Nysa, who has a clear Dionysiac connection, several other ancient automata are associated in some way with Dionysus and the theater.

The most extended treatment of ancient automata is the first century BCE treatise Peri automatapoietikes by Heron of Alexandria. Heron describes the construction of several elaborate automata: first, a rotating scene in which Maenads dance around Dionysus, whose thyrsus squirts

---

24 LSJ mis-translates θαυματουργός as "puppet-maker or -showman," citing Heron 1.7, where he is clearly talking about constructors of automata. In her otherwise excellent introduction to Heron of Alexandria, Susan Murphy (1995) conflates Heron's miniature automaton-theater with puppet theater (5), as does Kotlińska-Toma (2015) 85.

25 As, for example, in the Antiochus passage from Diodorus Siculus quoted above. Athenaeus also includes automata in a long list of partheatrical entertainments at Deipnosophistai 1.19d-20b. The automaton engineer in this passage is Cratisthenes of Phlius.

26 Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 5.198f.
real milk or water. This scene may reference stage tricks which involved filling bladders with liquid and squirting out the contents to imitate some bodily fluid, such as blood or vomit.\(^{27}\) In the case of the automaton, however, the trick is not that the thyrsus is concealed, but that the mechanism for making it squirt liquid is. It is not what is depicted that is marvelous, but how it operates. The Maenads are accompanied by the sounds of drums and cymbals. This automaton must be small enough, Heron tells us, that nobody could be suspected of operating it from inside.\(^{28}\) The automaton is built on top of a column, presumably so that it would be at eye level.

Heron goes on to describe a fully automated miniature theater, which displays multiple scenes, like a play with many acts.

The ancients used a simple device: when the theatre was opened, a painted mask appeared within it. This moved to the extent of opening and closing its eyes repeatedly. When the stage, after being closed, was opened again, the mask was no longer to be seen, but painted figures set in order for some story. And when it was closed and opened again, another array of figures would appear, illustrating each story in turn. The result was that only three movements occurred in the theatre, one that of the doors, another of the eyes, and a third of the backdrops. Our contemporaries, however, have set sophisticated stories on those toy stages, and have made use of varied and unconventional movements. As I proposed, I shall speak about one presentation which seems superior to me. The story adapted in it was the one about Nauplios. Scene by scene, it went like this.

When the stage was first opened, twelve painted figures appeared, arranged in three rows. They were made to portray some of the Greeks, repairing their ships and busying themselves about launching them. These figures moved, some sawing, some working with axes, some with hammers, others using bow-drills and augers, making a lot of noise, just as would happen in real life.

After sufficient time had elapsed, the doors were closed and opened again, and there would be another scene: the ships would appear, being launched by the Achaians.

When the doors were closed and opened again, nothing appeared in the theatre except painted sea and sky. After a short time, the ships sailed out in a line, some hidden, some

\(^{27}\) Athenaeus describes a similar stage trick involving the squirting of milk and wine to imitate vomit: "Phanodemos reports that when Diopeithas of Locris was in Thebes, he tied bladders full of milk and wine inside his clothes, and then squeezed them and claimed that the liquid was coming out of his mouth" (Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 1.20a, trans. Douglas Olson).

\(^{28}\) Heron, Peri automatapoietikes 4, followed by detailed instructions on how to build the automaton, 5-20.
visible. Often dolphins swam alongside them, sometimes diving into the sea, sometimes visible, just as in real life. The sea gradually turned stormy, but the ships ran on.

However, when the stage was closed and re-opened, none of the voyagers was visible, but only Nauplius holding a torch and Athena standing next to him; and a fire was lit above the stage, as though it were the flame of the torch.

And when the theatre was closed and opened again, the wreck of the ships appeared, and Ajax swimming; [and Athena] was lifted on the crane above the stage, and with a peal of thunder and a lightning bolt fell in the theatre itself, upon the figure of Ajax, which disappeared. And thus, as the theatre closed, the story reached its climax. Such was this presentation.

Heron stresses the realism of his devices: the dolphins dive in and out of the water "just as in real life"; the miniature builders are noisy, "just as would happen in real life"; this noise is picked up at the end, when the lightning is accompanied by thunder. The form of the show is clearly not that of classical tragedy. First, the action does not take place outside of a house or palace, but on the shore and at sea. Ajax and the dolphins even swim in the sea. Yet, the device alludes to stage drama: it is divided into acts, and ends with a _deus ex machina_, a miniature representation of the crane mechanism used for lifting characters in staged drama. We might see the automaton as both imitating staged drama and also showing how the automaton can imitate the stage in a more thaumatic way, improving, in a sense, upon that which it imitates.

This automatic theater show seems to have some relationship to the contemporary theater.

It has been suggested that the automaton described by Heron is an adaptation of Lycophron's _Nauplius_. While the text of Lycophron's play does not survive, the five acts of Heron's automaton correspond with the standard five acts of a Hellenistic tragedy, as Kotlińska-Toma points out. The miniature theater opens five times in the course of the Nauplius play:

---

29 Heron, _Peri automatapoietikes_ 22, trans. Susan Murphy. I have added breaks to mark the scene changes more clearly.


3. Doors open to a scene of sea and sky. Ships sail out amid leaping dolphins; sea turns stormy. Doors close.


5. Doors open. Shipwreck; Ajax swimming; dea ex machina of Athena; lightning strikes Ajax. Doors close.

Heron's narrative is not one of decline but of progress: as the miniature theater upstages the life-size theater, so the contemporary miniature theater is superior to earlier permutations. He contrasts ancient automata, saying that they had only three movements. In other words, the ancient automatic theaters, according to Heron, do not have moving players, but only show movement in the opening and closing of the doors, the change of backdrops, and the blinking of the eyes of the theater mask. The scenes themselves seem to be static. The Nauplius automaton, on the other hand, displays a large range of movements: the players move, operating different tools (saws, axes, hammers, bow-drills, and augers). Each of these movements is different: a saw moves back and forth, axes and hammers move up and down, drills and augers rotate. By showing the Greeks using this range of tools, the automaton-engineer shows variety in the different types of motion, each requiring a different mechanical solution. In another scene, the ships sail out in a line, "some hidden, some visible." This must mean that the water of the sea is moving, obscuring some ships and making others visible, and so again the automaton-engineer displays multiple motions at the time (the sailing of the ships, the movement of the waves, and the jumping of the dolphins). In the final scene, there is a mechane-within-a-mechane: Athena lifted by a miniature crane. This is somewhat humorous, surely, as the automaton-engineer could
have engineered an invisible contraption for Athena to enter on. Displaying the crane reminds us of the relative clumsiness of the *mechanai* of the real-life theater.

The miniature play ends not with the *deus ex machina*, but with the imitation of stage tricks typical of the Hellenistic theater: thunder and lightning, and the disappearance of a character (Ajax). The disappearance of Ajax alludes to the use of trap doors in the theater, a Hellenistic invention, also called "Charon's stairs." As for the natural phenomena, devices used to imitate thunder and lightning, the *bronteion* and *keraunoskepeion*, are known from Pollux' *Onomasticon* (4.127-130).

And the machine for displaying the lightning and thunder-making machine: the one (i.e. the *keraunoskepeion*) is a high pivot. And the *bronteion*: behind the skene, swollen wineskins full of pebbles are carried from bronzes, and from the *theologeion*, over the skene, at the top, the gods appear, as Zeus and those around him (appeared) in the "Weighing of Lives." 32

This passage is a small part of Pollux' long list of theater devices, which are usually taken to refer to developments in the Hellenistic theater, though there is no particular reason that they could not refer also to the imperial Greek theater. The passage suggests technological innovation, for the purpose of creating realistic effects, which we can see as part of a larger trend towards theatrical realism in the postclassical Greek theater. 33 These realistic effects were also thaumatic, particularly the imitation of thunder and lightning, which combine the *thauma* experienced at impressive natural phenomena with the *thauma* experienced at the ability to imitate them.

The appropriate reaction of a spectator to an automaton, according to Heron, was *thauma*.

Earlier in the treatise, he says that the ancients called those who made such devices

---

32 Pollux, *Onomasticon* 4.130.
33 Csapo (2010) 117-139.
thaumatourgoi, because of the amazement of the onlookers.\textsuperscript{34} Aristotle also uses automata as an example of a source of \textit{thauma}.\textsuperscript{35}

One interesting aspect of automata is the creation of \textit{thauma} at the representation of both ordinary and extraordinary events: the miniature builders with their tiny saws and augers are as likely to cause \textit{thauma} as the disappearance of Ajax, and the torch of Nauplius is as much of a stage trick as the strike of lightning at the end of the play. In the miniature theater, what is amazing is the engineering itself, which can be equally remarkable when used to depict a perfectly ordinary action as when used to depict an impossible or improbable action. Heron does not say where these automata were or would have been displayed. Heron's automata invite viewers to be close up to experience the miniature shows. On the other hand, as we will see, there were other paratheatrical entertainers who managed to make shows work in the theater which must have required a close-up view, perhaps by performing in the orchestra, close to the lower rows of seats.\textsuperscript{36}

7.1.3. Trick magicians and illusionists

Magic tricks were performed in public, including in the theater, as well as at symposia. The names of few performers survive (table 23, Appendix 2). One papyrus from the 2nd or 3rd century CE, concerning the accounting for an athletic festival, mentions a \textit{μαγγανάριος} (conjurer) along with an aulete, mime, and pantomime (\textit{ὀρχηστής}).\textsuperscript{37} One particularly popular type of magic trick performed in public was conjuring with pebbles. A practitioner of these

\textsuperscript{34} δὲ παλαιὸι τοὺς τὰ τουαῦτα δημιουργοῦντας θαυματουργοὺς διὰ τὸ ἐκπληκτὸν τῆς θεωρίας, (Heron, \textit{Peri automatapoiētikēs} 1).
\textsuperscript{35} Aristotle, \textit{Metaphysics} 983a.
\textsuperscript{36} Discussed by Dickie (2001) 603, in reference to people performing tricks with pebbles in the orchestra of the theater.
\textsuperscript{37} P.Oxy. 1050.
pebble tricks was called a ψηφάς, ψηφοκλέπτης, ψηφολόγος, ψηφοπαίκτης, or ψηφιστής (Latin caculator). 38 Several accounts of these pebble-conjurers survive from the imperial period, typically associating pebble-conjuring with deceit. 39 Artemidorus, for example, includes a pebble-conjuring dream in his book of dream interpretations, in which the pebble-conjurer deceptively hides the pebbles from the spectators. 40 In the astrological treatise by Ps-Manetho, pebble-conjurers are wandering players, compared to buzzing bees, traveling the earth and living off of the offerings of the crowd. 41 In addition to informal marketplace shows, pebble-conjurers performed in theaters: the citizens of Hestiaea or Oreos erected a statue of the ψηφοκλέπτης Theodorus in their theater. 42

A letter of Alciphron contains valuable evidence for the practicalities of performance of pebble-conjuring in the theater. The letter is in the voice of a farmer who has come to the city to sell his wares.

Ναπαίος Κρηνιάδης.
Oἰσθά μὲ ἐπισάξαντα τὴν ὅνον σύκα καὶ παλάθας <ἀστυδε> καταγαγόντα; ὡς οὖν ταῦτα ἀπεδόμην τὸν τινι γνωρίμω, ἄγει μὲ τις λαβόν εἰς τὸ θέατρον, οὐ καθίσας ἐν καλῷ διαφόρως ἐνυχαγογούμην θεωρίας. τὰς μὲν οὖν ἄλλας οὐ συνέχω τῇ μνήμῃ, εἰμὶ γὰρ τὰ τοιαῦτα καὶ εἰδέναι καὶ ἀπαγγέλλειν κακῶς: ἐν δὲ ἰδών ἀγαλῆς ἐγὼ σοι καὶ μικροῦ δεῖν ἀναυδὸς. ἐὰς γὰρ τις εἰς μέσους παρελθὼν καὶ στήσας τρίποδα τρεῖς μικράς ἐπετίθει παροψίδας· εἰτα ὑπὸ ταῦτας ἐσκέπε τραί μικρὰ καὶ λευκὰ καὶ στρογγύλα λαβίδια, ὡς ἡμεῖς ἐπὶ ταῖς ὀχθαῖς τὸν χειμάρρον ἀνευρίσκομεν· ταῦτα ποτὲ μὲν <ἐν> κατὰ μίαν ἐσκέπα παροψίδα, ποτὲ δὲ ύστερ' ὅπως ὑπὸ τῇ μιᾷ ἔδεικνυ, ποτὲ δὲ παντελῶς ἀπὸ τὸν παροψίδων ἡφάνιζε καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ στόματος ἔφαινεν. εἰτα καταβροχίσας τοὺς πλησίον ἐστῶτας ἄγων εἰς μέσον τὴν μὲν ἐκ ρίνος τινός τὴν δὲ ἐξ ὦτίου τὴν δὲ ἐκ κεφαλῆς ἀνηρεῖτο, καὶ πάλιν ἀνελόμενος ἐξ ορθαλμῶν ἐποίει. κλεπτιστατος ἄνθρωπος ὑπέρ ὁν ἀκούομεν Ἑὐρυβάτην τὸν Οἰχαλέα. μὴ γένοιτο κατ' ἄγρον τοιοῦτον θηρίον· οὐ γὰρ ἀλώσεται υπ' οὐδένος, καὶ πάντα ὑφαιρομένος τᾶνδον φροῦδα μοι [✝α κατ' ἄγρον] ἀπεργάσεται.

38 Dickie (2001) 599-600. Dickie corrects the LSJ definitions of ψηφάς and ψηφοπαίκτης as juggler to "someone who tricks spectators, by sleight of hand, into believing that they are seeing what they are not seeing; that is to say, a conjurer or prestidigitator" (600).
40 Artemidorus 3.55.
Napaeus to Creniades
You remember I loaded my donkey with figs and fruit cakes. Well, I put the donkey up until such a time as I could sell my wares to one of my customers; and then a fellow took me and carried me off to the theatre, where he gave me a good seat and entertained me by various shows. Most of the shows I don't recall, for I'm a poor hand at remembering and telling such things; but I can tell you that one thing I saw made me almost speechless with astonishment. A man came forward, and, setting down a three-legged table, placed three little cups on it. Then under these cups he hid some little round white pebbles, such as we find on the banks of rapid streams. At one moment he would hide them one under each cup; and at another moment (I don't know how) he would show them all under a single cup; and then again, he would make them entirely disappear from under the cups and exhibit them between his lips. Then he would swallow them, and, drawing forward the spectators who stood near him, he would take one pebble from a man's nose, another from a man's ear, and the third from a man's head, and after picking them up he would make them disappear from sight again. A very light-fingered gentleman! Eurybates the Oechalian, of whom we hear tell, wasn't in his class. I hope no creature like him never gets onto my farm. No one would ever catch him; and he would steal everything in the house and make off with all the goods on the place. 43

The farmer is able to remember only the conjuror's tricks, not the other shows at the theater, a detail which Alciphron uses to convey his rustic simplicity. Although the language of thauma is not used, the farmer displays a physical response that indicates astonishment, as he is speechless (ἀχανής and ἀναυδος). This passage shows that conjurors performed in the theater for a close-up audience, with whom they could physically interact. Not only must the spectators be able to see the pebbles on the table, but the conjuror even does sleight-of-hand, pulling pebbles from the noses and ears of the audience members. The farmer emphasizes the smallness of the conjuror's props. Both the cups and the pebbles are little (τρεῖς μικρὰς ἐπετίθει παροψίδας... τρία μικρὰ καὶ λευκὰ καὶ στρογγύλα λιθίδια). Writing in the 4th c. CE, Gregory of Nysa also describes a festival of Zeus, at which the crowd (τὸ πλῆθος) is so eager to see the partheatrical entertainment (τὰ θεάματά τε καὶ άκροάματα) that they rush onto the stage, which prevents the thaumatopoioi from performing. 44 Whether or not Gregory was exaggerating in his description, the desire of the

spectators to get close enough that they could see the performances must have posed a real problem in managing the crowds.

The practice of performing tricks visible only to audience members in the front rows has ramifications for our understanding of the performance of other paratheatrical entertainment which required a close-up view on the part of the spectators. Puppet shows and, if they were displayed in the theater, automata, would have been visible only to the front rows. While the front rows were occupied by local elites during the festival competitions, it is the common people (Alciphron's farmer, Gregory's ἄληθος) who are represented as the spectators of paratheatrical entertainment. This either means that there is a disconnect between actual practice (i.e. that elites sitting in the front rows did have a better view of the conjurers and puppeteers) and literary representation, or that the seating during paratheatrical shows was more flexible, allowing spectators who had been sitting farther up to come closer to watch the more intimate performances. The limitations of putting shows on stage which could not be seen clearly by most of the theater audience may also explain why trick magic, puppeteering, and automata never became festival competitions. Mime, pantomime, and acrobatic performances could be seen from any part of the theater, and it is perhaps not coincidental that these were the performances which eventually made the leap from hired entertainment to festival competitions.

Besides pebble conjuring, other types of trick magic are well attested in the context of symposia. A few fragments of treatises on magic tricks for entertainment at symposia survive.\textsuperscript{45} The best preserved example is Ps-Democritus' \textit{Paignia}, which survives on a 4th century CE papyrus. This is a collection of magic tricks, probably authored by the 3rd century CE neo-

\textsuperscript{45} Democritus' \textit{Paignia}: PGM 7.167-86, with translation and notes by Roy Kotansky. Individual tricks: PGM XIb.1-5 (trick for making dinner guests appear to have donkey snouts), Pliny \textit{NH} 35.175 (sulpher used for changing the colors of things).
Pythagorean Bolus of Mendes.\textsuperscript{46} The *Paignia* includes tricks for sympotic performance, such as, "To make gladiators painted [on the cups] 'fight': Smoke some 'hare's-head' underneath them." This trick is specifically geared towards the symposium, using a prop found at a dinner party (painted cups). Several tricks involve simple metamorphoses, such as using sulphur to change the appearance of bronze to gold, or smearing an egg with wine to make it look like an apple. Some of the tricks do not seem to be meant for performance, however, but are more like medical cures, mostly to increase sexual potency.

The mixing of performed illusions and cures in the *Paignia* raises the question of how distinct trick magic was from practical magic in the ancient world. In a commentary on Dionysius of Thrace, pebble-conjurors are contrasted with γοήται, suggesting that there was a clear distinction between trick magic and practical magic: "so we might call the art of sorcerers a wicked skill, but the art of pebble-conjurers a frivolous skill" (οἶνον κακοτεχνίαν μὲν ἄν καλέσαιμεν τὴν τῶν γοήτων, ματαιοτεχνίαν δὲ τὴν τῶν ψηφοπαικτῶν μέθοδον).\textsuperscript{47} Sorcerers, like other practical magicians, are capable of causing harm, while trick magicians are performers, who deceive their audiences only for entertainment. There is no reason to assume that ancient audiences would not have been able to tell the difference.

7.1.4. Jesters, jokesters, clowns

The most common term for a paratheatrical comic entertainer, what we might translate as a jester, jokester, or clown, is γελωτοποιός. Quite a few γελωτοποιοί are known (table 24, Appendix 2). Like all other paratheatrical entertainers, γελωτοποιοί were θαυματοποιοί. Diodorus Siculus, for example likens Agathocles to a γελωτοποιός and μήμος, saying that when

\textsuperscript{46} Dickie (2001) 119 reconstructs the history of the collection.
he made fun of those around him, the people (τὸ πλήθος) would start to laugh "as if they were watching one of the impersonators or marvel-makers" (καθάπερ τινά τῶν ἠθολόγων ἢ θαυματοποιῶν θεωροῦντας).

So far as we know, γελωτοποιοί never competed in festivals for prizes, though they certainly were part of the hired festival entertainment. There are many terms for comic paratheatrical entertainment, such as παρῳδός, πλάνος, and σκληροπαίκτης. There is not enough evidence to say how hard the boundaries were between these different categories.

Athenaeus calls Matreas of Alexandria, who performed riddles and parodies of Aristotle's Problems, a πλάνος. He probably could have also referred to him as a γελωτοποιός, παρῳδός, or θαυματοποιός.

Not all παρῳδοί were paratheatrical entertainers. Sopater of Paphos, for example, wrote dramas (Athenaeus mentions Bacchis, Mystakos' Wage, and Hippolytus) and is called a παρῳδός, meaning that he wrote parodies, not that he performed them. Athenaeus quotes one of Sopater's parodies in full, a description of a dinner in epic language. Some παρῳδοί, however, did perform at festivals. In a list of competitors for a festival on Delos from 236 BCE, a παρῳδός is listed after the θαυματοποιοί. This indicates that the παρῳδός was a θαυματοποιός, i.e., a paratheatrical entertainer.

A more intriguing terminological problem is the use of the term κωμῳδός in reference to paratheatrical entertainers. As we learned in the previous chapter, κωμῳδοί were actors of re-performed comedy, who competed in festivals. Yet, a fragmentary inscription from Athens from the 3rd c. CE includes κωμῳδοί, an ἄρχανολόγος, and παρῳδοί in a list of άκροάματα. The κωμῳδοί, then, were part of the hired entertainment at the festival in Athens at this time. It is

48 Diodorus Siculus, Library 20.63.
49 Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 1.19d.
50 Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 3.1.101, 4.158d, 4.160a, 4.175, 4.176, 11.784, 14.644c, 14.656f.
51 IG XI 2.120.
52 Robert (1936) 251.
difficult to know whether this means that the term κωμῳδός was being used for a different kind of comic entertainment, or whether comedy had migrated from a prize-winning festival competition to the hired entertainment in the 3rd c. CE.

Evidence from Syria suggests that the incorporation of κωμῳδοί into hired entertainment was a wider-spread phenomenon. Actors of comedy (ὑποκριταὶ κωμῳδίας) appear as the slaves (θρεπτοί) of Domitius Pompeianus in a dipinto from the palace of the dux ripae in Doura-Europos from 218-220 CE.53 The line is heavily reconstructed, reading [ὑπο/κρ]ταὶ κ[ωμῳδίας], but there are parallels. Two more inscriptions from the same site mention tragoidoi and komoidoi who are slaves.54 This suggests that komoidoi had a much different status in Syria in the 3rd c. CE than they did in Greek world in the 2nd c. CE, and that some komoidoi were paratheatrical entertainers rather than festival competitors. Another 3rd c. CE text from from Doura-Europos may shed light on this problem. Around 250 CE, a troupe of mimes and other entertainers (including a sword-swaller, and possibly the Homeristai) traveled to Doura-Europos and stayed for nine months in a private house, where someone recorded their names and specialties on a wall, painted on the wall plaster.55 Among the performers are a tragoidos, Asbolis, and a tragoida, Theodora. The fact that they were staying in a private house, stayed for such a long time, and were in the company of mimes suggests that they were brought for private entertainment. Perhaps both the traveling tragoidoi and the slave tragoidoi mentioned in the texts from Doura-Europos were entertainers who specialized in burlesques of tragedy, similar to the

54 Elpidephoros, Byzantine tragic actor (ὁ Βυζάντιος τραγῳδός), and Probos, actor (ὑποκριτής), slaves of Domitius Pompeianus: Dura-Europos IX 3.30-31 no. 945; Robert (1953) 180 no. 205. Cf. Rey-Coquais (1978) 69; Dodgeon et al. (2002) 29 no. 1.3.5; Edwell (2007) 130; Avram and Jones (2011) 133 n. 29. The tragic actor (τραγῳδός) Protos appears in Dura-Europos IX 3.32 no. 947.
55 Dura-Europos IX 2.217 no. 940.
Whether we ought to categorize these *komoidoi* and *tragoidoi* as mimes or as group them with other types of comic entertainers (jesters and parodists, etc.) is somewhat of a mute point, as they are clearly paratheatrical entertainers, who would have been classed as *thaumatopoioi*.

The content of paratheatrical comic performances was quite diverse. Some drew upon cultural knowledge, such as Matreas' Aristotelian parodies, while others responded to the crowd, like stand-up comics. One *γελωτοποιός* in the 4th c. BCE, Eudikos, imitated boxers and wrestlers, poking fun at the athletic festival competitors. Two *γελωτοποιοί* are described as dancing during their performances. Although fictional, Lucian's story about a *γελωτοποιός* who performs at a symposium shows the range of the content associated with such comedic performances.

When, as often happens, the service of the waiters was interrupted for a while, Aristaenetus planned to prevent even that period from being unentertaining and empty, and ordered the clown to come in and do or say something funny, in order to make his guests still merrier. In came an ugly fellow with his head shaven except for a few hairs that stood up straight on his crown. First he danced, doubling himself up and twisting himself about to cut a more ridiculous figure; then he beat time and recited scurrilous verses in an Egyptian brogue, and finally he began to poke fun at the guests.

The clown, whose name is Satyrion, is described as an *ἀνθρωπίσκος*, a dwarf, and his physical appearance seems to be part of the act, as it is the first thing that the reader witnesses as he enters.
the party. His hair is cut in such a way as to accentuate his physical difference. Similarly, Plutarch describes the Homeric Thersites as a γελωτοποιός, and Lucian makes Aesop the γελωτοποιός for the dead heroes and philosophers in the Elysian Fields, which suggests that γελωτοποιοί were associated with physical ugliness and low social status. As often is the case in literary depictions of jesters and clowns, Lucian's interest is not in Satyrion himself, but in the reaction of the audience to him. The point of the episode is to show that one of the guests, Alcidamas, cannot take a joke. While the others laugh when Satyrion makes fun of them, Alcidamas is irritated, and fights Satyrion, making the end of the performance into a sort of unintentional boxing parody. Satyrion's act incorporates dance, acrobatics, music, and verbal humor, first prepared lines in a pseudo-foreign accent, then improvised jabs at the dinner guests. This act of one γελωτοποιός is a variety show in itself.

Another type of comedic performance seems to have involved telling pre-scripted jokes. One Greek joke-book survives, the Philogelos, or Laugher-Lover. This compilation of jokes dates to the 4th or 5th c. CE, but collects jokes from different periods, some extracted from literary sources such as Plutarch. Many of the jokes feature a foolish pedant (σχολαστικός), a sort of counterpart to the wise fool who was a stock character in comedy and mime. The repetition of the σχολαστικός as the main character throughout the compilation suggests that this was a popular class of jokes. The jokes are about everyday life, covering topics like going to the doctor, traveling, buying and selling goods, love, marriage, and death. Jokes about athletes are popular.

Several of the jokes are about the theater, incorporating the perspectives of spectators, performers, and festival organizers. In one, a man must flee when he realizes he has taken a seat

60 Plutarch, How the young man should study poetry 18c.
61 Lucian, A True Story 2.18.
62 For introduction, an English translation, and notes, see Baldwin (1983).
in the theater between a man with bad breath and another with bad body odor.\textsuperscript{63} Another, in the same section on jokes about bad smells, has two women, one with bad breath, and another with bad body odor, falling in love with the same tragic actor (τραγῳδός). The actor responds to their advances by quoting a tragic line: "Alas, what shall I do? I am caught between two evils" (Οἴμοι, τί δράσω; δυσκόις μερίζομαι).\textsuperscript{64} This joke plays upon the trope of the actor as a source of sexual attraction common in elite literary sources, but in this version, it is the bodies of the women who love him who are disgusting, not the body of the actor. It also plays on the contrast between high and low, as he quotes a tragic line in reference to a mundane situation. In another joke about gluttony, a comic actor (κωμῳδίας ὑποκριτής) negotiates with the festival organizer (ἀγωνοθέτης):

Αιμόξηρος κωμῳδίας ὑποκριτής τὸν ἀγωνοθέτην πρὸ τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν ἀριστον ἤτει. τοῦ δὲ ἐπιζήτουντος, διὰ τὶ προαριστήσαι θέλει. Ἰνα, ἔφη, μὴ ἐπιορκήσω λέγω· ἐγώ μὲν ἥριστησα νῆ τῆν Ἀρτεμίνι μάλ' ἡδέως.

A gluttonous comic actor demanded that his sponsor provide a meal before he went on stage.
"Why do you have to eat before you go on?"
"So I shall not commit perjury when I say the lines, 'I swear by Artemis, I have eaten right well!'"\textsuperscript{65}
Like the joke with the tragic line, this joke applies a line from a comedy to a perfectly ordinary situation. Because a line from comedy (often about everyday life) and an ordinary situation might not obviously contrast, the line chosen incorporates a higher register, an oath sworn on a goddess.

These few examples illustrate several aspects of the jokes in the \textit{Philogelos}. There are often variations on a theme, which are somewhat formulaic, as with the jokes about the theater-goer and the tragic actor being caught between two smelly people. While the punch-line may be

\textsuperscript{63} \textit{Philogelos} 240.
\textsuperscript{64} \textit{Philogelos} 239.
\textsuperscript{65} \textit{Philogelos} 226, trans. Barry Baldwin.
a quote from a tragedy or comedy, the spectator does not need to know the play to get the joke. All the information pertinent to the joke is contained in the quoted line. Part of the humor is in the contrast in register, between the quotation from tragedy or comedy (higher register) and the rest of the joke (lower register), a contrast accentuated by the quotation being in poetry, while the rest of the joke is in prose. Jokes about going to the theater, or about comic and tragic actors, speak to a culture in which the theater was a part of everyday life. It is possible, though unprovable, that some of these jokes were performed on stage. The interest in the theater and athletic competitions would have worked well for festival performance, though these jokes could also have spoken to private audiences familiar with the theater and festivals.

7.1.5. Acrobats, tightrope walkers, and trapeze artists

Terms for acrobats include ἀκροβάτης, ἀρνειντήρ, or κυβιστητήρ; to these may be added sub-specialties such as the κοντοπαίκτης, one who balanced a pole on his head (table 25, Appendix 2). A trapeze artist could be called a (σ)κανδαλιστής or, perhaps, ρωμαιστής.66 A tightrope walker was an αἰθροβάτης (one who walks in the air) or καλοβάτης. Acrobatic performers could specialize in more than one of these categories: so Nonnos, aka Demetrios, of Alexandria, was an acrobat (κοντοπαίκτης), trapeze artist (σκανδαλιστής), and tightrope walker (καλοβάτης), honored by the Delphians with citizenship and the status of bouletes.67

While acrobatics are attested as early as the Iliad,68 very few acrobats are known individually. In addition to Nonnos, only five more acrobats are epigraphically attested by name.

66 A rare word which appears in a late antique glossary as a trapeze-artist, though others have suggested that it means a mime. Ferri (2008) argues that it means instead "actor of Latin comedy," though his argument is tenuous.
67 FD III 1.226 = SIG 3 847.
68 Homer Iliad 18.603-6, where two acrobats (κυβιστητήρε) perform with a chorus.
M. Cassius Valerius, citizen of Carthage and Sparta, an ἵσχυροπαίκτης, was honored by the Delphians with citizenship. While term ἵσχυροπαίκτης is not immediately transparent, the very limited evidence points to some sort of acrobatic specialty. Most literally, it means a "strong player," which could in theory describe an athlete or an acrobat. However, in his astrological treatise, Vettius Valens (b. 120 CE), who consistently associates Mercury with theatrical performers, groups ἵσχυροπαίκται and mimes, who wander, making their livelihood from displays. This suggests that ἵσχυροπαίκται were paratheatrical entertainers. A further clue may be found in a late antique section of pseudo-Manetho, Apotelesmatica, where acrobats are described as ἵσχυρῶν ἔργων...πονοπαίκτορας:

[Helios] produces men who sport with danger with strength-displaying work, crowd-pleasing, industriously mad for the theater, who walk through the air, leaping in their well-constructed work, completing their work measured for air and land, mimes, and those skilled in jest, who laugh scornfully.... The echo of ἵσχυροπαίκται in ἵσχυρῶν...πονοπαίκτορας suggests that ἵσχυροπαίκται were acrobats. In this passage from the Apotelesmatica, they are situated in the theater (θεατρομανοῦντας) and associated with the pleasure of the audience (ὥλοκληρεῖς). The pleasure of the acrobatic spectacle is in watching the acrobat skillfully defy danger. They are grouped with mimes and jesters, presumably their stage-mates.

An epitaph from Beroia from the 2nd c. CE for an acrobat suggests that he won festival prizes, and competed alongside his teacher, Maximus.

---

69 and Πεισαῖον (?).
70 FD III 1.216, Delphi, 1st - 3rd c. CE.
71 ἵσχυροπαίκτας ὢ μιμοδόους, ἐπίδειξες τὸν βίον/ ποριζομένους, ἔτι δὲ πλάνης καὶ ἀλητείας καὶ ἀκαταστασίας. Vettius Valens, Anthologies 4.17.
The ἐγκοτύλη is a sort of balancing act, similar to riding piggy-back. This pair of acrobats may have competed in festival contests, as the deceased is called Maximus' co-competer (συναγωνιστής). It is possible that the author of the text has borrowed some of the vocabulary used of festival competitors, as many actors are described as παραδόξος in imperial Greek inscriptions.

Finally, an inscription from Chalkis from the 3rd c. CE honors M. Ulpius Kallinikos, "the first to perform 55 κυκλοί in the theater of Dionysus." We cannot know precisely what these κυκλοί are: cartwheels or pirouettes have been suggested, but any circular acrobatic trick is possible. Presumably the κυκλοντήρια Sanno, who appears in a short Attic inscription from the 2nd c. BCE, also performed circular acrobatic tricks. However, the identification of Kallinikos as an acrobat is not certain. Jonathan Vickers proposes that the κυκλοί refer instead to dithyramb. From these very few attestations, we can conclude that acrobats, like other paratheatrical entertainers, could be honored by cities with statues and even citizenship and...prizes...

---

73 SEG 27-266.
74 See IGSK Pessinous 19 for commentary on the use of παραδόξος in combination with terms specifying festival victories (πλειστονίκης and περιοδονίκης).
75 ...πρώτῳ ποιήσαντι | ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ τῷ Διονύσῳ κύκλους πεντή/- κόντα πέντε... (SEG 29-807).
76 Reynolds et al. (1981) 143.
77 IG II 12583.
78 Private correspondence. Jonathan Vickers is currently working on a dissertation on ancient acrobatics (from archaic through Hellenistic times) at the University of Western Ontario. Vickers' work will be the first comprehensive treatment of ancient acrobatics since Deonna (1953).
membership in the *boule*; in the 2nd c. CE, they may even have been allowed to compete in some festivals.

When acrobats appear in literary sources, they are not always the targets of scorn. Stobaeus quotes Musonius Rufus (1st c. CE), who uses acrobats as an example of the love of hard work.

> ἀλλὰ οἱ μὲν ἄρα θαυματοποιοὶ δύσκολα οὕτως ύφιστανται πράγμαta καὶ τὴν ζωὴν παραβάλλονται τὴν ἑαυτῶν, οἱ μὲν εἰς μαχαίρας κυβιστόντες, οἱ δ' ἐπὶ κάλων μετέωροι βαδίζοντες, οἱ δ' ῥίπτοντες ὀρνεῖα πετόμενοι διὰ τοῦ ἀέρος, ὅν τὸ σφάλμα θάνατός ἐστιν. καὶ ταῦτα πάντα ὑφίστανται μικρὸν χάριν μισθοῦ.

But the marvel-makers perform such difficult feats, and risk their own lives, some tumbling on knives, others walking on ropes high in the air, and others flying like birds through the air, and for them a false step is death. And they do all these things for little pay.\\footnote{79 Stobaeus 3.29.75.}

This passage shows the variety of acrobatic specialties (knife-tumblers, tightrope-walkers, and acrobats who do leaping tricks). It also provides an interesting literary parallel to the epigraphic praise of acrobats, and other paratheatrical entertainers, for their skill. Musonius Rufus turns the traditional elite disdain for hired entertainers for being paid on its head by representing the acrobats as paragons of hard work, performing their death-defying feats their lives for little pay. So little pay, we might suppose, that they risk their lives not for the money but out of love for their craft. While the point of the passage is to illustrate the love of hard work, it also suggests that the *thauma* that the acrobats create comes not from the distortions of their bodies, but from the appearance of danger in their tricks.

7.1.6. *Pantomime*

Pantomime is well documented, and many performers are known (table 27, Appendix 2). Two Augustan dancers were thought to be the originators of pantomime, Bathyllus and Pylades.
According to Athenaeus, Bathyllus danced a more joyful style, while Pylades' style "dancing was solemn, expressing passion and variety of character." Bathyllus' dance may have been not comic but satyric: in his fifth satire, Persius mocks amateurs who try to dance "even three steps of Bathyllus' Satyr." The Pyladean style won out, and pantomime became firmly associated with tragedy. It was tragedy without words (the dancers did not speak or sing, though they could be accompanied by singers), telling familiar stories through dance and gesture in a contemporary form. In Latin inscriptions, pantomimes are usually specified as imperial freedmen. In Greek inscriptions, status (enslaved, freed, or free person) is rarely specified. However, it is likely that some of the pantomimes who we see in Greek inscriptions were also freedmen. This would explain the difference in naming conventions. Pantomimes typically took on names appropriate to their art: the most common being Paris, Pylades, and Apolaustus. One pantomime was named Ulpius Augustianus, "aka Paris," his stage name. These naming conventions were quite different from those of tragic and comic actors, who typically retain Greek-style names (name followed by patronymic in the genitive, followed by ethnic: for example, "Eudaimon son of Attikos, Theban").

Silence was the most distinctive feature of pantomime, as the dancer did not sing. Pantomime was a narrative dance, and the dancers communicated with their audiences by specific movements of their hands and feet. An epitaph for the pantomime Crispus from Heraclea on the Black Sea, from the late 2nd or early 3rd century CE, describes "the whole world marveling at him gesturing with his hands" (τὸν χειρονομοῦντα θαυμάσας καὶ δοξάσας ὁ κόσμος). A visual reminder of the silence of the pantomime dancer was the fact that pantomimes wore masks with closed mouths, unlike actors of tragedy and comedy, who wore

---

80 Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 1.20f.
81 TAM V 1016, where Paris is an orcheses.
82 SEG 31-1072.
Lucian's Lycinus associates the silence of pantomimes with a special
elegance of the dance. "In old days," he says, "dancer and singer were one: but the violent
exercise caused shortness of breath; the song suffered for it, and it was found advisable to have
the singing done independently." The pantomime, according to Lycinus, is more elegant
because he does not have to exert himself with singing.

The paradox of cross-linguistic communication through silence fascinated those who
wrote about pantomime. Pantomimes were thought to be able to communicate the stories of
Greek myth not only to speakers of Greek but to a universal audience. Pantomimes
communicated not only without language, but in some sense beyond language. Lucian tells a
story about the emperor Nero providing pantomime entertainment for a foreign king, from
Pontus on the Black Sea. This king does not speak Greek well, and so cannot interpret the song
which accompanies the dancer, but nevertheless is able to follow the plot of the pantomime
perfectly due to his vivid gestures. The king asks Nero for a dancer to take home with him,
saying, "I have barbarian neighbors who do not speak the same language, and it is not easy to
keep supplied with interpreters for them. If I am in want of one, therefore, this man will interpret
everything for me by signs." The Pontic king believes that pantomimes will be able to
communicate his messages across linguistic barriers. For him, silence is an answer to
multilingualism and difficulties of communication. This story is most likely a fiction, and most
audience members would not in fact be watching the stories on stage with no knowledge of the
plot. Pantomimes danced well-known mythical tales; using gestures, changing masks to
represent different characters, and perhaps some use of props, they would have been able to lead

---

83 For pantomime masks, see Jory (2001).
84 πάλαι μὲν γὰρ αὐτοὶ καὶ ἦδον καὶ ὥρχούντο· ἐξ' ἐπειδὴ κινουμένων τὸ ἄσθμα τὴν ὕδην ἐπετάρρατεν,
85 Ἔφη, "βαρβάρους ἔχω, οὗ ὁμογλώττους, καὶ ἐρμηνεύον οὐ ῥάδιον εὑπορεῖν πρὸς
αὐτοῦς. ἢν οὖν τίνος δέωμαι, διανεύων ὁτὸς ἕκαστά μοι ἐρμηνεύσῃ." Lucian, On Pantomime 64.
the audience through an interpretation of the myth. Even the gestures were probably very culturally specific, and may not have been intelligible to people who had not been conditioned to interpret their meaning. Furthermore, most audience members would have been Greek speakers, and would have been able to follow the story also through the accompanying song. This idea of universal inclusivity, regardless of native language, must have had some significance for people living in a multi-lingual society.

7.1.7. Mime

Mime actors and actresses traveled in troupes, performing their skits for pay in cities throughout the Roman Empire. There were both male and female mimes (table 26, Appendix 2). Unlike pantomimes and the actors of tragedy, comedy, and satyr-play, mimes performed without masks. Mime is often described as burlesque, but we might also compare it to sketch comedy, in the sense that the skits seem not to have been relatively short, invariably funny, and even when they were scripted, less formally composed than tragedy, comedy, or satyr-play. When mime scripts were written, they were written not to stand the test of time, but to serve the immediate needs of the performance. Re-performance in the short term is certainly possible, but there is no evidence of re-performance of old or famous mime texts. Mime was a genre of the new.

From the sixteen mime scripts which survive from the 2nd c. BCE to the 5th c. CE, all on papyrus, we can see that adultery plots were common and that the humor tended towards slapstick, with a great deal of bodily humor (in the Charition mime, for example, a clown character drives off a band of Indian women with his farts). Plot involving adultery and jilted...
lovers were popular.\textsuperscript{88} Two involve combat,\textsuperscript{89} while one is a lament for a child.\textsuperscript{90} In one fragment, Phoebus announces that he arose with Trajan to announce Hadrian as the new emperor,\textsuperscript{91} displaying an engagement with the contemporary political situation. Several include choruses,\textsuperscript{92} and two mention festivals.\textsuperscript{93} The latest fragment, from the 5th c. CE, is a list of mime titles with the necessary props for each, with one requiring no props, and others requiring various materials for the stage (props for a barber shop, metal-smith, a ship, the sun, "green stuff for the river"), live animals (a pig and a dog), and costumes.\textsuperscript{94} One of the mimes listed on this papyrus needed costumes for male and female Goths, suggesting that the male and female choruses in the \textit{Charition} were not unique. The mime papyri range from stock adultery plots to themes specific to a particular moment (the announcement of Hadrian) or place (the \textit{Charition}). Except for the announcement by Phoebus, all the plots are physically possible in the contemporary world. That is, mimes did not stage myths, nor did they use Aristophanic-style non-human choruses. Mime was always, in one way or another, an imitation of life.

Mime was an enormously flexible genre, which included many sub-genres. The many terms for mimes (ἀρχαιολόγος, βιολόγος, δεικτηριάς, ήθολόγος, λυσιωδός, μαγωδός, μμολόγος, μῖμος/μιμάς, μοσχολόγος, νεανισκολόγος) suggest that there were many mime specialties. Plutarch classifies mime into two broad categories, \textit{paignia} and \textit{hypotheseis}, neither of which he deems appropriate for the symposium.

"Οὐκοῦν," ἐφην ἐγώ, "μὴ ὑμῖν τινές εἰσίν, ὃν τοὺς μὲν ὑποθέσεις τοὺς δὲ παίγνια καλοῦσιν· ἅρμοζεν δ᾿ οὐδὲτερον οἶμαι συμποσίῳ γένος, τὰς μὲν ὑποθέσεις διὰ τὰ μῆκτα τῶν

\textsuperscript{88} The surviving fragments of mime texts are collected by Rusten and Cunningham in their 2003 Loeb edition of Theophrastus, Herodas, and Sophron. Adultery plots: Fr. 1, 2, 3, 3a, 4, 7, 10, and 13.
\textsuperscript{89} Rusten and Cunningham (2003) Fr. 9 and 12.
\textsuperscript{90} Rusten and Cunningham (2003) Fr. 8.
\textsuperscript{91} Rusten and Cunningham (2003) Fr. 5.
\textsuperscript{92} Rusten and Cunningham (2003) Fr. 5, 6, and 13.
\textsuperscript{93} Rusten and Cunningham (2003) Fr. 13 and 14.
\textsuperscript{94} Rusten and Cunningham (2003) Fr. 15.
"Well," I replied, "there are certain mimes that they call hypotheseis (narrative representations), and some that they call paignia (farces), but I do not suppose that either kind is suitable to a dinner party. The hypotheseis have a too prolonged action and demand too much equipment; and the paignia, which are packed with scurrilous and trivial low comedy, ought not even to be seen by the slaves that fetch our shoes, if their masters are prudent. The vulgar, even when women and young children are in the company, see exhibited stories and language that are more disruptive of an orderly mind than any tippling." 

Plutarch suggests that the paignia were less reputable than the hypotheseis, which are inappropriate for the symposium not because of their content but because the setting of the dinner party, held in a confined space and better suited shorter acts. The mime scripts that survive on papyrus seem to be hypotheseis, with their elaborate costumes, props, and sometimes large casts, including actors and choruses. These hypotheseis would have required advance planning and rehearsals. The paignia were presumably more informal, perhaps involving more improvisation. They are inappropriate to the symposium because of the content of the verbal and physical humor. Plutarch places the performance context of both types of mime outside of the symposium, that is, in public, further stressed by the specification of the audience of the paignia as oi polloi, women, and children. Mime is dangerous, according to Plutarch, because of its effect on the audience as a source of disorder. In this part of the dialogue, Plutarch is comparing good and bad forms of sympotic entertainment. The best entertainment for the symposium is Menander, whose comedies affirm the social order (by ending in marriage) rather than disrupting it (by displaying adultery, as mimes do). While Menander, according to Plutarch, is able to move between private and public, as school text, sympotic entertainment, and public performance, mime in all its forms is purely popular.

95 Plutarch, Table Talk 712e-f, trans. Minar, Sanbach, and Helmbold.
One type of *paignia* were short riddling jokes. Earlier we met the mime Ischomachus, who moved from marketplace shows to the theater. Athenaeus also describes the types of shows Ischomachus and two other mimes, Cleon and Nymphodorus, put on.

The riddles they performed were of the following sort: for example, a country bumpkin ate too much and felt sick, and when the doctor asked him if he had eaten until he threw up, he said: "No, actually I was tossing my food down." And when an old beggar-woman had an upset stomach, and the doctor asked if perhaps she was pregnant, she said, "How's that possible, when my belly's been empty for three days now?" These jokes are reminiscent of the doctor jokes found in the *Philogelos*, which typically feature a fool character misunderstanding something obvious about the body in front of an expert (the doctor). There may not have been a strong distinction between mimes who performed such riddling *paignia* and jesters (γελωτοποιοί).

Mime was noisy. The characters spoke, sang, and made ample use of sound effects. An epitaph for the mime Gemellos from the Black Sea demonstrates the association of mime with noise:

```
κεῖμε Γεμέλλος ἑγὼ
ὁ πολλοὶς θέατροις
πολλὰ λαλῆσαι
καὶ πολλὰς ὀδοὺς
ἀυτὸς ὀδεύσας,
καὶ οὐκέτι μοι στόμα
φωνᾶ[ζ] ἀπολύει,
οὕδε χειρῶν κρότος
ἔρχετε, ἀλλ’ ἀποδοὺς
τὸ δάνιον πεπόρευμε.
ταῦτα πάντα κόνις.
```
I, Gemellos, lie here, who chattered many things for many spectators, and traveled many roads myself. No more do I let loose sounds from my mouth, nor hold castanets in my hands, but having paid my debt, I went on my way (i.e. I died). Everything is dust.\(^98\) Those who erected Gemellos' epitaph sought to represent him as a successful mime, which in their eyes meant emphasizing his travel (many roads), popularity (many spectators), and skill (speaking and playing the castanets). Travel, popularity and skill are implicitly linked, as the more he traveled, the more spectators he would have had. For Gemellos and those who erected his epitaph, mime was noisy, and the distinction between the living mime artist and the mime artist in death is the loss of this ability to speak and make music.

### 7.2 The View from Below: the Charition Mime (P. Oxy. 413)

Because of the chance survival of mime texts on papyrus in Egypt, we actually know much more about the content of mime in the Roman period than we do about contemporary tragedy, comedy, and satyr play. One mime papyrus is particularly valuable for understanding the relationship of mime to drama, the *Charition*. The *Charition* is the longest surviving mime text from antiquity. It occupies the recto and part of the verso of a papyrus found at Oxyrhynchus and dates to the second century CE.\(^99\) The papyrus provides valuable evidence not only of the plot, characters, and dialogue, but also of the musical accompaniment, and the process of composition. The papyrus includes musical notations which indicate where the instruments are to come in, and how loudly (for example, "drums, loud, five times"). The *crotala*, castanets, also appear (as they did in Gemellos' epitaph). The musical notations suggest that the papyrus was a performance text for a director or for the musicians. The fact that the lines of all the characters are included on the papyrus also suggests such a use, because an individual actor's script would

---

\(^{98}\) St. Pontica III 143. Can the use of koine (ε for α) help in dating this inscription?

\(^{99}\) Editions: P. Oxy. 413; Santelia (1991); Andreassi (2001); fr. 6 in the Loeb collection of popular mime. See Hall (2010) for the relationship of the mime to Euripides and Tsitsiridis (2011) for mime under the Roman empire, with emphasis on the physical world of the theater.
not have needed the lines of all the other characters. While the existence of a text implies a certain set quality to the performance (that is, the characters are given lines, rather than improvising), the text also includes two versions of one scene, showing that the process of composition was flexible.

The mime is an adaptation of Euripides' *Iphigeneia among the Taurians*, set on the Malabar coast of India. Re-worked and re-imagined in an Indian context, the mime is still recognizably Euripidean. The heroine, Charition, is a priestess, like Iphigeneia; like Iphigeneia, she is held hostage by a foreign people, threatened with being the victim of human sacrifice, and must be rescued by her brother. Unlike Euripides' *IT*, the choruses of Indian men and Indian women in the *Charition* do not speak Greek but Indian. A significant part of the papyrus is dedicated to the writing out of these lines of Indian speech. Since its first publication, the main scholarly interest in the *Charition* has been in identifying the language of the Indian characters. This language has been variously identified by Dravidian linguists as Old Kannada or Tulu, as a mixture of Indian dialects, or as nonsense. Whether or not there are any "real" elements of Indian language in the text, for the Oxyrhynchite audience, the speech of the Indians would have been nonsensical. Including non-Greek speaking Indians in the mime provides many opportunities for humor, as the Greeks and Indians try ineffectively to communicate with one another.

The mime responds to the specific interests of the Oxyrhynchites. The Malabar coast was a land far-far-away closer to Oxyrhynchus, and when Charition and her party board their ship

---

100 Papyrus fragments of Euripides' *Alcestis* were found at Oxyrhynchus with the lines of individual characters, demonstrating that individual actors' scripts probably typically would only have included the lines of their character.
101 Col. 4 verso is a revision of Col. 1 recto.
102 For the debate about whether the language of the Indians is a representation of a real Indian language, see Hultzsch (1904); Barnett (1926); Rice (1929); Sastri (1926); Saletore (1936); Shivaprasad (1985).
home at the end of the mime, it is Egypt, not Greece, on the horizon. The bilingual interactions between Greeks and Egyptians in Oxyrhynchus are behind the humor of Greek-Indian bilingualism in the play, as Edith Hall has rightly pointed out. There was frequent sea traffic between Greco-Roman Egypt and the Malabar coast on the monsoon route, a predictable and gentle wind. The monsoon wind allowed merchants to travel to India and count a sure return six months later when the wind switched direction. Bilingual potsherds indicate Indian traders were present in Egypt in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. The relative ease of travel and trade in this period contributed to the popularity of escape plots and exotic settings seen in the *Charition* as well as in the Greek novels.

While the interest in India during this time has to do with the frequency of trade with India and the ability to travel to a place formerly known only in the realm of fantasy, the depiction of India in the mime resembles the established stereotypes in the Greek ethnographic tradition. Charition and the other Greek characters are consistently represented as plan-makers, innovators, and plotters, while the Indian characters (particularly the choruses) are followers, easily defeated. The Indians are defeated by wine in the end, evoking the Cyclops' inability to handle wine and unfamiliarity with proper drinking customs in the Odyssey and in Euripides' satyr-play. Wright stresses that the ethnic difference between the Greeks and Indians

---

103 Hall (2010) 9. For bilingualism in Greco-Roman Egypt, see Tovar (2010).
104 Eivind (2007).
106 For the role of travel in the Greek novels, see Morgan (2007). More direct links between mime and the ancient novel have been advanced by Hall (2010) n. 54, who discusses a mid-2nd c. novel papyrus found at Oxyrhynchus in relation to the *Charition*. Webb (2008a) associates the variety of perspectives in mime with a similar phenomenon in the ancient novel (136). What the escape-plots of the mime and the novel have in the background are the escape-tragedies of Euripides (*Helen*, *Iphigeneia among the Taurians*, and the fragmentary *Andromeda*). Wright (2005) provides an overview of the escape tragedies, with a note on *Charition* (183).
107 For overviews of Greek writings about India, see Karttunen (1989 and 1997) and Parker (2008). Webb (2008a) argues that ethnic mockery was a definitive feature of late antique mime, which often incorporated mockery of Christians and Jews (123).
in the play are primarily language-based.\textsuperscript{108} One might, however, keep in mind that all we have is the script of the play. Other markers of ethnic difference, such as costume, hairstyle, and style of dance are mostly lost to us.

The first interaction with the Indians is with a chorus of Indian women, armed with bows and arrows. Charition promptly greets them with a non-Greek word, "alemaka" (124). This may be a nonsense word, made up by Charition, as she displays no bilingual ability in the rest of the mime. The clown drives off the women to the River Psolichus with his farts. The name of the river, commentators agree, is a combination of the Greek psole (circumcised cock) and leichein (to lick), so it means something like "Circumcised-cock-licker-River," the only sexual joke in the text. The lack of sexual humor elsewhere in the mime challenges the perception that mime typically involved nudity.\textsuperscript{109}

When Charition's brother and the clown encounter the chorus of Indian men, the Indians try unsuccessfully to greet the Greeks in their language, repeating variations of the same word, "brathis," "bratheis," and later, "brathie."

\begin{quote}
 King: \textit{Brathis.}
 Together: \textit{Bratheis.}
 Clown: \textit{What are they saying?}
 Char.'s brother: \textit{He says, "Let's draw lots for portions."}
\end{quote}

The Greeks are confounded by this language that they do not know, as the clown makes clear, but the translation of "brathis" offered by the brother must be a false translation. The king utters a very short word, which the brother translates as a full Greek sentence, which makes no sense in

\textsuperscript{108} Wright (2005) 183.
\textsuperscript{109} Webb (2008a) 101-2 traces the origins of the association of mime with nudity, and makes a strong argument against the idea that mime actresses often removed their clothes during performance, as the anecdote about Cato leaving a mime show so that the actresses would not be embarrassed by his presence would suggest (Valerius Maximus, \textit{Facta et Dicta Memorabilia} 2.10).
the context of the greeting scene. The shortness of the word is the more striking because the utterances of the Indian characters are typically quite long. The brother claims a bilingualism which he does not have. There is a parallel for this sort of false or lying translation in Hercules and Poseidon's assertions that they can translate the Triballian's foreign speech at the end of Aristophanes' *Birds*: they give opposite translations, each to serve their own ends. The joke is that no-one can translate the Triballian's speech, that Hercules and Poseidon are equally unreliable translators.110

The clown, on the other hand, does not profess knowledge of the Indians' language, but tries repeatedly to interact with them.

61 ΒΑΣ. [.].ραθιε Ζ τυμι. βερη· κονζει· δαμυν· πετρεκιω
62 πακτει· κορταμες· βερη· έαλερω· δεπομενζι
63 πετρεκιωδαμυτ· κινζε· ποξεις· ζεβης· λολω
64 βια· βραδις· κοττως. ΚΟΙ. κοττως.
65 Β. κοττως ύμας λακτίσαιτο. ΒΑΣ. ζοπιτ τυμπ.
66 Β. τι λέγουσι· Γ. πείν δος ταχεως.
67 Β. Οκνείς οὖν λαλείν; καλήμερε, χαίρε. κροτ. τυμπ.


Drums, 7 times.

Bradis. Kottōs.

Together: Kottōs.

Clown: May Kottōs kick you.

King: Zopit.

Drums.

Clown: What are they saying?
Char.'s brother: Quick, give them a drink.
Clown: Do you refuse to talk? Good day, hello.

Castanets. Drums.

Where as the clown tries to communicate with the Indians by using the simplest Greek words (greetings), and is frustrated by his inability to understand their speech and reach them with his, Charition and her brother are unperturbed. They simply make up nonsense words or translations

---

110 Aristophanes, *Birds* 1677-84.
of their own. The clown is a wise fool, the only character to admit the truth, that the Greeks and Indians do not understand each other. In a sense, it is the clown who is the star of the mime, not Charition or her brother, as it is the clown who gets the most laughs. The clown causes the body humor at the River Psolichus, plays with words (following the Indians' "Kottōs" with "May Kottōs kick you"), and repeatedly reminds the audience by means of his questions ("What are they saying?") that Charition's brother, the false translator, has no idea what is really going on.

As the play goes on, the Indians become more intoxicated, and they speak and sing at greater length. The drums and castanets also become more frequent, punctuating nearly every line of their foreign speech. The clown, who has before shown the greatest interest in the language of the Indians, becomes taken up in the spectacle, and unexpectedly bursts out:

79 Β. μαρθα κροτ. μαρθούμα εδμαίμα ι κροτ. μαϊθο[ 
80 θαμούνα μαρθα κροτ. μαρθούμα. τυμπ.

Clown: martha (castanets) marithouma edmaimai (castanets) maitho thamouna martha (castanets) marithouma (drums)
The Clown thinks he is speaking the language of the Indians, but the audience knows that he is not. He crudely imitates the speech of the Indians, repeating the sound "ma" and "tha" in different combinations. Throughout the play, castanets punctuate the utterances of the Indians. When the Clown switches into Greek, the castanets punctuate his speech too. Surprisingly, the Indian king responds by speaking in Greek.

88 ΒΑΣ. [βάρβαρον ἀνάγω χόρον ἀπλετον, θεά Σελήνη, 
89 πρὸς ροθμόν ἀνέτω βήματι βαρβάρω[ι u -- 
90 ήνόδων δὲ πρόμοι πρὸς [ε][ρόθρουν δότε κροτ. [ u -- 
91 [Σ]ηρικόν ἰδίως θεαστικὸν βῆμα παράλ.[] . . [ 
92 τυμπ. πολ. κρούσ(ις)

A barbaric, unconfined dance I lead, goddess Selene, advancing with barbarian step to a loose rhythm. Chieftains of the Indians, bring the sacred-sounding drum (castanets), the frenzied Seric step, individually (drums, loud, clapping)....
The first word out of the king's mouth in Greek is "barbaron." One might think here of Cassandra's first utterance in the Agamemnon. Leading up to Cassandra's speech in the Agamemnon, there are several expressions of doubt that Cassandra will be able to speak Greek. During this time, Cassandra is silent onstage, and the audience does not know what to expect to come out of her mouth. When she finally does speak, her first utterance is a string of nonverbal syllables—otototoi popoi da—at which she switches into perfect Greek.\textsuperscript{111} Similarly, we expect the Indian king not to be able to speak Greek, but he defies expectations. The king places himself both west of India, by speaking Greek, and east of India, by dancing with a Seric step. The musical accompaniment, Santelia comments, is appropriate to the orgiastic rituals of Dionysus and Cybele: drums, castanets, and the flute. If the specific instruments are meant to evoke rituals of Dionysus, this would be in keeping with the theme of wine and drunkenness in the play. Dionysus is a god of contradictions and confusions, between west and east, Greek and non-Greek, as well as between male and female. These Dionysian echoes accent the idea of India as a land of contradictions.

The mime is punctuated by moments of surprise. It is surprising to find the Iphigeneia story set in India, surprising when the Indian characters speak in their own language, not Greek, and surprising when the Greek Charition greets the chorus of Indian women with a non-Greek word, "alemaka," which the Indian women repeat after her. It is surprising when the Clown attacks the armed Indian not with a weapon, but with his farts, and furthermore, when that method of attack is successful. While the language of \textit{thauma} is not used in the play, the aesthetic of \textit{thauma} pervades. The \textit{Charition} does not merely use the plot of a classical play, it re-imagines it, set in a new cultural context which would have had special significance for the audience in Oxyrhynchus. The \textit{Charition} has a clear and direct relationship with Euripides' play,

\textsuperscript{111} Aeschylus, \textit{Agamemnon} 1076.
as Heron's Nauplius miniature automatic theater had with the real-life theater, and as the
*Philogelos* jokes had with tragedies and comedies. Paratheatrical entertainment repeatedly
responds to and seeks to out-do the texts and performances of the Greek theater by transforming
the material into something more amusing or more spectacular. And what could be more
spectacular to a Greek audience than India?

The fact that the mime parodies *Iphigeneia among the Taurians* suggests that the
audience would have been familiar with Euripides, whether through performance or by word of
mouth. There is no reason to assume that the Euripidean echoes in the *Charition* were "learned
references," as Webb suggests, accessible only to a part of the audience familiar with the texts of
Euripides. The *Charition* does not allude to specific Euripidean lines, but instead adapts the
plot in broad strokes. The model of allusion and intertext that we use to understand the
relationship between elite literary texts does not always work for the texts of popular
performance. In order to understand the Euripidean background to the *Charition* mime, a
spectator need not have read the play, or even have seen a performance. To use a modern
example, most people could probably identify the plot of *Moby Dick* as being about a man
hunting a whale, and could furthermore specify that it was written a long time ago, whether or
not they had read it. A parody of *Moby Dick*, therefore, would not be accessible only to a small,
learned readership, but to anyone with a basic knowledge of the story. There is a core cultural
knowledge that is not dependent upon text, but on any number of moments of transmission
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112 Webb (2011) 111.
113 For example, a woman performing under the name Herman Vaudeville posted a video to YouTube of a
song parodying *Moby Dick*, "Call me Ishmael," set to the tune of Carly Rae Jepson's "Call me maybe"
(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fnjq6A—zpY). The song does not require the audience to have read
*Moby Dick*, only to know that it is a Great Book about a whale hunter, beginning with the line, "Call me
Ishmael." Like the mime, part of the reason the song is funny has to do with the high-low contrast
between Melville and Jepson, which is also a contrast between the old (Melville) and the contemporary
(Jepson).
(including but not limited to repeated casual reference, storytelling, word of mouth, parody, visual representation, and performance). Euripides was part of this core cultural knowledge, and it is this cultural knowledge the Charition draws upon and pokes fun at.

7.3 The View from Above: Paratheatrical Entertainers in Imperial Greek Literature

Literary sources provide perspectives on hired entertainers quite different from epigraphic sources. While epigraphic sources represent them as being admired by their audiences and celebrated by the cities in which they performed, elite authors look down upon hired entertainers as low-brow corrupters of Greek culture. In imperial Greek literature, hired entertainment categories are used as markers of the decline of post-classical Greek culture. Those who react with thauma to entertainment are shown to be shallow-minded and uncultured.

Athenaeus displays this elite disdain for popular performance in his dialogue Sophists at Dinner (2nd / 3rd c. CE). The guests at Athenaeus' imagined dinner party are all highly educated, elite Greeks, who show off their education by demonstrating their extensive knowledge of Greek literature of all genres, and from all periods. Athenaeus criticizes "later" Greeks (i.e. post-5th c. BCE) who have erected statues of performers, contrasting their interest in techne to more high-minded intellectual pursuits. Then he lists some of the performers whom Greeks in various cities have honored too highly.

"For in later times the Greeks attached much more value to crafts involving manual skill than to intellectual pursuits that require an education," τὰς γὰρ βαναύσους τέχνας Ἡλληνες ὑστερον περὶ πλείστου μᾶλλον ἐποιοῦντο ὡς καὶ ἡλικίας καὶ ἀνέγινοντες δημοσία, διὰ τὸ ἡλικίας δῦνει μὲν κολυμβῆσθαι τὰ ὅποιοι συμπίνουσι μὲν συγκοινωνίζονται δὲ ὅποιοι, καὶ τὰ ἑπτάσκαθα μᾶλλον πολλάκις δὲ ὅποιοι. Αθηναῖοι

114 "For in later times the Greeks attached much more value to crafts involving manual skill than to intellectual pursuits that require an education," τὰς γὰρ βαναύσους τέχνας Ἡλληνες ὑστερον περὶ πλείστου μᾶλλον ἐποιοῦντο ὡς καὶ ἡλικίας καὶ ἀνέγινοντες δημοσία, διὰ τὸ ἡλικίας δῦνει μὲν κολυμβῆσθαι τὰ ὅποιοι συμπίνουσι μὲν συγκοινωνίζονται δὲ ὅποιοι. Αθηναῖοι

Douglas Olson. We can tell that by "later" he means post-5th century BCE because the earliest performers listed are from the 4th century BCE.
The itinerant showman Matreas of Alexandria inspired admiration among the Greeks and the Romans. He used to say that he was raising a beast that devoured itself, and a debate continues until today about what Matreas' beast was. He also wrote parodies of Aristotle's *Problems* and read them in public: "Why does the sun sink but not dive?"; "Why do sponges soak up wine but not get drunk?"; and "How can accounts be reconciled, if they don't argue with one another?" The Athenians granted the puppeteer Potheinδις use of the stage on which Euripides staged his inspired dramas; and they erected a statue of Eurycleides in the theater along with that of Aeschylus. The magician (thaumatopoios) Xenophon was also much admired. He left behind a student, Cratisthenes of Phlius, who could make fire flare up spontaneously and created many other illusions that allowed him to baffle people's minds.\(^{115}\)

The language of *thauma* unifies these rather different performers: Athenaeus repeats ἐθαυμάζετο, emphasized by the echo in Xenophon the θαυματοποιός. The internal audiences are amazed at the wrong things, at tricks and shows and jokes. Instead, Athenaeus implies, the readers ought to be amazed at his immense knowledge of Greek culture, as he rattles off names of individual performers hundreds of years past, knowledge gained from long study of Greek literary and historical texts. Athenaeus repeatedly contrasts the classical past, here represented by Aristotle's *Problems* and the performances of Euripides and Aeschylus at the Theater of Dionysus in Athens, with later popular performance: the traveling parodist Matreas, the puppeteer Potheinas, Eurycleides, the illusionists Xenophon and Cratisthenes of Phlius. Focusing on puppeteering which takes place in the Theater of Dionysus, the site of the first performances of Aeschylus' and Euripides' plays, and the first dramatic festivals in the Greek world, heightens the contrast between the classical and post-classical past. Inscriptional evidence may confirm that the Theater of Dionysus hosted paratheatrical performances. An honorific inscription from Chalkis from the 2\(^{nd}\) century CE for the Marcus Ulpius Kallinikos says that he was "the first to make fifty five
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\(^{115}\) Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 1.19d-20b, trans. Douglas Olson.
*kykloi* in the Theater of Dionysus." The *kykloi* may refer to acrobatic tricks, such as cartwheels. For Kallinikos, it was a point of pride to have performed his cartwheels in this grand and ancient theater.

Many of these entertainers seem to re-work canonical Greek authors for their performances. Matreas tells Aristotelean jokes, and just after the section quoted above, we learn of a mocking singer who imitates Homer, warbling the story of the Cyclops in bad Greek. For Athenaeus, these entertainers represent a worsened form of Greek culture, popular mimicry of the elite literary genres which the learned dinner guests are so eager to claim knowledge of themselves. Implicit in the passage is the idea that the Learned Banqueters are the true guardians of Greek culture. Yet it is remarkable that a public performance by a joker would include a parody of Aristotle. This implies that knowledge of Aristotle was common enough among the spectators that his jokes would have been funny. Similarly, the singer who imitates the Homeric Cyclops must have been performing for an audience who knew their Homer, whether through text, oral performance, or cultural knowledge. Homer and Aristotle, in other words, were part of Greek popular culture, the shared cultural heritage of elite and non-elite Greeks.

Like Athenaeus' Learned Banqueters, Philostratus' Apollonius re-directs *thauma* away from paratheatrical entertainers and at himself. *Thaumatopoioi* are not, however, entirely maligned in the *Life*. Philostratus uses pantomime as a way to re-interpret Neo-Pythagorean silence in the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. Rather than practicing the anti-social, passive silence of the Pythagoreans, Apollonius' silence is communicative, like the communicative silence of
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116 SEG 29-807.
117 Reynolds and Beard (1981) 143 identify Kallinikos as an acrobat, based on the mention of *kykioi* (no specific acrobatic term is used in the inscription). It has also been suggested that Kallinikos performed dithyrambs, and was not an acrobat. For further discussion of Kallinikos, see the section on acrobatics above.
pantomimes. Philostratus brings together paratheatrical, philosophical, and paradoxographical *thauma*, suggesting that Apollonius himself is the only one in the world truly worthy of wonder.

Philostratus begins his *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* not with the birth of Apollonius but with Pythagoras of Samos, who, as it turns out, is not really Samian or Ionian, but the reincarnation of Euphorbus of Troy. It is not until the fourth chapter that we learn anything about the birth and parentage of Apollonius of Tyana, who is not born in any straightforward manner either. Apollonius’ mother receives a vision of Proteus during her pregnancy in which the shape-shifting god tells her that he is the father. This Protean child grows up to become a neo-Pythagorean philosopher, a sage figure who causes *thauma* wherever he goes, as he performs miracles which often reveal some true nature unobservable to others around him. For example, Apollonius is able to interpret bird language, understand all human languages without studying them, know of natural and human events before they have occurred, and recognize supernatural beings such as phantoms, demons, and vampires, who disguise themselves as humans. In various ways, all of these miraculous abilities may be categorized under Apollonius’ ability to know the interior truth of the matter: he knows what people or animals are saying or thinking, regardless of what linguistic signs or sounds they use to express meaning, or even if they are silent. He knows the true nature of those he comes into contact with, even if they are externally disguised. Philostratus is careful to point out that Apollonius’ abilities are true. That is, he is not an imposter or a magician (μάγος), as others have claimed. Apollonius lives in a world dominated by *thauma*: he travels to India, Ethiopia, Arabia, and to the West, encountering marvelous animals, peoples, customs, geography, and natural phenomena wherever he goes. Apollonius himself often reacts with *thauma*, and the people he meets react to him and his deeds with even greater
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118 Philostratus, *VA* 1.2. All translations of the *VA* by Christopher Jones.
thauma. Philostratus sets Apollonius next to various thaumatopoioi in order to make it clear that Apollonius causes thauma not by trickery or performance, but by true mystical knowledge.

How Apollonius came to have these miraculous abilities is somewhat mysterious. Philostratus suggests that Apollonius may have been in part divinely inspired. He is more divinely inspired, theioteron, than Pythagoras in his wisdom, and his birth is attended by a thunderbolt, a divine omen.119 Apollonius' abilities also have to do with his practices in life. He adopts a Pythagorean lifestyle, practicing self-control and restraint by becoming a vegetarian, abstaining from wine, controlling his sexual desires, not cutting his hair, and wearing simple linen clothes. This is the distinction between Apollonius and his philosophy teacher Euxinus, who knows Pythagorean doctrine but does not practice the Pythagorean way of life, being himself a glutton and sexually promiscuous, and is hence limited in his understanding.

Apollonius also takes a five-year vow of silence, a practice for which Pythagoreans were famous. For Pythagoras' followers, this five-year vow of silence was both a way to practice self-control, by restraining speech, and also a method of learning Pythagorean doctrine. In his Life of Pythagoras, Iamblichus tells us that the followers of Pythagoras who took the vow of silence sat and listened to Pythagoras speaking his doctrine from behind a curtain.120 They heard but did not see their instructor. One of the goals of the deprivation of sight was to lead students to true understanding of difficult mathematical concepts: that is, they learned Pythagorean mathematics without visual aids such as diagrams. Another goal may simply have been to add to the mysteriousness of the sect.

119 Philostratus, VA 1.2.
120 Iamblichus, Life of Pythagoras 17.
After five years of silence, they were allowed to see Pythagoras, and learn secrets which they were in turn to keep silent about. Philostratus alludes to the practice when he says, in his first chapter,

"καὶ ἡ σιωπὴ δὲ ὑπὲρ τοῦ θείου σφίσιν ἐπήσκητο· πολλὰ γὰρ θείᾳ τε καὶ ἀπόρρητα ἥκουσιν, ὅποι κρατεῖν χαλεπῶν ἢν μὴ πρῶτον μαθοῦσιν, ὅτι καὶ τὸ σιωπάν λόγος.

Hence they [i.e. the followers of Pythagoras] practiced silence on celestial subjects, having heard many sacred secrets which it would have been difficult to keep, except that they had learned first that even silence is a form of discourse.

"Τὸ σιωπάν λόγος" refers to Pythagorean learning through silence, as represented in Iamblichus, but also to Apollonius' rather different interpretation of Pythagorean silence. Pythagorean silence, centered as it was on the Master himself as he dispensed wisdom to his followers, was problematic in the post-Pythagorean world. Without Pythagoras, what Master should a neo-Pythagorean follower listen to? In the connection between silence and control of speech, as well as the connection to memory, Apollonius' neo-Pythagorean silence is similar to Iamblichus' portrayal of Pythagorean silence. In other ways, however, Apollonius' silence is much different. Philostratus' Apollonius interprets neo-Pythagorean silence through the lens of pantomime. Like a pantomime, Apollonius communicates in silence with gesture, and controls his audience more strongly in silence than those who attempt to command attention by speaking. When people speak to him, he responds "with his eyes, his hands, or by the motions of his head."\(^{121}\)

Apollonius listens to no doctrines during his period of silence, nor does he stay in one fixed place, as Iamblichus' Pythagoreans do. Instead he travels, communicating silently with many people. Iamblichus' Pythagoreans are closed off from society. They do not communicate with one another, or directly with Pythagoras. Control factors largely into Iamblichus' understanding of Pythagorean silence as well. The vow of silence is figured as a victory over the

\(^{121}\) ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰ λεγόμενα καὶ οἱ ὄφθαλμοι τι ἐπεσήμαινον καὶ ἡ χείρ καὶ τὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς νεῖμα. Philostratus, \textit{VA} 1.14.
tongue. When Apollonius explains Pythagoreanism to the Ethiopians in book 6 of the *Life*, he personifies Pythagoreanism as a woman standing apart from the rest of the personifications of philosophical schools in silence, and says that she has a *desma glottes*, a binding of the tongue, of her followers. For Apollonius, Pythagorean silence is about control, and specifically about controlling when to speak and when not to.

Philostratus is not the only imperial Greek author to triangulate between pantomime, silence, and Pythagoreanism. In *On Pantomime*, Lucian's interlocutor Lycinus says that he has heard someone say that the silence of the dancers "was symbolic of a Pythagorean tenet." Relatedly, in a discussion of various philosopher-dancers (including the dancing Socrates) Athenaeus mentions a contemporary pantomime, Memphis, who "explains the nature of the Pythagorean system, expounding in silent mimicry all its doctrines to us more clearly than they who profess to teach eloquence" (οὗτος τὴν Πυθαγόρειον φιλοσοφίαν ἐπιδείκνυσιν ἣτις ἑστί, μετὰ σιωπῆς πάνθ᾽ ἠμῖν ἐμφανίζων σαφέστερον ἢ οἱ τὰς τῶν λόγων τέχνας ἐπαγγελλόμενοι διδάσκειν). The dancer Memphis is able to communicate the "Pythagorean system," probably here meaning the mathematical explanations of the motions of heavenly bodies, with silent gesture, and he is able to communicate with physical motions even more effectively than those who communicate with words. These passages suggest that Philostratus may have been responding not only to an element of popular culture in his use of pantomime in the *VA*, but also to a specific association between Pythagorean silence and the silence of pantomimes.

Like a pantomime, Apollonius communicates with his audiences with silent gestures, often conveying surprisingly complex thoughts. At one point, he asks about a lawsuit with a
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122 Philostratus, *VA* 6.11.
124 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 1.20d.
gesture of his hand. The complexity of the thought communicated by a single gesture is an early indication of the kind of miraculous cross-linguistic communication that he is capable of later in the *Life*. He also quells pantomime riots in the cities he visits in Pamphylia and Cilicia with a silent glance.

He spent the time of his silence partly in Pamphylia and partly in Cilicia, and though he traveled among such pleasure-loving regions he never uttered a sound or was induced even to murmur. Whenever a city he visited was in turmoil, as many were because of their worthless amusements, he would enter, show himself, and give some hint of his intended rebuke by his hand and his expression. That would end all disturbance, and silence fell as if at the Mysteries. But there is nothing wonderful about restraining people beginning to fight over dancers or horses, since those misbehaving over such matters will blush, recover themselves, and return to their senses at the sight of a true man. Some pantomimes were associated with the factions of the charioteers ("the Greens," "the Blues," "the Whites," "the Reds"). Inscriptional evidence from Aphrodisias especially suggests that each charioteer faction may have had its own pantomime. Crowd allegiances to one faction or another could result in violent conflict. This is what "pantomime riots" mean, and is the reason that Philostratus mentions pantomimes and horses together as instigators of disturbance.

Whereas the pantomimes instigate riots as a result of their silent gestures, Apollonius stops the riots, causing silence with his silent gesture. Like the pantomimes, Apollonius controls the crowds; they both have an attractive power over their spectators. Apollonius is not just similar to a pantomime, in his gestures. He is better, because he causes silence and self-control in others.
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125 Philostratus, *VA* 1.15.

The crowd quiets down because they see a man, that is, not the sort of man who imitates women in dance (i.e. a pantomime). Similarly, Apollonius amazes the citizens of Ephesus with his ability to interpret the language of birds, distracting them from their obsession with pantomimes, pyrrhic dancers, pipers, and castanets, often used to accompany mimes, which as we saw in the last chapter, are used to indicate the ways in which the Ephesians have forgotten how to celebrate their festivals properly. Philostratus juxtaposes Apollonius to *thaumatopoioi* in order to show the difference between worthless and worthwhile objects of *thauma*, and to demonstrate why Apollonius inspires *thauma* in his audiences. While both Apollonius and the pantomimes are spectacular, Apollonius' spectacle is not one of deception. While both Apollonius and the pantomimes learn to communicate with silent gesture, pantomimes do so for entertainment, whereas Apollonius settles court disputes. Furthermore, Apollonius is in pursuit of a higher goal, the full immersion in the Pythagorean lifestyle in his quest to become a new Master. Spectators, he implies, should be discerning in their reactions of *thauma*. Philostratus views neo-Pythagoreanism through the lens of pantomime because it was of such central importance to imperial Greek culture. In a way, Apollonius manages to extract the most thaumatic aspects of pantomime (control of the body and silent communication) and separate them from the problematic body of the performer, transferring them instead to his own body, to use for his own ends.

**Conclusion**

Whether they were paid to perform or won festival competitions, all paratheatrical entertainers were *thaumatopoioi*. *Thauma* was the goal of every kind of paratheatrical
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127 Apollonius' spectators are "full of amazement" (μεστοὶ θαύματος) after Apollonius interprets the bird-language for them. Philostratus, *VA* 4.3.
entertainment, diverse as they were. This does not mean that the audiences of paratheatrical entertainment were mindless, as Plato would have us believe, or that paratheatrical entertainment had displaced tragedy, comedy, and satyr play, as Athenaeus suggests. Rather, they existed alongside one another, sharing in the same body of cultural knowledge, and both perpetuating Greek cultural identity. We have seen how automata, jesting, mime, and pantomime responded to tragedy and comedy, adapting and transforming the material in new and innovative ways.

Heron's automatic theater sought to out-do the real-life theater, making it even more thaumatic. Various jokes in the Philogelos joke book used tragic and comic lines to poke fun at the juxtaposition of high and low registers. The Charition mime adapted Euripides' Iphigeneia Among the Taurians, transferring the action to the Malabar Coast of India. The mime adds thaumatic effects by having the chorus of Indians speak Indian, not Greek, and by incorporating moments of surprise, such as when the Indian king abruptly starts speaking Greek, not Indian.

Pantomimes tell the stories of classical tragedy in dance, and cause thauma by using silent gestures, not words, to communicate these stories. In the last section of the chapter, we saw how Athenaeus and Philostratus reacted to the thauma experienced by the audiences of paratheatrical entertainers, and how they both sought to instruct their readers on what they thought to be worthy or unworthy of thauma. Philostratus' use of thaumatopoioi in the Life of Apollonius of Tyana is particularly complex, because he both uses pantomime as a way of understanding the purpose of silence in neo-Pythagoreanism, and also puts Apollonius in competition with pantomimes as they vie for the thauma of the audience. This competition between thaumatopoioi and thaumatourgoi persisted into late antiquity, with Christian wonder-workers trying to attract the audiences which flocked to see the thaumatopoioi in the theater.
Conclusion

Because of the importance of travel, the festivals were places of shared Greek culture, at which knowledge of the literature of the past as well as contemporary Greek literature was transmitted. We have seen that in cities across the Roman Empire, people were watching plays of Euripides, Menander, and contemporary drama. Any Greek speaker who went to the theater had access to the dramas of these two fantastically popular playwrights. Performances, repeated throughout actors' travels, linked audiences across the Mediterranean in a shared cultural network.

In this dissertation, I have considered the reasons for the long-term stability of the dramatic festivals under the Empire. Groups and individuals from all levels of society, elites and sub-elites, had something to gain from participating in dramatic festivals. The benefits they reaped for themselves, I believe, go a long way in explaining with why the dramatic festivals remained so central to Greek culture under the Empire.

But why, after over 700 years of success, did the festivals collapse? This question requires further research, but I offer a hypothesis. I wager it was the way in which festivals were funded, by endowments, coupled with the conservatism of their administration, which led to this collapse. Festival organizers relied on being able to lend the capital of the endowment at an attractive interest rate, which would in turn furnish enough in interest to support the festival. The interest rate on the endowment was not pegged to market value, but was rather fixed at a rate that would have been well below market value at the time of the foundation of the festival. The decline in interest rates in the 3rd century CE would have caused this system to fail. If the interest rate on an endowment was no longer below market value, festival organizers would have
had difficulty lending out the capital, and would have been unable to pay for the festival from the interest alone. Once forced to spend from the capital of the endowment, it was only a matter of time before the endowment was entirely depleted.

As private wealth also declined in the third century, it was not possible to rely on private benefactions to bolster the endowments. The imperial administration had neither the interest nor ability to supporting the extensive network of festivals throughout the Eastern provinces in the long term. We have precious little evidence for this last, understudied chapter in the history of the dramatic festivals, but one anecdote reported by Malalas hints in this direction. According to Malalas, the citizens of Antioch wrote to Commodus to ask for help in funding their Olympia and the Maiouma, a theatrical, night-time festival. He "provided a certain quantity of gold for the budget for the lamps and candles and other things pertaining to the festival of all-night enjoyments, for 30 days" (ἀφώρισε φανερὰν χρυσίου ποσότητα λόγῳ λαμπάδων καὶ κανδήλων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν προχωροῦντων ἐπὶ τὴν πανήγυριν τῶν λ’ ἡμερῶν τερπνῶν παννυχίδων).\(^1\) What Commodus did not do, of course, was to replenish the endowments of the festivals of Antioch. He sent money for a one-time celebration. Also interesting is what the citizens of Antioch, and in particular, the festival organizers, did not do when confronted with a budgetary crisis. They did not shorten the length of the festival, which was celebrated for a full month. No festival organizer wanted to be the one to celebrate a diminished festival, because his reputation was tied to the success of the festival in the year in which he held office, rather than to the long-term financial solvency of the festival. So, what could he do but go out with a bang?

In late antiquity, with the collapse of the festivals, mime and pantomime became the most prominent entertainment in the theater. The conservatism of the festivals, and the care taken to keep the program consistent over time, may have prevented mime and pantomime from taking

over the theater sooner. Once the institutional structure of the festivals was gone, they quickly ascended. The history of the theater in late antiquity should be seen as one of transition and change, not decline.

Many aspects of Greek drama in the Roman era are ripe for further research. What was the relationship of public to private performance, and of performed drama to the study of Greek drama in schools? A greater integration of art historical evidence, particularly domestic Roman mosaics with theatrical scenes, may help to elucidate the relationship between private and public performance. Archaeological evidence also begs to be considered more fully. As we saw at the very beginning of the dissertation, there were many more theaters in the Empire than there are attested dramatic festivals. How do we explain this gap? And when we consider the place of Greek drama in the West, might an understanding of the prevalence of dramatic performance in imperial Rome change our view of whether Seneca's plays were written with performance in mind?
Appendix 1: Catalog of Evidence for the Greek Dramatic Festivals in the Eastern Roman Empire, Organized by Site

This appendix is a site-by-site history of the dramatic festivals in the Roman Empire, from the time of Augustus through the gradual decline of the festivals in the 3rd and 4th c. CE. Evidence from the 1st c. BCE which is certainly pre-Augustan is omitted, whereas evidence which is dated to the 1st c. BCE, and may or may not be Augustan, is included.
Ill. 5. Map of the festivals of mainland Greece.

A1. Attica

A1.1 Athens

The festivals of Attica have been studied more intensely than those of any other area of the Greek world, but little is known of them after the mid-2nd c. BCE.\(^1\) With the end of the Didiskalia around 120 BCE, our evidence for the Athenian Dionysia breaks off.\(^2\) Plutarch attended a festival in Athens in 97 CE, perhaps the Dionysia, but writes only about the choral competitions (i.e. dithyrambs).\(^3\) We have no imperial-era records of Attic dramatic festivals outside of Athens.
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2. On the dating of the Fasti and Didiskalia, see Tracy (2015).
The Athenian Panathenea included dramatic competitions in the imperial period. The festival rose in status when Hadrian upgraded the Panathenea to the *periodos* in 119/20 CE. There is only one sure attestation of a new play at the Panathenea. An Athenian inscription from the 1st c. CE honors someone (the name is lost) for "having directed a new (i.e. newly-written) tragedy at the Great Panathenaea" (καὶ τραγῳδίαν Παναθήναια τὰ [μεγά]λα καὶ Νέα διδάκτος). While Csapo and Slater note, "this is our only evidence for drama at the Panathenea," there is other epigraphic and literary evidence. Gaius Julius Bassus, a *tragoidos*, *komoidos*, and herald, won at the Panathenea in the second half of the 2nd c. CE. Additionally, in Diogenes' Laertius' *Life of Plato*, Diogenes cites Thrasyllus referring to tragedy at the Panathenea.

Θράσυλλος δὲ φησι καὶ κατὰ τὴν τραγικὴν τετραλογίαν ἐκδοῦναι αὐτὸν τοὺς διάλογους, οἷον ἐκεῖνοι τέτρασι δράμασιν ἤγονίζοντο—Διονυσίος, Ληναῖος, Παναθήναιος, Χύτροις—ὁν τὸ τέταρτον ἦν Σατυρικόν· τὰ δὲ τέτταρα δράματα ἐκαλεῖτο τετραλογία.

Thrasyllus says that he [Plato] published his dialogues in tetralogies, like those of the tragic poets. Thus they contended with four plays at the Dionysia, the Lenaea, the Panathenaea and the festival of Chytri. Of the four plays the last was a satyrical drama; and the four together were called a tetralogy. Thrasyllus (d. 36 CE) anachronistically assumes that drama was performed at the Panathenaia in the 4th century BCE, mapping the practice during his own time onto the time of Plato. The Panathenaia originally included musical, poetic, equestrian, and gymnastic competitions, but not

---

5 IG II² 3157, l. 4-5. Cf. Csapo and Slater (1995) III.172 (English translation); Wilson (2000) 325 n. 152 and 383 n. 61. Wilson suggests that the choregos and director of this play was also the poet, though there is no mention of the poet in the inscription.
7 An honorific inscription for Bassus survives from Argos, dated to the 2nd or 3rd c. CE by Vollgraf (1919) 258-60, and more precisely, to the second half of the 2nd c. CE by Moretti (1953) 74.
8 Diogenes Laertius, *Life of Plato* 3.56.
drama.\textsuperscript{9}

The Hadrianea festival, which was established in Athens after Hadrian's death, may have included a dramatic program. In an inscription from after 138 CE, an emperor (the name is not preserved) greets the Athenian Technitai who have won the Hadrianea.\textsuperscript{10} The involvement of the Athenian Technitai with the Hadrianea Antoninea suggests that there could have been drama at this festival, although in the several surviving victory lists, only gymnastic and musical competitions appear.\textsuperscript{11}

While the records of the imperial-era Athenian festivals are scarce, there are several documents relating to the Athenian Technitai.\textsuperscript{12} The Technitai honor Hadrian, the "new Dionysus," in two Athenian inscriptions.\textsuperscript{13} Correspondence between Hadrian and the Athenian Technitai also survives. One inscription is the beginning of a letter from Hadrian to the Athenian Technitai of Dionysus, but the content of the letter cannot be determined.\textsuperscript{14} Another fragmentary inscription records the correspondence between Hadrian, a priest of Dionysus Choreios, and the Athenian Technitai.\textsuperscript{15} The correspondence covers two sides of a stone. The seven letters of face A are from Hadrian to the Technitai of Dionysos Choreios, and concern some crown-bearing, musical contests, and perhaps payments to the Technitai for this festival. The letters of face B, inscribed after the death of Hadrian, in the time of Antoninus Pius (138-161 CE), are between the

\textsuperscript{9} For the earlier Panathenaea, see Neils (1996) and Shapiro in Neils (1992) 53-75.
\textsuperscript{10} IG II\textsuperscript{2} 1348.
\textsuperscript{11} Victory lists for the Hadrianea: IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2087 (163/4 CE), IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2119 (180/1 CE), IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2114 (183/4 CE). Agonothetai of the Hadrianea: IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2050 (143/4 or 144/5 CE), IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2086 (163/4 CE), SEG 26-246 (175/6 CE), IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2130 (192/3 CE), IG II\textsuperscript{2} 2199 (c. 200 CE), IG II\textsuperscript{2} 3015 (210-220 CE).
\textsuperscript{12} Geagan (1972) collects the epigraphic evidence for the correspondence of Hadrian with the Athenian Technitai.
\textsuperscript{13} SEG 47-222 (129/30 CE) and IG II\textsuperscript{2} 1350 (135 CE).
\textsuperscript{14} Geagan (1972) 155-6 (Appendix 1).
\textsuperscript{15} IG II\textsuperscript{2} 1105 and IG II\textsuperscript{2} 4795; Geagan (1972) 134-9. Line numbers reference the text as restored by Geagan.
\textsuperscript{16} The epithet Choreios is used of Dionysos elsewhere, e.g. Plutarch, \textit{Moria}a 2.680b.
priest of Dionysos Choreios, Attalus Andragathos Sphettios, and the Technitai. They are concerned with financing for the festival and pay, perhaps for the Technitai contracted to perform. Attalus addresses the musical Technitai, suggesting that his correspondence may not have concerned the dramatic artists. The letters mention musical and poetic, but not dramatic, contests.

Geagan believes that the lack of evidence for the Athenian Technitai in the 1st c. BCE indicates that the Technitai had become less prominent. He says that Hadrian was writing "to the remnants of the once great Athenian synod," and interprets the letters of face A as records of the "formation of the synod." There is no mention of the formation of a synod in these letters. It is true that we lack inscriptive evidence from Athens for the Technitai from the early imperial period, particularly from the 1st c. CE, but this does not mean that the Athenian Technitai had disappeared or become inactive, as this correlates to a lack of epigraphic evidence more generally in the 1st c. CE.

It is clear from the many Athenian performers who appear in Boiotian victory lists that Athens remained a center for the acting profession in the late Hellenistic and imperial periods, even after the Didiskalia records cease (table 13). Of the 70 dramatic victors at Boiotian festivals from the 1st c. BCE to the 3rd c. CE, 19 are from Athens. Athenian dramatic competitors at imperial-era Boiotian festivals are outnumbered only by Thebans. We also know of 5 other Athenian dramatists from the imperial period from non-Boiotian inscriptions (table 14). In 97/6 BCE, the citizens of Delphi also honored the Athenian Technitai with inviolability, priority in

17 Geagan (1972) 152.
18 Geagan (1972) 152 face B l. 19.
19 Geagan (1972) 152 face B l. 13
20 Geagan (1972) 149: "Under Hadrian the technitai at Athens make a startling reappearance after an obscurity of almost two centuries."
21 Geagan (1972) 151.
consulting the oracle at Delphi, first place in processions, and proxeny. These honors were announced at the Pythia and Soteria in Delphi and inscribed at the sanctuary of Apollo and at Athens. The inscription from Delphi survives. This shows that there was an active group of Technitai in Athens in the first century BCE. There is a gap in the evidence between the 1st c. BCE and the time of Hadrian, which is presumably what Geagan has in mind when he speaks of the "startling reappearance" of the Technitai under Hadrian.

Table 13. Athenian dramatic victors at Boiotian festivals, 1st c. BCE-3rd c. CE, ordered by date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of victory</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Festival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandros son of Arison</td>
<td>1st c. BCE</td>
<td>poet of comedy</td>
<td>Charitesia at Orchomenos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attalos son of Attalos</td>
<td>1st c. BCE</td>
<td>actor of comedy</td>
<td>Charitesia at Orchomenos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophocles son of Sophocles</td>
<td>1st c. BCE</td>
<td>poet of tragedy</td>
<td>Charitesia at Orchomenos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrios son of Demetrios before 86 BCE</td>
<td>actor of comedy</td>
<td>Sarapieia at Tanagra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poses son of Ariston before 86 CE</td>
<td>poet of comedy</td>
<td>Sarapieia at Tanagra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharadas son of Timon 83 BCE</td>
<td>poet of satyr-play</td>
<td>Mouseia at Thespiae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariston son of Poses 80-50 BCE</td>
<td>poet of comedy</td>
<td>Amphiaraiia and Rhomaia at Oropos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charias son of Charias 80-50 BCE</td>
<td>actor of tragedy</td>
<td>Amphiaraiia and Rhomaia at Oropos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epinikos son of Alexandros 80-50 BCE</td>
<td>tragoidos</td>
<td>Amphiaraiia and Rhomaia at Oropos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraklides son of Heraklides 80-50 BCE</td>
<td>poet of satyr-play</td>
<td>Amphiaraiia and Rhomaia at Oropos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straton son of Isidotos 80-50 BCE</td>
<td>actor of comedy</td>
<td>Amphiaraiia and Rhomaia at Oropos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agathemeros son of Pythocles 150-160 CE</td>
<td>actor of new tragedy</td>
<td>Mouseia at Thespiae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiphon 150-160 CE</td>
<td>poet of new comedy, actor of</td>
<td>Mouseia at Thespiae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 FD III 2.49.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of victory</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Festival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artemon son of Artemon</td>
<td>150-160 CE</td>
<td>poet of new tragedy</td>
<td>Mouseia at Thespiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metriobios son of Metrobios</td>
<td>150-170 CE</td>
<td>tragoidos of old tragedy</td>
<td>Mouseia at Thespiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philemon</td>
<td>150-170 CE</td>
<td>tragoidos of old tragedy</td>
<td>Mouseia at Thespiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publius Aelius Amphichares</td>
<td>161-180 CE</td>
<td>poet of new tragedy, poet of new comedy</td>
<td>Mouseia at Thespiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Eutychianos</td>
<td>after 212 CE</td>
<td>komoidos</td>
<td>Megala Kaisarea Sebastea Mouseia at Thespiae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Athenian dramatic victors at non-Boiotian festivals, 1st c. BCE-3rd c. CE, ordered by date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of victory</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Festival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alkimakos</td>
<td>1st c. BCE</td>
<td>actor of old tragedy</td>
<td>Lenaea at Rhodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus Aelius Auphelius Apollonius, of Athens and Tarsus</td>
<td>138-161 CE</td>
<td>komoidos</td>
<td>Olympia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintus Marcus Straton (1)</td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
<td>komoidos</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintus Marcus Straton (2)</td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
<td>komoidos</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintus Marcus Titianus</td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
<td>komoidos</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

23 IG XII 1.125.
24 IG III 120.
25 IG II² 12664.
26 Ibid.
27 Ibid.
A1.2 The Peloponnese

A1.2.1 Epidaurus

At Epidaurus, the late Hellenistic Apollonieia and Asklepieia included competitions in re-performed tragedy (tragoidoi) and re-performed comedy (komoidoi). Only one tenuous piece of evidence survives for the Roman-era continuation of these competitions. The standard practice at this festival, well attested in the Hellenistic period, was to contract performers to appear. One komoidos, Dionysios, son of Dionysios, a Rhodian citizen, was fined 4 mina, and a tragoidos, Hippostratos son of Kaukon, a Cnidian, 6 mina, for breaking their contract to appear at the Apollonieia and Asklepieia in Epidaurus. Peek dates this inscription to the 2nd or 1st c. BCE.28 Gaertringen separates the fragment mentioning Dionysios from that mentioning Hippostratos and dates only Dionysios to the 1st or 2nd c. CE.29 If the later dating for Dionysios is correct, this would be our only evidence for imperial-era dramatic competition at Epidaurus.

Performances of poetry and music had a therapeutic function in the cult of Asklepius.30 Milena Melfi has recently examined the performance spaces of the Roman-era Asklepieia, including the Asklepieia at Epidauros.31 Her study puts drama into a larger context of performance at the Asklepieia.32

A1.2.2 Corinth and Isthmia

28 Peek, Asklepieion 44.
29 IG IV² 1.99.
30 Melfi (2010) 334, with a quote of Galen: "...Asklepios, who ordered not a few to have odes written as well as to compose comical mimes and certain songs—for the motions of their passions having become more vehement, have made the mixture of the body warmer than it should be" (De Dan. Tuenda I.8.19-21, trans. Edelstein and Edelstein). Robinson (1978) discusses different uses of the theater in sanctuaries of Asclepius (mystery plays, drama, oratory, rituals and sacrifices, medical demonstrations).
31 Melfi (2010) considers not only dramatic performances, but also performances of poetry and music (especially hymns) and rituals.
32 She suggests that the Antonine odeion at Epidauros was built specifically for performances of the hymns inscribed on the portico around the odeion, because the hymns were dramatic: "A theatre-like structure was, in fact, the most appropriate place for the performance of the Epidaurian hymns, as it was confirmed by their very articulate dramatic structure, featuring a choir and soloist singers" (Melfi [2010] 321).
The Isthmia included dramatic contests. Several victory lists for the Isthmia and Caesarea survive. The Caesarea was held immediately after the Isthmian games, i.e. appended to the Isthmia.\textsuperscript{33} Rather unusually, victory lists survive from several different periods (3 CE, 41-54 CE, 127 CE, and the late 2nd c. CE), allowing us to track the changes that were made to the Isthmia and Caesarea over the course of the imperial period.

In 3 CE, the thymelic contests at the Isthmia Caesarea were limited, including only a trumpeter, herald, poet, writer of encomium, aulete, kitharist, and kitharode.\textsuperscript{34} The inscription relating to the Caesarea during the reign of Claudius includes only the contests related to the imperial family (prose encomium for the emperor, prose encomium for Tiberius, poem for Livia Augusta).\textsuperscript{35} By 127 CE, however, there were significant changes to the festival.\textsuperscript{36} The thymelic contests were much expanded, both by expanding categories which previously existed, and by adding new categories (including drama). There were three poetry competitions and two encomium competitions in 127 CE versus one each in 3 CE. The musical contests were expanded, with the addition of the choral kitharist, aulete, and child kitharode, and drama was added to the program. Interestingly, the Corinthians show a preference for comedy at this festival, as there is a competition for a poet of comedy but not a poet of tragedy, and for a child \textit{komoidos} but not a child \textit{tragoidos}. Old comedy and tragedy are both represented by the \textit{komoidos} and \textit{tragoidos}. The last attestation of the festival is in the late 2nd c. CE.\textsuperscript{37} This last victory list is missing most of the lines relating to the thymelic competitions, but the presence of the kitharode (the final thymelic competition on the earlier programs) suggests that the thymelic program did continue to this point.

\textsuperscript{33} Gebhard in Gregory et al. (1993) establishes where the contests were held.
\textsuperscript{34} Corinth 8.1.14.
\textsuperscript{35} Corinth 8.1.19. Only the first 11 lines of the inscription survive.
\textsuperscript{36} Biers and Geagan (1970).
\textsuperscript{37} Corinth 8.1.15.
The specialties of one victor at the Isthmia points to the increasingly hybrid nature of performances in the imperial period. Gaius Aelius Themison won at the Isthmia, Nemea, and *koinon Asias* for his musical performances of Euripides, Sophocles, and Timotheus. Honors given by the Milesians to Themison at the Isthmia were recorded at Isthmia in the first half of the 2nd c. CE.38

38 Broneer (1953) 192-3 = SEG 11-52c.

The council and the people of the Milesians (honor) Gaius Aelius Themison, son of Theodotus, who won the Isthmia, Nemea, *koinon Asias* 5 times, and the other contests 89 times, and was the first and only one to set Euripides and Sophocles and Timotheus to music for his own purpose (*ἐαυτῷ*). Decreed by the council. Power identifies Themison as a kitharode.39 Gaius Aelius Themison may have competed at the Isthmia at a time when *tragoidoi* were also competing, both kitharode and tragedians working from the same canon of classical drama.


40 Ringwood-Arnold (1937) 436. The earliest attestation of drama at the Heraea is an inscription from Tegea from the 2nd c. BCE, on which the victories of an Arcadian actor are surrounded by wreaths. This

---

*A1.2.3 Argos*

The Nemea and Aspida at Argos, held back-to-back, both had dramatic competitions. The Aspida was earlier called the Hecatombaea, then the Heraea.40 In the 2nd c. CE, Gaius Julius

40 Ringwood-Arnold (1937) 436.
Bassus won as an actor of old tragedy (*tragoidos*) at the Nemea and Aspida. Bassus was an accomplished actor who won at several of the contests on the *periodos*. His honorific inscription claims a total of 323 victories (table 15). The contests are listed in groups by order of importance: contests on the *periodos* first (Nemea, Capitolia, Panathenea, and *koinon Asias*), followed by other *koina* contests (in Asia and Crete), and other unnamed 5-year contests. The Nemea and Aspida are listed first because of the local significance, as the inscription was erected in Argos.\(^{41}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Festival</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Victories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nemea and Aspida</td>
<td>Argos</td>
<td>herald, <em>tragoidos, dia panton</em></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitolia</td>
<td><em>Rome</em></td>
<td><em>tragoidos</em>, herald</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panathenea</td>
<td><em>Athens</em></td>
<td><em>dia panton</em></td>
<td><em>1</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>koinon Asias</em></td>
<td>Pergamum, Ephesus, Smyrna</td>
<td>*dia panton, koinon (<em>of tragoidoi)</em></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other <em>koina</em> of Asia</td>
<td><em>Cyzicus, Philadelphia, Laodicea, Sardis, Tralles</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>koina</em> of Crete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Massalia</td>
<td><em>komoidos, tragoidos</em></td>
<td><em>2</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other 5-year contests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>323</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{41}\) The Olympia was not traditionally a dramatic or musical festival. Ignoring the traditional contests at the Olympia, Nero performed as a tragic actor at the Olympia in 66 CE. This was the only performance of tragedy in the history of the Olympia.

---

\(^{41}\) Similar, an honorific inscription for Philoxenos of Side lists Sidetan contests first, followed by sacred contests, followed by contests which award prizes in money, the least prestigious. The victories are listed in order of importance, beginning with the victories which had local significance for the Sidetans. Bean (1965) no. 149 = IGSK Side im Altertum II 130.

\(^{42}\) Vollgraf (1919) 258-60. Gaius Julius Bassus is likely the father of Bassus of Miletus, also an actor: I. Didyma 183.
A1.2.5 Sparta

A budget for a festival, including a competition in tragedy, survives on a bronze inscription found at the theater in Sparta.\textsuperscript{43} Dating from 143-8 CE (based on the inclusion of a victor, Aelius Granianus of Sicyon, known to have won at the Olympia in 145 CE), Cartledge and Spawforth suggest the festival in question is the Urania or Eurycleia.\textsuperscript{44} The total amount of the prizes preserved on the inscription is 87,760 sesterces, with the tragic actor alone collecting a prize of 12,000 sesterces.

\textsuperscript{43} SEG 11-838.
\textsuperscript{44} Cartledge and Spawforth (1989) 188: "As for the programme itself, it included not only contests for athletes, musicians, and tragic actors, but also ones for trumpeters, painters, and even rhetors. One is left with the impression of a determinedly up-to-date agonistic entertainment, attempting to cater for as many tastes as possible."
A1.3 Phocis

A1.3.1 Delphi

In the Hellenistic period, Delphi had two dramatic contests, the Pythia and the Soteria.\(^{45}\) Only the dramatic contests of the Pythia are attested in the imperial period. Gaius Julius Julianus won in the tragedy competitions at the Pythia in the Augustan period,\(^{46}\) and the actor Daidouchos Krat—, also a victor at the Pythia, was honored with citizenship by the Delphians in the mid-2nd c. CE.\(^{47}\) Plutarch laments the addition of tragedy to the Pythian games.\(^{48}\)


\(^{46}\) IGSK Smyrna II 1.656.


\(^{48}\) Plutarch, *Convivial Questions*, 674D-E.
A1.4 Locris

A1.4.1 Opous

The Opountians celebrated a Dionysia. A Roman citizen, Gnaeus Calpurnius Helix, organized the Dionysia in Opous during the reign of Augustus, and paid for the festival himself (ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων).49

49 IG IX 1.282.
A1.5 Boiotia

While Athenians poked fun at their Boiotian neighbors, whom they called Boiotian swine, the epigraphic evidence suggests that Boiotia was not a cultural backwater. Boiotia was a musical center as far back as the 5th c. BCE, as a place of musical competitions as well as a source of musical instruments. Particularly fine auloi were produced in Boiotia, and Theban auletes won often at Athenian festivals. While many of the Boiotian festivals had athletic competitions as well, music and drama dominated. Far more inscriptions attesting to the musical and dramatic festivals survive from Boiotia than from any other area of the Greek world. Alessandra Manieri has published an edition of texts, translations, and commentary of Boiotian inscriptions relating to the musical and poetic festival competitions, from their beginnings through the imperial period. Most of these inscriptions date from the 1st c. BCE, but there is ample evidence for the celebration of the Mouseia at Thespiae into the 3rd c. CE.

The order of victors on the victory lists follows the order in which the competitions were held, which were remarkably consistent. The typical order of competitions at the Boiotian festivals was as follows:

1. trumpeter
2. herald
3. encomium
4. rhapsode

50 Plutarch, De esu carnium 6: τούς γὰρ Βοιωτοὺς ἣμᾶς οἱ Ἀττικοὶ καὶ παχεῖς καὶ ἁνασθήτους καὶ ἠλιθίους μάλιστα διὰ τὰς ἀδημογαίς προσηγόρευον· 'οὔτοι δ' αὖ σὺς καὶ ὁ Μένανδρος (fr. 748 Koerte)οὗ γνάθους ἔχουσι,' καὶ ὁ Πίνδαρος (Ol. VI 89 sq.) 'γνῶναι τ' ἐπείτα 'αὐγῇ ἔχρη ψυχῆ σοφωτάτη' κατὰ τὸν Ἦρωλετον (B 118). ("It is a fact that the Athenians used to call us Boeotians beef-witted and insensitive and foolish, precisely because we stuffed ourselves. 'These men are swine';... and Menander says, 'Who have jaws'; and Pindar 'And then to learn...'; 'A dry soul is wisest' according to Heraclitus," trans. B. Perrin.) Cf. Plutarch, Gryllus, and Cratinus, frags. 73A-B (Edmonds).


52 Manieri (2009).

The Boiotian inscriptions attest to an active theatrical culture in Boiotia, and Boiotian festivals attracted competitors not only from Boiotian cities, but also from Athens, the Peloponnese, Southern Italy and Sicily, and Asia Minor. Nevertheless, none of the Boiotian festivals were on the *periodos*.

**A1.5.1 Orchomenos**

The Charitesia at Orchomenos was a musical and dramatic contest. Three victory lists and two dedicatory inscriptions by festival organizers of the Charitesia survive from the 1st c. BCE. While two victory lists include only *tragoidoi* and *komoidoi* as dramatic competitors, the latest one has a full dramatic program: *tragoidos, komoidos*, poet of satyr-play, actor (of satyr-play), poet of tragedy, actor (of tragedy), poet of comedy, actor (of comedy). The Homoloia was celebrated immediately following the Charitesia, and had dramatic contests only for *tragoidoi* and *komoidoi*.

**A1.5.2 Thebes**

---

55 IG VII 3195 and 3196.
56 IG VII 3197.
57 IG VII 3196 l. 23-38.
There were dramatic festivals in Thebes, at least one of which survived into the imperial era, but the evidence is fragmentary. A victory list for the Romaia from 120 BCE includes satyr-play. We have only the beginning of the portion that would have included dramatic victors, but the presence of a poet of satyr-play strongly suggests that there was tragedy and comedy as well at this festival. This recently excavated inscription is the only surviving victory list of the Theban Romaia.58

The beginning of a victory list for the Agrionia at Thebes from the 1st c. BCE mentions one member of the Technitai.59 Manieri suggests that this refers to the Isthmian and Nemean branch of the Technitai, and suggests that the Agrionia may have been managed together with the Mouseia.60 However, the involvement of the Technitai of Dionysos in the festival does not definitively prove that there were dramatic competitions, as musicians could also be members of the Dionysiac synod.

From the imperial era, we have one victory list from Thebes which includes a tragoidos, but the name of the contest is not preserved.61 The festival may have been the Romaia, the Agrionia, or the Dionysia Herakleia. The order of the competitions is unusual for Boiotian contests: prose encomium, tragoidos, cyclic aulete, aulode. Typically musical competitions came before dramatic competitions at Boeotian festivals, but here the order is reversed, with the tragoidos before the aulete and aulode.

Finally, the Dionysia Herakleia is attested in a papyrus from the 3rd-4th c. CE.62 It reads simply:

αθνας εκμιλε

...athnas ekmile...
in Megara
at Corinth
Nemea in Greece
the contest is called Dionysia Herakleia.
This is the last attestation of the Dionysia Herakleia and one of the latest attestations of a
dramatic festival from anywhere in the Greek world. The contest is also named in an inscription
from Ephesos from the late second century CE for the pantomime Tiberius Iulius Apolaustus.
Apolaustus won "first of men from all time (at) the sacred contest held in Thebes by the first
(vote) of the tragic dance, the Commodeia Dionysia Herakleia."\textsuperscript{63} Whether the Dionysia had
traditional dramatic competitions in addition to the tragic dance (pantomime) is unknown,
though it is not unreasonable to assume that Dionysia did, in general, include dramatic
competitions.

A1.5.3 Thespiae

More inscriptions pertaining to the Mouseia at Thespiae survive than from any other
imperial Greek festival. The earliest definite evidence for the dramatic competitions is a statue
base in honor of Pythokles of Hermione, which refers to a victory at the festival for the Muses at
Helicon and Cadmean Dionysos (265-255 BCE).\textsuperscript{64} The association of Dionysus with the cult of
the Muses in the 4th century BCE may indicate that drama was introduced to the festival earlier

\textsuperscript{63} I. Ephesos 2071.
\textsuperscript{64} Manieri (2009) Thes. 7.
than Pythokles' victory. The participation of competitors from as far away as Asia Minor (the Lycian Apollodotos) suggests that the festival was well known, although the Mouseia was not on the periodos. Schachter attributes the popularity of the cult of the Muses, and the success of the festival, in part to "the participation in the agon of the various guilds of technitai, which assured both widespread publicity and a good standard of performances at the Mouseia."

In the 1st c. BCE, the Mouseia had a full dramatic program, with competitions in old and newly written comedy and tragedy, and satyr-play. Three victory lists from the 1st c. BCE survive, all fragmentary (table 16). One inscription, from after 84 BCE, preserves the beginning of the victory list. Another, dated to the mid-1st c. BCE, preserves the end of the list of dramatic competitions (new tragedy and comedy, closing with epinician). The third is in three fragments, and mentions a victor in new tragedy or comedy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16. Competitions at the Mouseia in Thespiae, 1st c. BCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victory list, after 84 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poet of prosody (i.e. prose writer) trumpeteter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


66 There is ample epigraphic evidence for the dramatic and musical competitions throughout the Hellenistic period (Manieri [2009] Thes. 8-32).

67 For the periodos in the imperial period, see Gouw (2008) 102.

68 Schachter (1986) 2.152.

69 IG VII 1760 = Manieri (2009) Thes. 33

70 IG VII 1761 = Manieri (2009) Thes. 34.

71 Manieri (2009) Thes. 35 groups together three fragments: A) IG VII 1763, B) I.Thespiai 182, C) I. Thespiai 183.

72 IG VII 1760 = Manieri (2009) Thes. 33

73 IG VII 1761 = Manieri (2009) Thes. 34.

74 Manieri (2009) Thes. 35 groups together three fragments: A) IG VII 1763, B) I.Thespiai 182, C) I. Thespiai 183.
In the 1st c. CE, a festival of the imperial cult was appended to the Mouseia, which became the Mouseia Sebastea. No victory lists from the 1st c. CE survive. Our only pieces of evidence for the festival in the 1st c. CE are five honorific inscriptions for organizers (agonothetai) of the Mouseia at Thespiae, three of them for the same person, Ariston son of Philinos. In these inscriptions, the Mouseia and Erotidea are often mentioned together, as when Ariston is said to have served as agonothete of the Erotidea, Caesarea, Mouseia, and of Julia Augusta (i.e. of the Erotidea Caesarea and the Mouseia Sebastea). Roesch suggests that the Mouseia and Erotidea were celebrated together, with the same organizer. Manieri, however, points out that in one inscription, the Mouseia is separated from the Erotidea. Here Lucius Furius Rufus is honored for being agonothete of the Erotidea and Caesarea, and Mouseia twice

---

77 ἀγωνοθετήσαντα δὲ Ἐρω-/τιδῆων καὶ Καισαρίων καὶ Μουσῆων/ καὶ Σεβαστῆς Ιουλίας, I. Thespiai 376 l. 5-7. The same phrasing is used in I. Thespiai 377, l. 3-5, whereas Athanias is said to be agonothete of the Mouseia Sebastea and Erotidea Kaisarea, ἀγωνοθετήσαντα Μου-/σήν Σεβαστῶν καὶ Ἐρω-/τιδῆων Καισαρίων, I. Thespiai 358, l. 3-5.
78 Commentary on I. Thespiai 376.
79 I. Thespiai 405.
(ἀγωνοθήσαντα Ἐρωτιδή/[ον καὶ Καισαρήων, Μουσείων δὲ δίς). The δὲ after Μουσείων marks the Mouseia off from the Erotidea Caesarea.

Livia's connection with the Mouseia is attested not only in the addition of her name to the festival, but also in the addition to the program of an encomiographer for Julia Augusta Mnemosyne (14-29 CE). Tiberius may have been involved in this change to the festival, as the same inscription lists an encomiographer for Messalinus, perhaps M. Valerius Messalla Messalinus, and his stepbrother Taurus (T. Statilius Taurus). Manieri attributes these honors for Messalla and his stepbrother to Messalla's friendship with Tiberius, although Tacitus' description of Tiberius and Messalla's relationship is not particularly friendly. Nevertheless, it is difficult to see what other reason the Thespians would have for honoring these Romans specifically.

Another three victory lists for the Mouseia survive from the mid-2nd c. CE. The dramatic program remained unchanged, with old tragedy and comedy, and new tragedy, comedy, and satyr-play (table 17). However, the order of musical and dramatic competitions changed. Whereas in the 1st c. BCE, the aulete and aulode competitions were performed back to back, as were the kitharist and kitharode competitions, in the first two victory lists from the mid-2nd c. CE, the two aulete competitions, the Pythian aulete and cyclic aulete, are separated by the dramatic competitions, as are the kitharist and kitharode. These musical events (Pythian aulete and kitharist first, choral aulete and kitharode last) frame the dramatic competitions. Furthermore, satyr-play comes not directly before or after tragedy and comedy, but after the cyclic aulete and kitharode. In the slightly later list, from 161-9 or 176-80 CE, the competition in old tragedy has migrated up in the program, framed by the kitharist and Pythian aulete, while the competitions in newly written drama (new tragedy and comedy) remain together. There is no

---

80 I. Thespiai 405, l. 2-3.
81 I. Thespiai 174.
82 Tacitus, Annals 1.8 and 3.18.
komoidos in the later victory list. It could be that there was no komoidos competition in this year, or that it had been dropped from the program. However, I suspect that if we had the rest of the victory list, we would find the komoidos nested between the choral aulete and kitharode, echoing the nesting of the tragoidos between the kitharist and Pythian aulete. Overall, the changes to the festival program seem to be directed at greater integration of the musical contests with the dramatic contests during the 2nd c. CE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 17. Competitions at the Mouseia in Thespiae, 2nd c. CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victory list, 150-160 CE&lt;sup&gt;83&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poet of the processional ode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trumpeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writer of encomium for the emperor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encomium for the Muses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poet for the emperor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poem for the Muses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rhapsode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pythian aulete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitharist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor of old comedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tragedios of old tragedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poet of new comedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor of new comedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poet of new tragedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor of new tragedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chorale of new tragedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poet of satyr-play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dia panto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rest of the evidence for the Mouseia in the 2nd c. CE adds little to our understanding of the festival. One Avidius Archestratos, agonothete of the Mouseia, was honored by his daughter,<sup>86</sup> and the Thespians voted a statue of a choregos, Philinos, be erected.<sup>87</sup>

<sup>83</sup> IG VII 1773 = Manieri (2009) Thes. 42.
<sup>84</sup> I. Thespiai 177 = Manieri (2009) Thes. 43.
<sup>85</sup> I. Thespiai 179 = Manieri (2009) Thes. 44.
<sup>86</sup> IG VII 2519 = Manieri (2009) Thes. 45.
The final chapter of the Mouseia at Thespiae is indicated by three victory lists from the 3rd c. CE. All three name the contest as the Megala Caesarea Sebastea Mouseia, suggesting that the former Erotidea Caesarea and Mouseia Sebastea were re-organized into one large contest. Two victory lists, from before 212 CE, break off before the list of victors begins, only preserving the names of the festival organizers, priests, and other officials.\(^8\) The latest evidence of the contest is a complete victory list from after 212 CE.\(^9\) The competitions at the Megala Caesarea Sebastea Mouseia in Thespiae after 212 CE were as follows.

1. trumpeter
2. herald
3. rhapsode
4. Pythian aulete
5. Pythian kitharist
6. cyclic aulete
7. \textit{tragoidos}
8. \textit{komoidos}
9. kitharode
10. (leader) of the city chorus
11. \textit{dia panton}

From this list, we can see that the program has been reduced, eliminating competitions in newly-written tragedy and comedy entirely. The various encomia, which expanded the program in the 2nd c. CE, have also been eliminated.

\(^8\) I. Thespiai 387 = Manieri (2009) Thes. 46.
A1.6 Epirus

A1.6.1 Nicopolis

The Actia at Nicopolis included tragedy and comedy from the time of the foundation of the festival. Gaius Julius Julianus won the competition in tragedy at the Actia under Augustus.\(^{90}\) It is certainly possible that the Actia had competitions in comedy from the beginning, but the first attestation of comedy at the Actia is from the late 1st c. CE, in Arrian's report of Epictetus' Discourses.\(^{91}\) While he was living in Epirus after his expulsion from Rome by Domitian in 89 or 92 CE, Epictetus witnessed a comic actor (komoidos), Sophron, compete at the games in the theater, presumably the Actia. This Sophron may be Marcus Julius Sophron, a comic actor from Hierapolis in Phrygia.\(^{92}\) In 128 CE, a komoidos who won at the Actia voted on a decree of the Technitai in Ankyra.\(^{93}\)

---

90 IGSK Smyrna II 1.656.
91 Arrian, Discourses of Epictetus 3.4.
93 Bosch (1967) 166 no. 130.
A1.7 Cyclades

A1.7.1 Paros

The Dionysia on Paros had competitions in tragedy. A letter from Paros from the 1st c. BCE, inscribed in Magnesia, says that the Magnesian Leukophryneia will be announced in the theater at Paros, at the beginning of the contest of tragedies at the Dionysia. In the 1st c. CE, a tragic poet (τραγῳδογράφος) from Syria, Gaius Julius Magnus, was buried on Paros. Gaius Julius Magnus is the only Syrian tragic poet known from the imperial period. No fragments of his poetry survive, and we do not know whether Gaius Julius Magnus' tragedies were meant for performance or if they were literary exercises, as no festival victories are cited in his epitaph.

---

94 I. Magnesia 50.
95 IG XII 5.433.
96 TrGF 181.
A1.8 Dodecanese

A1.8.1 Rhodes

There were competitions in tragedy at the Alexandreia and Dionysia at Rhodes at least into the 1st c. BCE. The Dionysia was established on Rhodes in the 4th c. BCE. The Alexandreia was appended to the Dionysia in the 3rd or first half of the 2nd century BCE. The first attestation of the joint Alexandreia and Dionysia is in 129 BCE. Several inscriptions honoring the choregoi of the tragic choruses at the Alexandreia and Dionysia survive from the 1st c. BCE. A victor at the Alexandreia and Dionysia appears in a fragmentary inscription from the 1st c. BCE, but neither his name nor the contest in which he won survive.

Like the Dionysia, the Lenaea was a musical and dramatic festival established on Rhodes in the 4th c. BCE. A victory list for the Lenaea at Rhodes includes a tragic tetralogy. The date of the inscription and the identity of the poet have been much debated, with some arguing for a date in the 1st c. BCE and others for the 4th c. BCE.

---

Of Sophocles...and Hym...

Aristomedes, Theban, competed against Kleandros in Rhodes... in Rhodes, allotted to the tribe Kaimeris with Kleandros, and he won in the Lenaea having acted "The Captive" (of comic poet X). Alkimachos the Athenian, having acted the "Peleus" of Sophocles and "Mad Odysseus" and "The Iberians" and the satyr-play "Telephus" in Rhodes was second. Thrasyboulos won the Lenaea, having acted (the play) of Eu--. (The poet) Thr-- having led the "Invocations" of Mormos, won. Aristomedes the Theban acted.

Gaertringen dated this inscription to the 1st c. BCE based on the letter forms.\textsuperscript{102} Bethe noticed that a certain Athenian Sophocles, son of Sophocles, appears as a poet of tragedy in a victory list for the Charitesia at Orchomenos, where his lead actor happens to be Theban.\textsuperscript{103} If the 1st c. BCE date is correct, the Sophocles of the Rhodian tetralogy is likely the same Sophocles who won at Orchomenos. O'Connor tentatively follows Bethe.\textsuperscript{104}

Moretti, however, pushes the date back to the 4th c BCE.\textsuperscript{105} Millis and Olsen also reject the idea that it dates to the 1st c. BCE, "since Victor's Lists do not otherwise appear to run so late."\textsuperscript{106} They are surely thinking of victory lists in Athens, as the existence of victory lists in the 1st c. BCE (and later) can be amply demonstrated from many non-Athenian contexts. What is

\textsuperscript{102} IG XII 1.125.
\textsuperscript{103} IG VII 3197; Bethe (1896) 245.
\textsuperscript{104} O'Connor (1908) 78 no. 24.
\textsuperscript{105} IGUR 223-229.
\textsuperscript{106} Millis and Olson (2012) 224.
unusual is the naming of the winning plays, a practice common in the Hellenistic period, which had, for the most part, fallen out of favor by the 1st c. BCE. Only one other victory list with the titles of the winning plays has been dated to the 1st c. BCE, inscribed in the market hall in Magnesia, which includes only one title per playwright, not tetralogies. The rarity of the practice of recording winning play titles in the 1st c. BCE strongly suggests an earlier date for the Rhodian inscription, whether in the 4th c. BCE or Hellenistic. The performance of a complete tetralogy also points to an earlier date.

Only one Rhodian dramatic inscription is securely dated to the imperial period. The Rhodians honored one of their own citizens, a comic actor named Rufus, for victories at 55 sacred contests in the 1st c. CE. The contests are not named.

---

107 I. Magnesia 88.
108 IG XII 1.84; IGR IV 1133. Bibliography: SEG 30-1853; Jones (1987) 208; Mygind (1999) 247-293 no. 94; SEG 49-1062; Rusten and Henderson (2011) 730, no. 47B. Rusten and Henderson (2011) translate ἀκριβίας as "realism"; this may be somewhat over-translated. They may have in mind Csapo, who has argued that there was a general trend towards realism in acting during the Hellenistic period, which probably continued into the imperial period (Csapo [2010] 117-139). Mygind (1999) collects intellectuals and artists of Rhodes from the late 5th c. BCE through the 2nd c. CE, including musical and dramatic artists; Rufus is among them.
A1.9 Crete

The *koinon* of Crete included dramatic competitions. Gaius Julius Julianus won at the *koinon* of Crete in the tragedy competition in the Augustan period.\(^{109}\) Where on Crete the *koinon* was celebrated is unknown.

\(^{109}\) IGSK Smyrna II 1.656.
A1.10 Mysia

A1.10.1 Cyzicus

The koinon Asias was celebrated in 8 cities in Asia Minor, including Cyzicus, and had dramatic competitions. The tragoidos Bassus claims to have won 24 times at the koinon Asias in Pergamum, Ephesus, and Smyrna (i.e. the major koina Asias), and 24 times at the "other koina of Asia" (i.e. the minor koina Asias). The "other koina of Asia" would include Cyzicus, Philadelphia, Laodicea, Tralles, and Sardis. The koinon Asias at Cyzicus was a minor contest, like that at Philadelphia, Laodicea, Tralles, and Sardis, and not on the periodos, as the koinon Asias in Pergamum, Ephesus, and Smyrna was. One Cyzican victor is known from an inscription in Ephesus, the child tragoidos Marcus Aurelius Nikephoros.

A1.11 Aeolis

110 Vollgraf (1919) 258-60.
111 IGSK Ephesos VII 2.3814.
A1.11.1 Pergamum

There was a Dionysia in Pergamum, held in every third year.\textsuperscript{112} Pergamum celebrated a major koinon Asias, which included dramatic competitions, which was on the *periodos*.\textsuperscript{113} The tragoidos Bassus won at the *koinon Asias* in Pergamum in the 2nd c. CE.\textsuperscript{114}

\textsuperscript{112} Jones (2002) 55 n. 9.
\textsuperscript{113} On the *koinon Asias*: Moretti (1954).
\textsuperscript{114} Vollgraf (1919) 258-60.
### A1.12 Ionia

#### A1.12.1 Ephesus

There were four dramatic festivals in Ephesus: the Dionysia, the Ephesea, the Artemisia, and the *koinon Asias*. The Dionysia in Ephesus was celebrated yearly. A list of the festival organizers of the Dionysia in Ephesus records nearly every festival organizer from 51/50 to 18/17 BCE.\(^{115}\) The organizers from 51/50 to 40/39 BCE, listed on the North side of the stone, were all priests of Roma in addition to being organizers of the Dionysia. The organizers from 39/38 to 18/17 BCE, listed on the South side of the stone, are not said to be priests of Roma, but all held the office of prytanis.\(^{116}\) All the organizers paid for the Dionysia with their own funds.

The great Ephesea must have included musical competitions, and may have included dramatic competitions, as an honorary decree by the Technitai of Dionysus for a benefactor, T. Aelius Alcibiades of Nysa, was voted on by the "co-competitors at the 5-year contest of the great Ephesea in the great and foremost metropolis of Asia, twice neokoros, the city of the august Ephesians."\(^{117}\) In the 2nd c. CE, the Technitai of Dionysus had a meeting-place in Ephesus. One house in Ephesus is lavishly decorated with Dionysiac imagery, leading some to think that this was the meeting-house for the Technitai.\(^{118}\)

The Artemisia at Ephesus had dramatic competitions. In the 2nd c. CE, a child *komoidos*, T. Flavius Sarpedon, citizen of Acmonea and Ephesus, won "the contest of the great holy Artemisia."\(^{119}\) Some information about the budget for the Artemisia survives. An edict by Paullus Fabius Persicus in 44 CE establishes a total budget of 4500 denarii for the contests in

---

\(^{115}\) IGSK Ephesos Ia 9.

\(^{116}\) For the dating of the priests of Roma, see Mellor (1975).

\(^{117}\) IGSK Ephesos Ia 22.

\(^{118}\) Ascough et al. (2012) 222-3 (B4).

\(^{119}\) IGSK Ephesos V 1606 (between Hadrian and Septimius Severus). The names of two organizers of the Artemisia are preserved in IGSK Ephesos V 2064. Another child victor, a kitharode, Aurelius Serapion of Thyatira, also won at the Artemisia: IGSK Ephesos VII 2.3813.
Ephesus, "in accordance with the decree of Ovidius Pollio."\textsuperscript{120} The edict, and the decree of Ovidius Pollio which it references, concern financial problems in Ephesus, particularly in relation to the sanctuary of Artemis. The 4500 denarii budget is probably for the Artemisia.

The \textit{koinon Asias} was celebrated in Ephesus and included dramatic contests. This was one of the major koina of Asia, and was on the \textit{periodos}.\textsuperscript{121} The \textit{tragoidos} Bassus won at the \textit{koinon Asias} in Ephesus in the 2nd c. CE.\textsuperscript{122} Three statue bases of Titus Flavius Montanus, twice eparch of the Technitai and high priest of Asia, have been found at the theater in Ephesus.\textsuperscript{123} All date to between 103 and 116 CE, under Trajan. Montanus was the festival organizer of the \textit{koinon Asias}, using the money left by the will of Lucius Vibius Lentulus, procurator of Trajan, to pay for the contest.\textsuperscript{124} He also paid for the vaults of the theater at Ephesus.\textsuperscript{125}

Several inscriptions from Ephesus preserve the names or specialties of competitors, but not the festivals they competed in. Julius Tryphonianus Caesareus of Tralles and Ephesus, a \textit{komoidos}, appears at the beginning of a fragmentary imperial-era inscription.\textsuperscript{126} The rest of the inscription is lost. An undated epitaph of an unnamed actor also survives.\textsuperscript{127} The beginning of an honorific inscription for a child \textit{tragoidos}, Marcus Aurelius Nikephoros of Cyzicus, survives

\textsuperscript{120} IGSK Ephesos Ia 17. Three more copies survive, one from the theater (IGSK Ephesos Ia 17); one from the market (IGSK Ephesos Ia 18); and two fragmentary Latin versions (IGSK Ephesos Ia 19A and 19B).
\textsuperscript{121} Moretti (1954).
\textsuperscript{122} Vollgraf (1919) 258-60.
\textsuperscript{123} IGSK Ephesos V 2061, 2062, and 2063. IGSK V 2062 may have been bilingual, as small fragments in Latin also survive.
\textsuperscript{124} IGSK Ephesos V 2061.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid. See also Sturgeon in Chapin (2004) 424, who notes that the city paid for repairs and renovations to the theater in the 1st c. CE, but expenses relating to the theater building were typically paid by private donation in the 2nd c. CE. Montanus must have left money in his will to Ephesus, because a statue of Lucius Vibius Lentulus was erected "from the revenue left by Titus Flavius Montanus, in his will, a public document" (IGSK Ephesos V 2061.1). A dedication by Montanus to Artemis Ephesia and Trajan also survives on the architrave of the theater: IGSK Ephesos V 2037.
\textsuperscript{126} IGSK Ephesos IV 1147.
\textsuperscript{127} IGSK Ephesus VII 2.4125.
from Ephesus, but breaks off before the child's victories are listed. Finally, an inscription lists the victories of a mime, Tiberius Claudius Philologus Theseus, but the names of the contests are not preserved. Theseus was a citizen of Ephesus as well as Marathon and Magnesia on the Maeander.

During the reign of Nero, Gaius Stertinius Orpex, freedman of the consul Gaius Stertinius Maximus, willed an endowment for distributions of money to the Ephesians. A 10-drachma distribution is reserved "for the tragic…" (τραγεικό). The 10 drachmas are perhaps meant for an individual, such as a tragic actor or dancer, as 10 drachmas is surely too small an amount to be shared among a group.

A1.12.2 Magnesia on the Maeander

The Leukophryneia at Magnesia was a musical, gymnastic, and equestrian festival, which included competitions in tragedy, and is amply attested in the epigraphic record. Hellenistic inscriptions relating to the Leukophryneia covered one wall of the agora. They include the story of the foundation of the festival in response to an epiphany of Artemis, as well as letters inviting other cities to send ambassadors to the festival (theoroi), and letters of reply from those cities. All three branches of the Technitai of Dionysus sent theoroi to the Leukophryneia in Magnesia. While the vast majority of the Leukophryneia inscriptions are Hellenistic, there is some later evidence. One organizer of the Leukophryneia appears in a short inscription from the 1st c. BCE. The last attestation of the Leukophryneia is an inscription honoring a pantomime from 138 CE. The list of contests in this inscription, where the pantomime probably performed,

---

128 IGSK Ephesos VII 2.3814.
129 IGSK Ephesos IV 1135.
130 IGSK Ephesos VII 2.4123.
131 I. Magnesia 54.
132 I. Magnesia 210, dated based on the letter forms.
includes the Leukophryneia as well as the Eusebeia in Poteoli, the Sebastea in Naples, the Ephesia, the Isthmia, the Pythia, and the Aresantadianeia.\textsuperscript{133}

The Romaia in Magnesia also included dramatic contests. A set of victory lists for the Romaia were inscribed in the market hall in Magnesia. It only lists the poets of new drama who won at the contest, as well as their lead actors (table 18). Side A (the East side) dates from the mid-2nd c. BCE, while side B (the South Side) dates from the 1st c. BCE.\textsuperscript{134} Side C is too fragmentary to provide any information. Each section (A.a, A.b, etc.) represents a distinct celebration of the contest.

If Side B is from the 1st c. BCE, it would be the latest instance of the practice of recording of the titles of the winning plays, alongside the name of the winning poet from anywhere in the Greek world. In places where only one or two of the victors are preserved (B.c, B.d, B.e, B.g), we should assume that there were, nevertheless, competitors in all three categories (tragedy, comedy, and satyr-play), as parts of the inscription are missing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Side of IGS</th>
<th>competitions</th>
<th>victor</th>
<th>play</th>
<th>actor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magnesia am Maeander 88</td>
<td>(poet) of tragedies</td>
<td>Theodoros son of Dionysios</td>
<td>Hermione</td>
<td>Apollonios son of Apollonios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(poet) of comedies</td>
<td>Metrodoros son of Apollonios</td>
<td>Homoioi</td>
<td>Agathokles son of Agathokles, of Miletus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(poet) of satyr-play</td>
<td>Theodoros son of Dionysios</td>
<td>Thytes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.b (mid-2nd c. BCE)</td>
<td>(poet) of tragedies</td>
<td>Glaukon son of Glaukon, of</td>
<td>Herakleitos son of Menodorus, of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{133} I. Magnesia 192.
\textsuperscript{134} I. Magnesia 88.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ephesus</th>
<th>Mallos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(poet) of comedies</td>
<td>Diomedes son of Athenodoros, of Pergamum</td>
<td>Menodotos son of Metrodoros, of Pergamum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(poet) of satyr-play</td>
<td>Polemon son of Neon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.c (1st c. BCE)</td>
<td>(poet) of tragedies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polemaios son of Diodoros, of Ephesus</td>
<td>Clytaemnestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Artemidoros son of Artemidoros, son of Dioskourides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.d (1st c. BCE)</td>
<td>(poet) of comedy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agathenor son of Aristonax, of Ephesus</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hierokles son of Hierokles, but by nature son of Philotos, of Tralles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(poet) of satyr-play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polemaios son of Diodoros, of Ephesus</td>
<td>Ajax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.e (1st c. BCE)</td>
<td>poet of satyr-play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harmodios son of Asklepiades, of Tarsus</td>
<td>Protesilaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.f (1st c. BCE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>too fragmentary to determine the contests or victors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.g (1st c. BCE)</td>
<td>(poet) of satyr-play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theodotos</td>
<td>Palamedes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_A1.12.3 Priene_

The Dionysia in Priene is last attested in the 1st c. BCE.¹³⁵ Only the boys' aulete competitions are attested.¹³⁶ There may well have been dramatic contests which do not appear in

---

¹³⁵ I. Priene 111 (beginning of the 1st c. BCE), 117 (1st c. BCE).
¹³⁶ I. Priene 117, 132, 133 (boy auletes).
the epigraphic record. The Dionysia may be the thymelic contest referred to in one other fragmentary inscription from Priene.137

A1.12.4 Smyrna

The Dionysia in Smyrna, which had competitions in tragedy, is last attested in the late 2nd or early 1st c. CE, but several other dramatic contests are known from the imperial period.138 The most important was the koinon Asias.139 This was one of the major koina of Asia, and was on the periodos.140 Gaius Julius Julianus won the tragedy competition at the koinon Asias in the Augustan era, and was honored with an inscription in Smyrna. He may have won in a year in which the contest was held in Smyrna, though the city of his victory is not stated in the inscription.141 The koinon Asias was important enough that one newly founded contests was schedule so as not to conflict with it. In 180-189 CE, a curator, Marcus Ulpius Apuleius Eurykles, wrote to the Aphrodisians about the establishment of the Lysimacheia, a musical and dramatic festival. He wrote that the contest would be scheduled between the Barbilleia at Ephesus and the koinon Asias in Smyrna.142 This would allow the Technitai to compete both at the koinon Asias and the Lysimacheia at Aphrodisias.

An Olympia, with musical and dramatic contests, was established in Smyrna in the imperial period. In two decrees of the Technitai inscribed in Ankyra in 128 CE, two members of the Technitai, who are musical and dramatic victors, are said to be Olympic victors: a choral

137 I. Priene 128.
138 JGSK Smyrna II 1.582.
139 SEG 32-1097 (180-189 CE, Aphrodisias). This is a letter from a curator to the Aphrodisians regarding the contests of Aphrodisias, and mentions the koinon Asias in Smyrna.
140 Moretti (1954).
141 JGSK Smyrna II 1.656.
142 SEG 32-1097.
kitharist (χοροκιθαρiator<τη>ς τοῦ ὀλυμπιονείκου), and Gaius Antonius Pol—, comic actor and Olympian victor (Γαίου Ἀντωνίου Πολ-/[.....]ως κωμῳδοῦ ὀλυμπιονείκου). Additionally, a komoidos, Titus Aelius Auphelius Apollonius, won at the Olympia under Antoninus Pius (138-161 CE).

A1.12.5 Didyma

There were tragedy competitions at the Didymeia in Didyma. Bassus of Miletus won as a tragoidos at the Didymeia in the second half of the 2nd c. CE, and was honored there with an inscription.

---

144 Bosch (1967)155, no. 128, l. 41-42.
145 IG III 120.
146 I.Didyma 183.
A1.13 Lydia

A1.13.1 Philadelphia

Philadelphia celebrated the *koinon Asias*, which included dramatic competitions. The *tragoidos* Bassus won 24 times at the "other koina of Asia," i.e. the minor koina, such as that celebrated in Philadelphia.\(^\text{147}\)

A1.13.2 Sardis

Like Philadelphia, Sardis celebrated a minor *koinon Asias*, where the *tragoidos* Bassus may have won in the 2nd c. CE.\(^\text{148}\)

\(^{147}\) Vollgraf (1919) 258-60.

A1.14 Caria

14.1 Aphrodisias

There were at least three dramatic competitions in Aphrodisias: a contest established by the Technitai (henceforth referred to as the "contest of the synod"), as well as the Lysimacheia, and a contest established by Claudius Adrastus. The contests of Aphrodisias were scheduled around other festivals, regionally and internationally. The Lysimacheia was scheduled between the Barbillea in Ephesos and the koinon Asias in Smyrna, to allow the Technitai to travel between all three contests. This is known from a letter from 180-189 CE from Marcus Ulpius Apuleius Eurykles to the Aphrodisians.\(^{149}\) Another letter from a curator from 180-189 CE records that the contest established by Claudius Adrastus, the Adrasteia, is scheduled in the 9th month of the year, after the Nicerateia in Tralles, and before a festival at Heraclea.\(^{150}\)

The dramatic festivals of Aphrodisias are attested primarily by inscribed lists of prizes and letters concerning the festivals, which have been well studied by Roueché.\(^{151}\) The prize lists are a unique glimpse into the variation in remuneration for victors at different festivals in the same city, as well as among victors in different categories. On some prize lists, the name of the competition does not survive, but was probably one of the three known dramatic competitions (table 19). This table does not represent the order of the competitions at any contest, only the prize amounts awarded.

| Table 19. Prize amounts for the dramatic contests at Aphrodisias (denarii). |

---


\(^{151}\) Roueché (1993).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competition</th>
<th>Contest of the Synod (c. 100 CE)</th>
<th>Unknown Contest (c. 100 CE)</th>
<th>Lysimachia (180-189 CE)</th>
<th>Contest of Claudius Adrastus (180-189 CE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tragoidos, First Prize</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragoidos, Second Prize</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragoidos, Third Prize</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koinon of Tragic Actors</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Tragedy (Κανή Τραγῳδία), First Prize</td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Tragedy (Κανή Τραγῳδία), Second Prize</td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragic Chorus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komoidos, First Prize</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komoidos, Second Prize</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komoidos, Third Prize</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koinon of Comic Actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Comedy (Κανή Κομῳδία)</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Comedy (Ἀρχαία Κομῳδία), First Prize</td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Comedy (Ἀρχαία Κομῳδία), Second Prize</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satyr (dance?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dia Panton</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prize amounts for the same competition at different festivals varied. For example, the *tragoidos* competition was awarded between 500 and 2700 denarii depending on the festival. However, there may also be some attempt to standardize the prize amounts across festivals, as the first, second, and third prize amounts for several competitions at different festivals are quite similar.

---

152 Roueché (1993) no. 52 (block A).
153 Roueché (1993) no. 52 (blocks D and E).
The *tragoidos* competition at the Lysimacheia and the contest of Claudius Adrastus, both attested in the late 2nd c. CE, received very similar prize amounts: 1500 denarii for each first prize, 500 and 600 denarii respectively for the second prize, and 300 and 250 denarii respectively for the third prize. The *tragoidos* and *komoidos* at the Lysimacheia received prizes in the same amounts. These amounts, in turn, are similar to the prizes awarded to the *komoidos* at an unknown contest around 100 CE: 1600 denarii for the first prize, 500 denarii for the second, and 300 denarii for the third. Whether or not the contest whose prizes were inscribed around 100 CE was still celebrated in the 180s CE, the prize list remained on public view. When new competitions, the Lysimacheia and the contest of Claudius Adrastus, were established, the organizers may have been looking to prize amounts at past and present Aphrodisian festivals to determine an appropriate amount to award in each category, and making adjustments depending on the funds available for the festival.

The standard order of competitions may also be reconstructed from the prize lists. As at all festivals, the first competitions were the trumpeter and herald. At Aphrodisias, the musical and dramatic competitions followed, with the athletic and equestrian competitions coming last on the program. Within the dramatic competitions, comedy precedes tragedy. At one contest at Aphrodisias around 100 CE, the name of which does not survive, the musical and dramatic competitions followed this order.\(^\text{156}\)

1. trumpeter
2. herald
3. Pythian aulete
4. cyclic aulete
5. comic actor (*komoidos*)
6. tragic actor (*tragoidos*)

This festival had contests in re-performed tragedy and comedy (a first, second, and third prize for

---

the *komoidos* and *tragoidos* are listed). Unfortunately, the part of the inscription which would have listed the competitions following the *komoidoi* and *tragoidoi* has been lost, and so it is impossible to know if there were other dramatic performances as well (particularly, in newly-written comedy or tragedy). There may also have been a *dia panton*, an over-all competition, for the musical and dramatic competitors, which would have been the last event in the musical/dramatic program.

At another contest in Aphrodisias of around 100 CE, the musical program included dance, but not drama. One column is missing from this inscription, which would have been to the left of column I. This column presumably had the opening competitions of the festival, such as the herald and trumpeter. The musical competitions were in the following order.

1. kithara with chorus
2. choral aulete
3. Pyrric dance
4. satyr (dance?)
5. *dia panton*

The inclusion of *σατύρῳ* (Col. I, l. 6) poses some difficulty in interpretation. The meaning "satyr-drama" seems unlikely. The inclusion of satyr-drama without any other dramatic competitions would be unprecedented, but there may have been other dramatic competitions listed in the missing column. Still, it would be equally unusual for musical competitions to interrupt the dramatic competitions, putting satyr-drama at the very end, before the over-all competition (the *dia panton*). The meaning "satyr-dance" would make more sense of its place in the competitions, immediately preceding the pyrrhic dance. If this is correct, it will shed some light on the epitaph of Aemilianus Geminos from Amastris, where the same question about the meaning of *satyros* arises. Aemilianus "won for the *satyros* at Cyzicus and Pergamum" (σατύρῳ

---

157 SEG 35-1327.
In light of the list of prizes from Aphrodisias above, however, where σατύρῳ seems to more likely mean satyr-dance, we should interpret σατύρῳ in Aemlianus’ epitaph also to refer to a dance. The festivals where he won could have been the κοίνα Ἀσίας, celebrated in Cyzicus and Pergamum.

The Lysimacheia had the most robust dramatic program of the Aphrodisian festivals: first, second, and third prize for re-performed comedy and tragedy (the κομιόδος and τραγοίδος), a κοινόν competition for the κομιόδοι and τραγοίδοι, contemporary comedy (καινὴ κωμῳδία) and tragedy (καινὴ τραγῳδία) as well as "ancient comedy" (ἀρχαὶ κωμῳδία). There is even a competition for a "tragic chorus." Rather atypically, the Lysimacheia had only musical and dramatic competitions, without any athletic or equestrian events. The full name of the festival, which appears at the beginning of a list of prizes inscribed in the late 2nd c. CE, calls attention to this.

The prizes of the 5-year talent-bearing contest, only musical, of Flavius Lysimachus are inscribed below.

The competitions were arranged in the following order.

1. trumpeter
2. herald
3. writer of encomia
4. poet
5. Pythian aulete
6. solo kithara
7. boy kitharode
8. ?
9. choral aulete

---

158 SEG 35-1327, 1. 10.
159 Leake (1843) 244-5 and 303, no. 22; LBW 1620d; Liermann (1889) 115-116, no. 20a; Frei (1900) 77, no. 14; CIG 2759; MAMA VIII 420; Roueché (1993) no. 53. Bibliography: Robert and Robert (1966) 426 no. 391; Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 321, no. 16b; Reynolds (1982) no. 60; Robert and Robert (1983) 158 no. 392.
160 MAMA VIII 420.
Like the other festivals in Aphrodisias, most of the musical competitions preceded the dramatic competitions at the Lysimacheia. Within each dramatic category, comedy preceded tragedy. Interestingly, the koinon of komoidoi and tragoidoi occurred before the competitions in newly-written comedy and tragedy, and "ancient comedy," suggesting that it was not a komoidoi who performed "ancient comedy."

Some festivals endured into late antiquity. In the mid to late 5th c. CE, an organizer of the Maiouma (Maioumarch), was commemorated in a verse inscription. The Maiouma was a Syrian festival associated with water, celebrated in Antioch, Aphrodisias, and Ostia. John Malalas describes the Maiouma as a theatrical, night-time festival, in a passage on the contributions of Commodus to various Greek festivals. Malalas' description of the festival as σκηνικής most likely refers to mime and pantomime entertainment.

A1.14.2 Stratonikeia

The festivals of Stratonikeia, particularly the Panamaria (the festival of Zeus Panamaros), the Heraia, the Komyria, and the Dionysia, are known from a series of inscriptions from the 2nd

---

163 For the Maiouma festival more generally, see Robert (1969) II 947-952 and Mentzou-Meimare (2009). Laumonier (1937) has suggested a relative chronology of the inscriptions, and a family tree (for the family tree of Tiberius Flavius and Flavia Mamalon, see Laumonier [1937] 254).
c. CE detailing benefactors' contributions to the festivals, and particularly the feasts they provided to various groups in Stratonikeia. While victory lists and prize lists do not survive from Stratonikeia, some of the festival competitions may be gleaned from the benefactors' contributions and feasts. The Panamaria was a thymelic festival. One festival organizer, Diomedes II Hierokometes, received thymelic and athletic competitors, who came from abroad to compete at the Panamaria in the 2nd c. CE. The inscription recording Diomedes' benefactions refers to a decree enacted by the thymelic and athletic competitors, probably a decree of the Technitai honoring Diomedes for his kindness towards them.

Theatrikoi were one group who appear as honorands of feasts at the festivals of Stratonikeia. The theatrikoi may be the thymelic competitors, or the akromata, i.e. the paratheatrical entertainers. Two benefactors, Claudius Ulpius Aelius Asklepiades and Ulpia Aelia Plautilla, provided feasts for the theatrikoi at the Kamyria, in addition to the usual feasts. The same benefactors lengthened the Panamaria from 10 to 30 days. Similarly, Epainetos Ulpiades and his wife honored the theatrikoi (θεατρικοὺς ἐτίµησαν), probably meaning that he provided a feast for them. Ulpiades and his wife were priest and priestesss of Zeus Panamaros in the 2nd c. CE. The inscription describing their benefactions does not say at which festival they honored the theatrikoi, but the Panamaria is a reasonable supposition based on their priesthoods. Epainetos Pamphilos, an athletic victor, and his wife, Flavia Artemon, also provided feasts for

---

164 Cousin (1904) 20-22, no. 1B; IGSK Stratonikeia I 266. Bibliography: Brinkmann (1916) 159; Nilsson (1906) 16; Cook (1914) III 163 ff.; Oppermann (1924) 61 and 80; Roussel (1931) 98; Laumonier (1958) 275-6 with n. 6; Robert, Hellenica XI 543; Merkelbach (1971) 116-7; Robert and Robert (1973) 460 no. 417.

165 IGSK Stratonikeia I 309, l. 22.


167 Hatzfield, BCH 44 (1920) 87-9 no. 19; IK Stratonikeia II 1.684. Bibliography: Laumonier (1938) 274.
several groups, including the *theatrikoi*, at the Panamaria in the 2nd c. CE.\textsuperscript{168}

There were certainly paratheatrical entertainers at the Panamaria. One inscription from the 2nd c. CE says that the benefactors "paid for both a resident pantomime and all the other *akroamata*" ([μισθωσάμενοι καὶ τὸν ἐπιδημήσαντα ὀρχηστήν καὶ τάλλα ἀκροάματα πάντα]).\textsuperscript{169} Similarly, Demetrios and Damylas paid for the resident *akroamata* at the Panamaria (2nd c. CE).\textsuperscript{170} Benefactors of an unknown contest in the 2nd c. CE "honored the resident *akroamata*" (τιμήσαντες καὶ τὰ ἐπιδημήσας[ν]~/[τα] ἀκροάματα).\textsuperscript{171} In 164-166 CE, Tiberius Flavius Theophanes provided entertainment (σκηνὰς) at the Panamaria as well as food (sweets and wine), money (distributed at the dinner), and supplies for the festival (oil and unguents).\textsuperscript{172} Many of his benefactions take place outside of the gymnasium and theater. This entertainment probably means paratheatrical entertainment, as it takes place in public, but not in the theater.

Whether any of these thymelic competitors at the festivals of Stratonikeia were actors cannot be determined from the inscriptions relating to benefactors' contributions, as none of these inscriptions specify which thymelic competitions were supported in Stratonikeia. However, one epitaph for a tragic actor, Diogenes, is known from Stratonikeia.\textsuperscript{173}

\textit{A1.14.3 Tralles}

\textsuperscript{168} Hatzfield (1920) 89-90 no. 20; IGSK Stratonikeia II 1.685. Bibliography: Laumonier (1937) 267 no. 89 and 284-5 no. 120; Laumonier (1938) 274.
\textsuperscript{169} Cousin (1904) 257 no. 80; IGSK Stratonikeia I 199. Bibliography: Robert (1940) 172 no. 166; Laumonier (1937) 257; Laumonier (1938) 171; Robert (1969) 664.
\textsuperscript{170} Hatzfield (1927) 97-8 no. 64; IGSK Stratonikeia I 254. SEG 4-303; Cousin (1904) 38 no. 22; Laumonier (1938) 172.
\textsuperscript{171} IGSK Stratonikeia II 1.706.
\textsuperscript{172} Cousin and Deschamps (1887) 379-383 no. 2; IGSK Stratonikeia I 203. Bibliography: Laumonier (1937) 254 and 256.
\textsuperscript{173} IGSK Stratonikeia II 1.1201.
Like Cyzicus, Philadelphia, Laodicea, and Sardis, Tralles was the site of a minor *koinon* *Asias*, which included dramatic competitions. The *tragoidos* Bassus, who won 24 times at the "other *koina* of Asia," may have won at Tralles.\(^\text{174}\)

In the late 2nd or 3rd c. CE, a mime, Flavius Alexander Oxeidas of Nicomedia, was honored with an inscription in the theater in Tralles.\(^\text{175}\) Flavius Alexander Oxeidas won 44 contests, all in Asia Minor, suggesting that many contests included competitions for mimes in the late 2nd or early 3rd c. CE. He is called an Asian victor (*Ασιονείκης*), who won at contests in Asia 18 times, and contests in Lycia and Pamphylia 26 times. He was a member of the council (boule) in Antioch and Heraclea, and of the elder council (gerousia) in Miletus.

\(^{174}\) Vollgraf (1919) 258-60.
A1.14.4 Kaunos

The Romaia Letoia at Kaunos had tragedy competitions. An inscription from the 2nd c. BCE or later records that Polyxenos, a tragic poet, won in the competitions for newly-written tragedy at the Romaia Letoia.\textsuperscript{176} If there were competitions for new tragedy at the Romaia Letoia, there were likely competitions for re-performed drama as well. By the Flavian period, the festival had become the Letoia Kaisareia, attested by a list of athletic victors on Rhodes.\textsuperscript{177}

\textsuperscript{177} Pugliese-Carratelli (1955) 292 no. 66a; cf. Mellor (1975) 48 n. 128, Robert (1966) 114 and 116. Mellor (1975) 39 notes that the Lycian League celebrated a Rhomaia Letoia, established in the 2nd c. BCE.
A1.15 Lycia

A1.15.1 Oenoanda

The Demostheneia at Oenoanda was a musical and dramatic festival, with one day of athletic competitions. It is known from the will of Gaius Julius Demosthenes (124 CE), discussed at length in chapter 4 and 6, which established an endowment for the festival and specified the competitions, prizes, and administration of the festival. The order of competitions at the Demostheneia were as follows.

1. trumpeter
2. herald
3. writer of prose encomia
4. poet
5. choral aulete
6. poet of comedy
7. poet of tragedy
8. kitharode
9. dia panton
10. gymnic competitions

Like the festivals of Aphrodisias, the musical competitions at Oenoanda precede the dramatic competitions, and within the dramatic competitions, comedy precedes tragedy. Between the dia panton and the gymnic competitions, two days are set aside for hired entertainment (paramisthomata).

---

A1.16 Pamphylia

A1.16.1 Side

The Mysticon in Side was a dramatic festival. It may have been celebrated into the late 3rd c. CE, as a funerary epigram for a woman, Romana, wife of Zosimion, appeared as a priestess at "glorious thymelic [contests]" (εἰγ θυμέλαις κλυτής) in the late 3rd c. CE.\textsuperscript{179} Coins of Side bear the legend Σίδη μύστις νεωκόρος.\textsuperscript{180} These thymelic contests may also refer to the Pythia at Side, which was presumably a musical contest.\textsuperscript{181} After 212 CE, Marcus Aurelius Philoxenos of Side competed as a herald and komoidos at the Mysticon.\textsuperscript{182} An imperial-era decree of the council and demos of Side ratifies the rights and privileges of the Technitai.\textsuperscript{183}

\textsuperscript{179} IGSK Side im Altertum II 226.

\textsuperscript{180} Bean (1973) no. 149.

\textsuperscript{181} IGSK Side im Altertum II 134 (a Seleucid altar), which describes the Pythia as "sacred, open to the whole world, equal to the Pythian Apollonia, a holiday, celebrated with a triumphal entry for the whole world."


\textsuperscript{183} IGSK Side im Altertum II 137 = Bean (1965) no. 148. Bean suggests an alternative reconstruction, which would make this inscription not a decree but an imperial letter, or a letter from a governor to the Technitai. Bean's alternative reconstruction would read ἐν Σίδη in place of ἐνταῦθα, and χαίρειν instead of ἀγώνων. Cf. Geagan (1975) 399.
A1.17 Cilicia

A1.17.1 Hierapolis/ Kastabala

A poet of Menandrian-style comedy, Onesicles son of Diodorus, was honored with an inscription at Hierapolis in the 1st or 2nd c. CE.\textsuperscript{184} No festival victories are recorded in his honorific inscription.

Marcus Aurelius Philoxenos of Side, herald and \textit{komoidos}, won at the Severeia Peraseia in Kastabala after 212 CE.\textsuperscript{185} Perasia was a Kastabalan goddess, associated with Artemis.\textsuperscript{186} Bean notes that this is the first attestation of the Peraseia, but cites earlier attestations of the Severeia.\textsuperscript{187} The Peraseia, nevertheless, may have been celebrated earlier, and the Severeia appended to it. The theater at Kastabala was built under the Severans, suggesting that dramatic contests at Kastabala do not pre-date the Severan period.\textsuperscript{188}

\textsuperscript{185} IGSK Side im Altertum II 130.
\textsuperscript{186} Strabo calls her Perasia Artemis, Strabo, \textit{Geography} 12.2.7. On the cult of Perasia in Kastabala: Andrade (2009) 117-125. Andrade argues that the Kastabalans retained their local cultic rites (such as walking over hot coals) while performing Greekness (by using Greek language, visual and epigraphic styles) in the context of the cult of Perasia in Kastabala.
\textsuperscript{187} Bean (1965) no. 149.
\textsuperscript{188} Sear (2006) 362.
A1.18 Phrygia

A1.18.1 Laodicea on the Lykos

Laodicea celebrated the *koinon Asias*, which included dramatic competitions. The *tragoidos* Bassus, who won at the *koinon Asias* in Pergamum, Ephesus, and Smyrna, and also the "other *koina* of Asia," may have won at Laodicea.\(^{189}\)

The end of a decree of the Technitai survives from Laodicea on the Lykos from the time of Antoninus Pius (138-161 CE).\(^{190}\) Whether the Technitai issued this decree in order to honor someone who happened to be from Laodicea, and therefore had a copy erected there, or whether it concerned some privileges which they wished to be guaranteed during visits to Laodicea, cannot be determined based on this fragment.

\(^{189}\) Vollgraf (1919) 258-60.

\(^{190}\) IGSK Laodikeia am Lykos 65A; Corsten and Yıldız (1997) 50-51, no. 1; SEG 47-1740. See also SEG 50-1272.
A1.19 Galatia

A1.19.1 Ankyra

There was a Mysticon contest associated with Dionysus in Ankyra. Pleket thinks the contest was a mystical drama held in public, in the theater, in which contestants impersonated Hadrian and Dionysus. Pleket suggests there were private mysteries performed in addition to the public performances.¹⁹¹ This contest is attested by two decrees of the Technitai of Dionysus, which were inscribed in Ankyra in 128 CE. One records a decree of the Technitai to honor the organizer of the mysticon contest, the helladarch Ulpius Aelius Pompeianus.¹⁹² The voting members of the Technitai include a comic actor (*komoidos*), Gaius Julius Collega, son of Neocaesarsus.

¹⁹¹ "This ἀγώνισται indeed seems to have been held in public, viz., in the theatre of Ankyra; it was a competition to which various ἀγωνίσται were invited; presumably it was a religious drama, in which the leading actors impersonated Dionysus and Hadrian. The adjective μυστικός probably bears upon the sacred dances performed in this play. Secret performances certainly cannot be postulated here" (Pleket [1965] 336). There was also an ἀγών μυστικός in Side in Pamphylia (Robert Hellenica XI-XII 366; Robert [1958] 21).

Another decree of the Technitai in Ankyra concerns a Mysticon contest, this one held in Claudiconium. It reveals that the helladarch, presumably Pompeianus, wrote to the Technitai to request an honor, which they voted to grant him. The honors are two gilded statues of the helladarch with shields, to be erected "in the most visible places of the fatherland" (ἐν τοῖς τῆς αὐτοῦ ποις τὴς αὐτοῦ πα−/τρὶδος ἐπισηµοτάτῳς). The involvement of the Technitai in the Mystikon of Claudiconium suggests the possibility that this was a dramatic contest.

---


194 Bosch (1967) 166, no. 130, l. 9-10.
A1.20 Bithynia

A1.20.1 Prusias ad Hypium

The Augusteia Antoninea may have had dramatic competitions. It was certainly a thymelic festival, and the presence of an epitaph of an Athenian tragic actor (tragoidos) in Prusias suggests that there may have been a venue for the performance of drama there. The Augusteia Antoninea is a likely candidate. The epitaph of the tragic actor, Tiberius Claudius Philoxenos of Athens, dates from the 1st or 2nd c. CE, and is decorated with tragic masks and victory crowns.\(^{195}\) Ameling posits that Philoxenos was part of a traveling troupe of actors.\(^{196}\)

In a decree of the 3rd c. CE from Prusias ad Hypium, the athletic and thymelic associations honor a contest president of the Augusteia Antoninea, Callicleanus Callicles.\(^{197}\) This contest was earlier called the Augusteia, as recorded in an inscription from 193-211 CE.\(^{198}\) The Antonineia may have been appended under Caracalla or Elagabalus, as the contest is called the Augusteia Antonineia in an inscription from 219-221 CE.\(^{199}\)

\(^{196}\) IGSK Prusias ad Hypium 97. He notes that another Athenian contest-victor (of an unknown specialty) had connections to Bithynia. The Athenian Rhamnousios son of Alexandros, sacred victor and xystarch in Bithynia for life, appears in an Athenian inscription of 145/6 CE: IG II\(^2\) 3741.
\(^{197}\) Perrot (1872) 31 no. 21; Mordtmann (1863) 230 ff., no. 30; Koerte (1899) no. 25; IGR III 61; IGSK Prusias ad Hypium 49. Cf. Duruy (1883) 408.
\(^{198}\) IGSK Prusias ad Hypium 13 (an honorary decree for a contest-president).
\(^{199}\) IGSK Prusias ad Hypium 11 (an honorary decree for M. Aurelius Asclepiodotianus Asclepiades, contest president).
A1.21 Pontus

A1.21.1 Neocaesarea

A contest established by Eukratos, the *koinon* of Pontus, had dramatic competitions, attested by the victory of Marcus Aurelius Philoxenos of Side, herald and *komoidos*, after 212 CE.  

The honorific inscription for Philoxenos says that he won at the τὸν Εὐκράτος κοινὸν Πόντου ἱσάκτιον ἐν Νεοκαίσαρείᾳ, ἱεροὺς οἰκουμενικοὺς εἰσελαστικοὺς, "the [contest] of Eukratos, *Koinon* of Pontus, equal to the Actian games, in Neocaesarea, sacred (contests) open to the whole world, celebrated with a triumphal entry." Several coin issues from Neocaesarea bear the legend κοινὸν Πόντου. The *koinon* was made up of six inland cities, including Neocaesarea. 

---

200 IGSK Side im Altertum II 130.  
201 Ibid.  
202 A separate *koinon* included ten coastal cities (IGR III 79). See commentary by Bean (1965) no. 149.
A1.22 Syria

A1.22.1 Antioch on the Orontes

The Hadrianeia in Antioch had dramatic contests, attested by the victories of the herald and komoidos, Marcus Aurelius Philoxenos of Side, after 212 CE.\(^{203}\)

Finlayson argues that Syria was especially known for mime and pantomime, particularly Apamea and Antioch.\(^{204}\) She connects the developments in entertainment (the increasing popularity of mime and pantomime) to developments in the use of the theater space, noting that the orchestra was used for front-row seating, to provide a better view of the mimes and pantomimes.\(^{205}\) Finlayson's suggestion that Syria was a center for mime and pantomime could be bolstered by an additional piece of evidence, a 3rd c. CE lead tablet from Apheca in Syria cursing the pantomime Hyperechios.\(^{206}\) The Technitai honored a pantomime, Julius Paris, a citizen of Apamea and Antioch, under the reign of Hadrian (117-138 CE).\(^{207}\) Scholars have puzzled over whether Julius Paris was a member of the Technitai of Dionysus or not. Almazova argues that he was not, on the grounds that he could not have been a sacred victor, as pantomime had not yet been admitted to festival competition in the Greek East under Hadrian.\(^{208}\) As a freedman, she argues, he would not have been eligible to join the Technitai. Pleket casts doubt on her argument, pointing out that Paris could have been one of the co-competitors (synagonistai), who were not festival victors, and that due to his grants of citizenship, he "will have been considered a free man."\(^{209}\) Finlayson assumes, without argument, that Julius Paris was a member of the Dionysiac synod, and confuses pantomimes with actors (perhaps due to the

\(^{203}\) IGSK Side im Altertum II 130.

\(^{204}\) Finlayson (2012).

\(^{205}\) Finlayson (2012) 293.

\(^{206}\) Audollent (1904) 22 no. 15; for an English translation, see Gager (1992) 53.


\(^{208}\) Almazova (1998).

\(^{209}\) SEG 48-1844.
epigraphic convention of referring to them as ὑποκριταί).\textsuperscript{210}

If Julius Paris had been a member of the Dionysiac synod, it seems highly unlikely that this would have gone unmentioned in the text of the inscription. While the Technitai must have had some reason for honoring Julius Paris, the reason need not be that he was one of their members. After all, the Technitai honored many contest-presidents who had organized festivals in which they had participated and benefactors of various kinds. No one would argue that the contest presidents or benefactors must have been Technitai themselves.

\textsuperscript{210} Finlayson (2012).
Appendix 2: Catalog of Paratheatrical Entertainers, Organized by Type

This Appendix is a collection of the known paratheatrical entertainers up to the 3rd and 4th c. CE, arranged by type. Most, but not all, paratheatrical entertainers are included in Stephanes' Many more entertainers are known from Late Antiquity, into the 8th and 9th c. CE. A treatment of these later paratheatrical entertainers, focusing on mimes and pantomimes, may be found in Webb (2008a).

Table 20: Thaumatopoioi (unknown specialty)

Table 21: Puppeteers

Table 22: Makers of automata

Table 23: Trick Magicians, conjurers, illusionists

Table 24: Jesters, Parodists

Table 25: Acrobats, Trapeze artists

Table 26: Mimes

Table 27: Pantomimes
**Table 20. Thaumatopoioi (unknown specialty).**

Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Apollonios¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>169 BCE</td>
<td>169 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Aristion²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>259 BCE</td>
<td>259 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Artemo³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>169 BCE</td>
<td>169 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Diopethes of Lokris⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Herakleitos of Mytilene⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>late 4th c. BCE</td>
<td>late 4th c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ischomachos⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Kleopatra⁷</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>268, 263 BCE</td>
<td>268, 263 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Noumenios son of Lysimachus⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>236 BCE</td>
<td>236 BCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 -os⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>169 BCE</td>
<td>169 BCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 -os¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυματοποιός?</td>
<td>236 BCE</td>
<td>236 BCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Paramonos son of Syrillos, of Thisbe¹¹</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>first half of the 1st c. CE</td>
<td>first half of the 1st c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Philokles¹²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>192 BCE</td>
<td>192 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Philon son of Aresios¹³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαύμασι νικέσας</td>
<td>500-480 BCE</td>
<td>500-480 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Serdon, Roman¹⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>259 BCE</td>
<td>259 BCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ IG XI 1.133 (Delos). Stephanes 262. θαυματοποιός appears in epigraphy only on Delos.
² IG XI 1.115 (Delos). Stephanes 320.
³ IG XI 1.133 (Delos). Stephanes 419.
⁴ Athenaeus, *Deipnosofistai* 1.20a. Stephanes 766.
⁵ Athenaeus, *Deipnosofistai* 1.20a, 12.538e. Stephanes 1092.
⁶ Athenaeus, *Deipnosofistai* 10.452e. Stephanes 1304.
⁸ IG XI 2.120 (Delos). Stephanes 1890.
⁹ IG XI 1.133 (Delos). Stephanes 2748.
¹⁰ IG XI 1.120 (Delos). Stephanes 2989.
¹³ IG I² 658 (dedication, Acropolis, Athens). Stephanes 2558. Listed by Stephanes as a θαυματοποιός.
¹⁴ IG XI 1.115. Stephanes 2257.
Table 20. Thaumatopoioi (unknown specialty).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skymnos of Tarentum&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therasiates&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>236 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thras-&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>236 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoilos&lt;sup&gt;18&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>169 BCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<sup>15</sup> Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 1.20a, 12.538e. Stephanes 2285.
<sup>16</sup> IG XI 2.120 (Delos).
<sup>17</sup> IG XI 2.120 (Delos). Stephanes 1225.
<sup>18</sup> IG XI 1.133 (Delos). Stephanes 1031.
Table 21. Puppeteers
Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Antiochus IX Cyzicenus</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>νευροσπάστης</td>
<td></td>
<td>ruled 115-95 BCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Eurykleides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>νευροσπάστης, θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Potheinas</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td>νευροσπάστης</td>
<td></td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 -sion</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td>νευροσπάστης</td>
<td></td>
<td>169 BCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 unknown names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυματοποιό</td>
<td></td>
<td>4th c. BCE (fictional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 Diodorus Siculus 34.34.1. Stephanes 213.
20 Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 1.19e. Stephanes 984.
21 Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 1.19e. Stephanes 2077.
22 IG XI 1.133 (Delos). Stephanes 2487.
23 Plato, Republic 514b.
Table 22. Makers of automata
Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus IX Cyzicenus</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ruled 115-95 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown name</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>270s BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown name</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown name</td>
<td>Pu</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 Diodorus Siculus, Library 34.34.1. Stephanes 213.
25 Heron, Peri automatapoiëtikes 22 (Nauplius play in a miniature automatic theater).
26 Heron, Peri automatapoiëtikes 4 (automaton of dancing Maenads).
27 Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 5.198f (statue of Nysa stands, pours a libation, sits, automatically during the grand procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus).
Table 23. Trick Magicians, conjurers, illusionists  
Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cratisthenes of Phlius(^{28})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>student of Xenophon the θαυματοποιός</td>
<td></td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Eurybates the Oechalian(^{29})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>? 2nd-4th c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Theodorus(^{30})</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>ψηφοκλέπτης</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 unknown name(^{31})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>μαγγανάριος</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd/ 3rd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 unknown name(^{32})</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>? 2nd-4th c. CE (fictional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Xenophon(^{33})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0θαυματοποιός</td>
<td></td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{28}\) Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 1.19e. Stephanes 1496 (made fire flame up spontaneously [αὐτόματον], and other φάσματα).
\(^{29}\) Alciphron *Letters* 2.17.
\(^{30}\) Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 1.19b.
\(^{31}\) P.Oxy. 1050.
\(^{32}\) Alciphron *Letters* 2.17.
\(^{33}\) Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 1.19e. Stephanes 1914.
Table 24. Jesters, Parodists
Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aesop of Phrygia 34</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>γελωτοποιός</td>
<td>fictional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agrion 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>γελωτοποιός</td>
<td>5th-3rd c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aulos 36</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>παρῳδός</td>
<td>3rd c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Boiotos of Syracuse 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>παρῳδός</td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Deinias of Athens 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>γελωτοποιός</td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Eudikos 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>παρῳδός</td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Eutyches 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>γελωτοποιός</td>
<td>3rd c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gabba 41</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>παρῳδός</td>
<td>time of Caesar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Hermogenes 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>παρῳδός</td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kallias 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>γελωτοποιός</td>
<td>5th-3rd c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Kallimedon son of Kallikratos of Athens 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>γελωτοποιός</td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Kardax 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>γελωτοποιός</td>
<td>5th-3rd c. BCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34 Lucian, *A True Story* 2.18 (Aesop is the jester for the dead heroes and philosophers in the Elysian Fields).
35 Plutarch, *That it is not possible to live pleasurably according to the doctrine of Epicurus* 13.1095d. Stephanes 46.
37 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 15.698b, 699c. Stephanes 530.
40 IG II² 2153 (Athens).
41 Plutarch, *Dialogue on Love* 760a.
42 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 15.687f.
43 Plutarch, *That it is not possible to live pleasurably according to the doctrine of Epicurus* 13.1095d. Stephanes 1322.
45 Plutarch, *That it is not possible to live pleasurably according to the doctrine of Epicurus* 13.1095d. Stephanes 1379.
Table 24. Jesters, Parodists

Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Kephisodoros of Athens</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>late 2nd c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Mandrogenes of Athens</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4th/3rd c BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Matreas of Alexandria</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Matron/ Matreas Pitanaios</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4th/3rd c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Menaichmos of Athens</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Mnasigeiton of Athens</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Oenonas/ Oenopas, Italian</td>
<td>Pu (T?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Pantaleon of Athens</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Philippos</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5th c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Philippos</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Sacullo</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46 FD III 2.50. Stephanes 1396.
49 Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 1.5b, 2.62c. Stephanes 1620.
50 Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 14.614d-e.
52 Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 1.20a, 14.638b. Stephanes 1933 (imitated dithyrambs; shipwrecked Odysseus speaking bad Greek).
53 Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 1.20a, 14.616a-b. Stephanes 1996.
54 Xenophon Symposium 1.11; Plutarch, The oracles at Delphi no longer given in verse 401c; Table Talk 2.629c and 7.709f; Aelius Aristides Art of Rhetoric 2.2; Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 14.3. Stephanes 2498.
55 Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 15.697f. Stephanes 2500.
56 Plutarch, Life of Brutus 45.
Table 24. Jesters, Parodists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 Satyrion⁵⁷</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>γελωτοποιός</td>
<td>2nd c. CE (fictional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Saunio the Latin⁵⁸</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td>γελωτοποιός</td>
<td>91-88 BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Straton of Athens⁵⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td>γελωτοποιός</td>
<td>4th/3rd c. BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Thersites⁶⁰</td>
<td>γελωτοποιός (Plutarch)</td>
<td>time of the Trojan War</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 unknown name⁶¹</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td>παρῳδός</td>
<td>236 BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 unknown name⁶²</td>
<td></td>
<td>γελωτοποιός</td>
<td>time of Alexander the Great</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 unknown names⁶³</td>
<td></td>
<td>γελωτοποιοί (men and women)</td>
<td>time of Caesar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 unknown name⁶⁴</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>γελωτοποιός</td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 unknown name⁶⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td>γελωτοποιός</td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>γελωτοποιός</td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁵⁷ Lucian Symposium 18 (danced, recited scurrilous verses in an Egyptian accent, mocked the dinner guests).
⁵⁸ Diodorus Siculus 37.12 (escaped death on stage at a festival by humoring the crowd).
⁶⁰ Many, incl. Homer Iliad 2.211-77; Plato Republic 620C (becomes a monkey in the myth of Er); Plutarch, How the young man should study poetry 18c (an example of what a reader should not imitate, along with a φθορεύς and πορνοβοσκός; Lucian VH 2.20 (brought a charge of libel against Homer); Libanius Encomium of Thersites.
⁶¹ IG XI 2.120 (Delos). List of competitors and performers at a festival. The παρῳδός is listed after the θαυματοποιοί. Stephanes 3002.
⁶² Plutarch, How to tell a flatterer from a friend 60b (Alexander criticized for giving gifts to a γελωτοποιός).
⁶³ Cassius Dio 45.28.
⁶⁴ Athenaeus 11.464e (jesters and mimes perform at the dinner party).
⁶⁵ Galen, On the Usefulness of Parts, Kühn vol. 3, page 264.
### Table 24. Jesters, Parodists

Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unknown names</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td></td>
<td>γελωτοποιοί</td>
<td>time of Xenophon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>unknown names</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>σκληροπαίκται</td>
<td>early 3rd c. BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>unknown names</td>
<td>Pu</td>
<td>γελωτοποιοί</td>
<td>166/5 BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>unknown names</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>γελωτοποιοί</td>
<td>time of Commodus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

66 Lucian *The Cock* 11.
67 Xenophon, *Anabasis* 7.3.33.
68 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 4.129d, summarizing a letter of Hippolochus of Macedon.
69 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 5.195f (acted and danced with Antiochus). Athenaeus reports that Epiphanes was trying to out-do Aemilius Paulus’ festival in Macedon.
70 Cassius Dio, *Roman History* 74.6 (Pertinax made public the names of the jesters and the money Commodus had given them); Herodian, *History of the Empire* 1.13.8 (Commodus over-indulged in jesters and "performers of scurrilous acts").
Table 25. Acrobats, Trapeze artists
Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 A-on(^{71})</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>καλοβάτης, ὁξυβάτης, κοτυλιστής</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Agathodoros son of Straton, of Sidon(^{72})</td>
<td>Prx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>169 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 -goras(^{73})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st c. BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Antipater(^{74})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>170 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Aurelius Nonnos, aka Demetrios of Alexandria(^{75})</td>
<td>C, B</td>
<td></td>
<td>κοντοπέκτης, σκανδαλιστής, καλοβάτης</td>
<td></td>
<td>late 2nd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Demetrios(^{76})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Marcus Cassius Valerius(^{77})</td>
<td>C, HI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st-3rd c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Marcus Ulpius Kallinikos(^{78})</td>
<td>None. Could be an acrobat or a performer of dithyramb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Maximus(^{79})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{71}\) IG XI 2.120, cf. SEG 27-266 (Beroia, Macedonia). Stephanes 9. [στεφανοθείς in line 1 and ἀθλήματα in line 2 suggest a festival victory.  

\(^{72}\) IG XI 133 (Delos), Le Rider (1967) 258. Stephanes 21.  

\(^{73}\) I.Délos 2618. Stephanes 2668.  

\(^{74}\) IG XI 2.132 (Delos). Stephanes 216.  

\(^{75}\) FD III 1.226 (Delphi). Stephanes 1889.  

\(^{76}\) IG XIV 1535 (epitaph for the 5-year-old child of Demetrios, Rome).  

\(^{77}\) FD III 1.216 (Delphi). Stephanes 515.  

\(^{78}\) SEG 29-807 (performed 55 kykloi in the Theater of Dionysus in Athens).  

\(^{79}\) IG XI 2.120, cf. SEG 27-266 (Beroia, Macedonia).
Table 25. Acrobats, Trapeze artists

Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Sanno⁸⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td>κυκλίστρια</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd c. BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 unknown names⁸¹</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>θαυματουργοὶ γυναῖκες</td>
<td>early 3rd c. BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 unknown name⁸²</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>ὀρχηστρίδα τῶν τὰ θαύματα δυναμένων</td>
<td>time of Socrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 unknown name⁸³</td>
<td></td>
<td>ρωμαίστης</td>
<td>1st c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁸⁰ IG II² 12.583 (epitaph, Athens). Stephanes 2214.
⁸¹ Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 4.129d, summarizing a letter of Hippolochus of Macedon.
⁸² Xenophon Symposium 2.1 ff; Plutarch, The oracles at Delphi no longer given in verse 401c (Socrates watched κυβιστήσεις).
Table 26. Mimes
Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Agathoklion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bιολόγος, μειμωλόγον πάντων έξοχος</td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Amazonios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bιολόγος</td>
<td>before 367 CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Apollonios of Lindos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>μίμος</td>
<td>2nd/ 1st c. BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Asiatikos</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>άρχαιολόγος</td>
<td>3rd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Aurelius Antiochianos of Apamea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>νεανισκόλόγος</td>
<td>imperial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Aurelius Euripas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bιολόγος</td>
<td>late 3rd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Aurelius Makedonis of Perge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bιολόγος</td>
<td>3rd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Basilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>μειμάς</td>
<td>3rd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Diopeithes of Lokris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none; mentioned with another mime called an ήθολόγος</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

84 GV 515 (epitaph, Kition, Cyprus).
85 IGLS 13 1.9407 (Bostra).
86 Peek, Asklepieion 44. Stephanes 287.
87 IG II² 2153 (Athens). Asiatikos is listed as one of the άκροάματα, after the κωμῳδοί and before the παρῳδοί.
88 SEG 17-662 (epitaph, Aspendos, Pamphylia).
89 P.Oxy. 1025. Stephanes 981.
90 IGSK Perge 449 (epitaph). Stephanes 1597.
92 Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 10.20a.
Table 26. Mimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flavius Alexandros Oxeidas of Nikomedia</td>
<td>Pr (T)</td>
<td>B, G, Hl</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>βιολόγος</td>
<td>2nd/3rd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavius Zenon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaius Kaisonios Philargyros</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td>C, Prx</td>
<td>µοσχωλόγος</td>
<td></td>
<td>mid-1st c. BCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelasinos of Heliopolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>µῖμος δεύτερος</td>
<td>late 3rd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemellos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὁ πολλοῖς θεάτροι</td>
<td>2nd/3rd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gollathios</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamarion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>µῖμος</td>
<td>imperial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>βιολόγος</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>βιολόγος</td>
<td>3rd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermeimios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>µῖμος κυμβαλιστής</td>
<td>late 1st c. BCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

93 Robert (1936) 244-5 (=LBW 1652b). Honorary inscription from Tralles. Stephanes 1956. Flavius Alexandros Oxeidas won at contests in Asia (18 times), Lycia and Pamphylia (26 times).
94 IGR I 552 (epitaph, Dalmatia).
95 IC IV 223 (Gortyn, Crete). Cf. Robert (1936) 242. Robert thinks that the µοσχωλόγος was a particular genre of mime, and points out several other proxeny decrees for theatrical professionals from Gortyn.
96 Malalas XII 314-5. Stephanes 541.
97 St. Pont. III 1.143. Stephanes 542.
98 IGSK Ephesos 2092 (name written under a sketch of a mime actor in the theater in Ephesus). Stephanes 563.
99 SB 8407. Stephanes 147.
100 IG XIV 2342 (epitaph, Aquileia, Italy). The epitaph contrasts talking in life (φωνάεσσαν, τὸ λαλέων) with the silence of death.
101 CIG XIV 2324.
102 SB 8249 (ostrakon, Egypt). Stephanes 1111.
Table 26. Mimes

Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the *boule*; G = membership in the *gerousia*; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaios (i.e. Gaius)</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>σκηνικός</td>
<td>3rd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karmilis</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleon</td>
<td>ó Μίμαυλος, μίμος Ιταλικός</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrilla</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td>Y μεμίας</td>
<td>2nd/ 3rd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makedon</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrobios</td>
<td>λυσιδός</td>
<td>time of Sulla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtion</td>
<td>δεικτηρίας</td>
<td>time of Ptolemy Philadelphus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noemon</td>
<td>ήθολόγος</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nymphodorus</td>
<td>μίμος, θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philistides of Syracuse</td>
<td>μίμος γελοίον, θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>324 BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porphyry</td>
<td>μίμος</td>
<td>d. 275 CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

103 *Dura-Europos* 940 I col. 4b l. 13 (wall painting from the house of the *dux ripae*, Dura-Europos). Stephanes 1315.
104 IGSK Ephesos 2092 (name written under a sketch of a mime actor in the theater in Ephesus). Stephanes 1381.
106 SEG 12-325 (epitaph, Beroia, Macedonia). Stephanes 1522. The phrase ἡ πρίν ποτε δόξης ἀραμένα πλείστους ἐν θυμέλαις στεφάνους suggests that Kyrilla won crowns in thymelic contests. Webb (2011) 236 cautions, however, that the crowning may be metaphorical.
110 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 10.20a, citing Phanodemus.
111 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 1.19f, 10.452f. Stephanes 1894.
Table 26. Mimes
Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ephesus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Publius - echaios</td>
<td>Prx</td>
<td>μαγωδός</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st c. BCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Sextus Iulius Parolos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>μεμωλόγος</td>
<td>imperial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Straton of Tarentum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>τούς διθυράμβους μιμούμενος</td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Tiberius Claudius Philologos Theseus of Athens</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td>C, B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>βιολόγος</td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Sannyron</td>
<td>μίμος γελοίων</td>
<td>4th c. BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Sergios</td>
<td>μίμος</td>
<td>time of Antony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Sorix</td>
<td>ἀρχιμίμος</td>
<td>time of Sulla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Volumnius</td>
<td>μίμος</td>
<td>1st c. BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 unknown name</td>
<td>μιμάς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 unknown names</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>μίμος</td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 unknown names</td>
<td>τῶν αἰσχίστων ύποκριταί</td>
<td>time of Commodus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

113 Acta Sanctorum Nov. 2.230. Stephanes 2124.
114 Robert (1938) 7. Stephanes 2120.
115 IGSK Smyrna 468 (epitaph).
116 Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 1.19f. Stephanes 2316.
117 IGSK Ephesos 1135. Stephanes 1219.
119 Plutarch, Life of Antony 9.7.
120 Plutarch, Life of Sulla 36.1.
121 Plutarch, Life of Brutus 45.
122 IG II 13145/46 (epitaph, Athens). Stephanes 3022.
123 Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 11.464e (jesters and mimes perform at the dinner party).
### Table 26. Mimes

Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42 unknown names&lt;sup&gt;125&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td>μῆμος</td>
<td></td>
<td>124 CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 unknown names (mime troupe)&lt;sup&gt;126&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Pu?</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>124</sup> Herodian, *History of the Empire* 1.13.8 (Commodus over-indulged in jesters and "performers of scurrilous acts").

<sup>125</sup> SEG 38-1462 (endowment for the Demostheneia at Oinoanda).

<sup>126</sup> P. Oxy. 413 (Charition mime)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Achilles</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td>καινοῖς ὁρχήμασι μοίρης/ ὁ πρὶν ἐνι σκηναῖς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>imperial period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Actica</td>
<td>Pu</td>
<td>histrionica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Gaius Ummidius Actius Anicetus</td>
<td>Pu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td>1st c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Aelius Aurelius Apolaustus</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>age of Augustus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Aelia Catella</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ὥρχήσατο (with a chorus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reign of Nero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Apolaustus</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Severan period (193-235 CE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

127 SEG 56-1209 (=IGSK Stratonikeia 1494). Cf. Staab (2007) 39-44 and Jones (2007) 46-7. Achilles became a gladiator after his career as a pantomime. Presumably, Achilles was his stage name because he played the part of Achilles. The full epitaph for the gladiator he killed reads: Δρόσερος | πά(λου) γ´ | ἐκτινὲ μὲ Δρόσερον καινοῖς ὁρχήμασι μοίρης/ ὁ πρὶν ἐνι σκηναῖς, νὸν δ´ ἐν σταδίοισιν vacat Ἀχιλλεύς vacat.


129 CIL 4.1646, 2150, 2155, 2413d, 3891, 4471, 4479, 4965, 5395, 5399, 5404, 8060, 8813, 8827, 9077, 10175a, (Pompeii), CIL 4.10535, 10643a, 10643c (Herculaneum), CIL 10.1946 (Puteoli). Franklin (1987) argues that Actius Anicetus and Gaius Ummidius Actius Anicetus should be identified as the same pantomime (96-99). For a discussion of Ummina Quadratilla's involvement with pantomimes, which Pliny the Younger mentions at Ep. 7.24, see Sick (1999).

130 CIL 9.344 (epitaph, Canusium).

131 Cassius Dio, Roman History 61.19. Aelia Catella was 80 years old, and accompanied by an elderly chorus.

132 EAOR I 43 (Rome).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apolaustus</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>161-169 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Neikon, son of Paradoxos of Aigina</td>
<td>Pu</td>
<td>C, B</td>
<td>ὄρχηστής, θαυματοποιός</td>
<td>after 161 CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Nemesius</td>
<td>Pu, Pr</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>magister chori orchestopalae et pantomimorum</td>
<td>first half of 3rd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathyllus of Alexandria</td>
<td>Pu, Pr</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>παντομίμους ὀρχήσασθαι</td>
<td>age of Augustus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castrensis (Sicilian?)</td>
<td>Pu, Pr</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>none; mentioned alongside Anicetus and Paris</td>
<td>1st c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>Pu</td>
<td>none; mentioned alongside a</td>
<td>1st c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- [133] Calza (1914) I, 70 (Ostia Antica).
- [134] FD III 1.469 (Delphi). Stephanes 1785. The Delphians made this dancer a citizen and council member, along with his children. His name suggests a date of after 161 CE, when Marcus Aurelius became emperor.
- [137] CIL 4.1661, 1679, 2180, 2290. CIL 4.2180 (calos Castrensis) is near CIL 4.2179 (calos Paris). Franklin (1987) argues that Castrensis was a member of the troupe of Actius Anicetus (99-100). May be the same as Actius Castrensis who appears in CIL 4.1646 (graffito from Pompeii).
Table 27. Pantomimes (1st c. BCE-3rd c. CE)
Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Claudius Pylades of Thyateira</td>
<td>Pu</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>όρχηστής</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Crispus of Alexandria</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>τῆς ἐνρόθμου τραγῳδίας στέφος λαβών</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd/ 3rd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Dionysia</td>
<td></td>
<td>saltatricula, gesticularia</td>
<td></td>
<td>70-60 BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Gaius Julius Actius</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td></td>
<td>age of Augustus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Gaius Theoros Lux</td>
<td></td>
<td>victor pantomimorum</td>
<td></td>
<td>age of Augustus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Gaius Ummidius Actius Anicetus</td>
<td></td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Galeria Copiola</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td>embolaria</td>
<td></td>
<td>performed 82 BCE-9 CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

139 TAM V 2.1012 (Thateira, NW Lydia); CIG 3207 (Smyrna). Stephanes 2180.
140 SEG 31-1072 (epitaph, Heracleia Pontica). Stephanes 1504. Webb (2011) 233 raises the question of whether the crown referred to is metaphorical, rather than indicating a festival victory.
141 Cic. Rosc. Com. 23, Gell. 1.5.3. Starks in Hall and Wyles (2008) argues that Dionysia was a pantomime, and provides bibliography on the debate about whether saltatricula and saltatrix may be used to designate pantomime (117).
142 CIL 6.33966 (epitaph, Rome).
143 CIL 6.10115 (Rome, seal with the names of the pantomimes Gaius Julius Lux defeated: Pylades, Nomius, Hylas, Pierus), CIL 4.1891 (Pompeii). This inscription attests to the fans of Theoros, called Theoriani. Some think that Theoros was Bathyllus; see Starks in Hall and Wyles (2008) 125-6.
144 CIL 10.1946 (Puteoli).
145 Pliny NH 7.158. Pliny claims that Galeria Copiola performed first in 82 BCE and then again in 55 BCE, at the dedication of the theater of Pompey (a Magno Pompeio magni theatri dedicatone anus pro
Table 27. Pantomimes (1st c. BCE-3rd c. CE)
Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 Hellas</td>
<td>panto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Hylas of Salmacis</td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Hyperechius</td>
<td>Pu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Julius Paris</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Julia Nemesis</td>
<td>saltatrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Kres</td>
<td>όρχιστης</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Leonides, aka Psophax of Prymnesium, Kotiaion</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Libania</td>
<td>όρχιστρίς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

miraculo reducta), and finally at age 104 for the votive games of Augustus in 9 CE. Starks in Hall and Wyles (2008) suggests that "embolariae may have been proto-pantomimae...but they were most likely 'short sketch' artists as opposed to the featured male dancers, or 'curtain-warmer' acts to fill the stage between principal pantomime sketches" (130).

146 CIL 12.1916 (epitaph from Narbonne in Gaul, for a 14-year-old pantomime).
147 CIL 6.10115 (defeated by Gaius Theoros Lux), Macrobius Saturnalia 2.7.12-15.
148 Audollent (1904) 22 no. 15 (Syrian curse tablet). Stephanes 2447 (who dates him to the 4th/5th c. CE).
150 CIL 6.10143 (Rome, epitaph for a 9-year-old dancer).
151 GV 825 (epitaph, Miletus). Stephanes 2933.
152 LBW 798 (epitaph, Kotiaion, Phrygia). Stephanes 1548.
Table 27. Pantomimes (1st c. BCE-3rd c. CE)
Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucius Aurelius Apolaustus Memphius</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td>reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucius Aurelius Pylades</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td>reign of Commodus (180-192 CE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucius Furius Celsus</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td>C, Prx</td>
<td>μόθων ὀρχηστῆς</td>
<td>1st c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td>Severan period (193-235 CE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Aurelius Agilius Septentrio</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td>reign of Commodus (180-192 CE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Aurelius Arescius (of Scythopolis?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td>reign of Valerian and Gallienus (253-260 CE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

155 EAOR VIII 16 (Puteoli), CIL 5.7753 (Genoa, building dedication). L. Aurelius Pylades was the student of P. Aelius Pylades. Both are called hieronicae in CIL 5.7753; 4 victories attested in EAOR VIII 16. Cf. Webb (2011) 229.
156 I.Cret. IV 222 (Gortyn). L. Furius Celsus was crowned in the theater with a golden crown. See Garton (1982) 598 no. 30. Stephanes 1389.
157 EAOR I 43 (Rome).
158 CIL 14.2113 (Lanuvium), CIL 14.2977 (Praeneste). This pantomime was a priest of the synod of Apollo.
159 CIL 14.462a (Ostia Antica). Son of Teretina Pylades, also a pantomime.
### Table 27. Pantomimes (1st c. BCE-3rd c. CE)

Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the *boule*; G = membership in the *gerousia*; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34 Marcus Aurelius Septentrio¹⁶⁰</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td>207-211 CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Marcus Septimius Aurelius Agrippa of Lepcis Magna ¹⁶¹</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td>after 211 CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Marcus Ulpius Apolaustus ¹⁶²</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>histrio, maximus pantomimorum</td>
<td>reign of Trajan (98-117 CE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Marcus Ulpius Castresis ¹⁶³</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td>reign of Trajan (98-117 CE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Memphus ¹⁶⁴</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td>imperial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Memphis ¹⁶⁵</td>
<td>φιλόσοφον ὀρχηστήν</td>
<td>3rd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Metrodoros ¹⁶⁶</td>
<td>ὀρχηστής</td>
<td>performed 41 BCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Mysticus ¹⁶⁷</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td>1st c. CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Nero ¹⁶⁸</td>
<td>Pu</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>histrionem</td>
<td>37-68 CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁶⁰ CIL 14.2113, 2977 (Praeneste).
¹⁶² CIL 6.37841, 6.10114 (Rome). Crowned at games; also won the overall competition (*coronatus adversus histriones/ et omnes scaenicos artifices XII*).
¹⁶³ CIL 5.2185 (Venice, epitaph for 16-year-old Plotia Felicitas set up by the pantomime Marcus Ulpius Castresis).
¹⁶⁴ CIL 12.3347 (Nemausus, modern Nimes, Gallia Narbonensis).
¹⁶⁵ Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai* 1.20d.
¹⁶⁷ CIL 4.5198, 5196 (Pompeii), CIL 4.10643c (graffito from Herculaneum; along with Mysticus, a comedian and Actius Anicetus are mentioned), CIL 6.33967 (Rome, epitaph for a 6-year-old *liberta* of the pantomime Mysticus).
## Table 27. Pantomimes (1st c. BCE-3rd c. CE)

Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the *boule*; G = membership in the *gerousia*; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>saltaturumque</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vergeri Turnum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vergili Turnum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(planned, not performed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Nomius (Syrian)</td>
<td>defeated by Gaius Theoros Lux</td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>age of Augustus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Paridion of Side</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>όρχηστής</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Paris (1)</td>
<td>defeated by Cassius Dio, Lucian, histrio (Suetonius, Tacitus)</td>
<td>(54-68 CE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Paris (2)</td>
<td>histrio (Suetonius), όρχηστής (Cassius Dio)</td>
<td>reign of Domitian (81-96 CE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Paris (3) of Antioch</td>
<td>όρχηστής</td>
<td>2nd c CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

168 Suetonius *Nero* 54. Nero never performed his pantomime; unsatisfied with his progress, he had his pantomime instructor Paris killed.

169 CIL 6.10115 (defeated by Gaius Theoros Lux).


171 Suetonius *Nero* 54, Tacitus *Annals* 13.19-21, 27, Cassius Dio, *Roman History* 63.18.1, Lucian *On Pantomime* 63. This may be the same Paris mentioned in CIL 4.8232, 8484, 8696, 8856, 8885, 8888a-c, 10243g (Pompeii) and CIL 4.10643a (Herculaneum). Nero had Paris killed when he failed to teach him the art of pantomime to his satisfaction (Suetonius *Nero* 54). See Franklin (1987) 96 n. 8 for bibliography on Paris.

172 Suetonius *Domitian* 3.1 (Domitian divorced his wife for love of Paris), Cassius Dio, *Roman History* 67.3.1 (murder of Paris).

173 IGR 1.975, 4.1272 (Thyatira, Lydia).
Table 27. Pantomimes (1st c. BCE-3rd c. CE)
Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48 Paris (4)(^{174})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὀρχηστής</td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Paris (5)(^{175})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὀρχηστής</td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Paris (6)(^{176})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὀρχηστής</td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Paris (7)(^{177})</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td></td>
<td>imperial</td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Parmian(^{178})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὀρχηστρίς</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Parthenopaeus (^{179})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none (image; the dancer holds a closed-mouth mask)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Phibammon son of Achilles of Hermopolis (^{180})</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>παντόμιμος</td>
<td>181 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Philistion of Dyrrhachion (^{181})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>παντόμιμος</td>
<td>84-60 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Phoebe Vocontia of Rome (^{182})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>emboliaria artis omnium erodita</td>
<td></td>
<td>Julio-Claudian period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Pierus of Tibur (^{183})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>defeated by Gaius Theoros Lux (pantomimus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>age of Augustus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{174}\) Galen 12.454.
\(^{175}\) Galen 1.492.
\(^{176}\) Libanius, Oration 64.41.
\(^{177}\) CIL 12.3347 (Nemausus, modern Nimes, Gallia Narbonensis).
\(^{178}\) IGL Syr. 4.1280 (Laodicea, Syria). The profession, ὀρχηστρίς, is a restoration: Παρμιάνη / Ἀφροδίτη / τὰς Ἐκρής / ὁ ἕνθη ὡρχηστρίς(?)
\(^{179}\) TC medallion from Arausio (S. France), museum at St. Germain, no. 31673. The medallion depicts the pantomime, his assistant, and a portable water organ, with the inscription: NICA PARTHENOPAEE. Perrot (1971) 93 and Hall in Hall and Wyles (2008) 2 and 28.
\(^{181}\) Pomtow (1920) 177 no. 161 = I.Apollonia D525. Honorific decree from Delphi. Stephanes 2510.
\(^{183}\) CIL 6.10127 (epitaph for a 12-year-old dancer).
**Table 27. Pantomimes (1st c. BCE-3rd c. CE)**

Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58 Platon (^{184})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>òρχηστής</td>
<td>3rd c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Ploutogenes (^{185})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>παντόμιμος</td>
<td>ca. 80 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Publius Aelius Crispus (^{186})</td>
<td>Pu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Publius Aelius Pylades (^{187})</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>pantominus</td>
<td></td>
<td>reign of Hadrian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Pylades (1) of Cilicia (^{188})</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>pantominus, histrio (Macrobius)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>age of Augustus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 Pylades (2) (^{189})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὄρχοῦμένον</td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Pylades (3) (^{190})</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td>pantominus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Severan period (193-235 CE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Pylades (4) son of Pylades (^{191})</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>None. Identification based on the name Pylades.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>first quarter of 2nd c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{184}\) P.Oxy. 1676 (letter from Oxyrhynchus). Stephanes 2066.  
\(^{185}\) I.Priene 113, line 66. Stephanes 2075. Zosimus funded the performances of a pantomime Ploutogenes in Priene, ca. 80 BCE. This is the first use of the term pantomimos.  
\(^{189}\) Galen *On precognition* 14.632.  
\(^{190}\) EAOR I 43.  
\(^{191}\) FD III 2.106. Stephanes 2182.
Table 27. Pantomimes (1st c. BCE-3rd c. CE)
Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhodocleia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>όρχηστρίς</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samios of Paros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>όρχηστής</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st/ 2nd c. CE</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarapion son of Epikrates, of Hermopolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>παντόμιμος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturninus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Βαχχικός όρχηστής</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septentrio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qui Antipoli in theatro biduo saltavit et placuit</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophe Theorobathylliana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>arbitrix imboliarum</td>
<td></td>
<td>last quarter of the 1st c. BCE or 1st c. CE</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spendon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>όρχηστής</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st c BCE</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>όρχήστρια</td>
<td></td>
<td>237 CE</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terentia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>saltatrix</td>
<td></td>
<td>imperial</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teretina Pylades of Scythopolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td></td>
<td>reign of Valerian and Gallienus (253-</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

192 Greek Anthology 16.283. Stephanes 2192.
193 IG XII 6.2.716 (epitaph, Samos).
196 CIL 12.188 (epitaph for a 12-year-old who danced at Antinopolis).
197 CIL 6.10128. The argument that Sophe was a pantomime hinges on her epithet Theorobathylliana, a combination of the names of two famous pantomimes, Theoros and Bathylus (Starks [2008] 125-6).
198 SEG 33-466 (epitaph, Larisa, Thessaly). Stephanes 2292.
200 CIL 6.10144 (epitaph).
201 CIL 14.462a (Ostia Antica). Father of Marcus Aurelius Arescius, also a pantomime.
Table 27. Pantomimes (1st c. BCE-3rd c. CE)

Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76 Terpnos of Attaleia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>θαυμαστός οὗτος ὃς ἦν ποτε ἐν θυμέλεσι</td>
<td>260 CE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 Theocritus Pylades</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td>reign of</td>
<td>Caracalla (198-217 CE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 Threptos</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὅρχηστής</td>
<td>imperial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Thyas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>saltatrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>imperial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 Tiberius Claudius Myrismos</td>
<td>C, HI</td>
<td></td>
<td>tragiκής ἐνρύθ μου κινήσεως ὑποκριτής</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>imperial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Tiberius Julius Apolaustus</td>
<td>C, B, St, HI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>tragiκής ἐνρύθ μου κινήσεως ὑποκριτής</td>
<td>180/192 CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

202 IG X 2.1.436 (epitaph, Thessalonike). Stephanes lists Terpnos as a pantomime, although the epitaph is not conclusive. Stephanes 2399.

203 Cassius Dio, *Roman History* 78.21.2, CIL 5.5889 (Mediolani, sepulchral altar). The altar is decorated with the parts Pylades performed: on one side, *Troadas*; on another, *Iona*. Below the *Iona* inscription is a figure identified as Creusa: Slater (1996b) 17 and fig. 19). Cassius Dio reports that Theocritus was Caracalla’s dancing instructor; he was driven out of Rome to Lugdunum, "where he delighted the people, since they were rather countryfied. Thus, from a slave and a dancer, he rose to be commander of an army and prefect. Theocritus was the son of a slave, and he had been brought up in the theatre, but he advanced to such power under Antoninus that both the prefects were as nothing compared to him" (Cassius Dio 78.21.2, trans. Cary).

204 IG XII 1.655 (Rhodes, epitaph). Stephanes 1235. The epitaph reads: Πρίσκου Θρέπτος ὅρχηστής/ ὑπὲρ τὰς γ’ ἱππικοὺς ὀὐτοὺς.

205 CIL 8.12925 (epitaph for a 14-year-old dancer).

206 I. Magnesia 165 (honorary inscription, Magnesia on the Maeander). Stephanes 1759.

207 FD III 1.551, FiE II 70 and 71. Stephanes 236.
Table 27. Pantomimes (1st c. BCE-3rd c. CE)
Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the boule; G = membership in the gerousia; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tnepheros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd/3rd c. CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulpius Augustianus, aka Paris</td>
<td>Pu (T)</td>
<td>C, HI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>166-180 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown name</td>
<td>C, B, St, HI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125-150 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown name</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>176-180 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown name</td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180-210 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown name</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd c. CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

209 TAM V 1016. Stephanes 475. Augustianus performed at the festival of the emperors in Thyateira. 
FD III 2.105 (Delphi). Stephanes 3017. 
210 I. Magnesia 192 (honorary inscription, Magnesia on the Maeander). Stephanes 3016. This is the earliest securely datable evidence of pantomime competitions in the Greek East. Festival victories: Eusebeia in Puteoli, the Sebastea in Naples, the Ephesea, the Leukophrynea in Magnesia on the Maeander.
211 Pesiri (1978) 169-172 no. 13 (Fundi).
### Table 27. Pantomimes (1st c. BCE-3rd c. CE)

Abbreviations: Pr = private; Pu = public; T = theater; S = slave; F = freedperson; IF = imperial freedperson; E = elite; C = citizenship; B = membership in the *boule*; G = membership in the *gerousia*; Prx = proxeny; St = statue; HI = honorific inscription; Cr = crown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Ethnic</th>
<th>Performance context</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>Festival victories</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89 unknown name 214</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reign of Caracalla (198-217 CE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 unknown name 215</td>
<td></td>
<td>παντόμιμος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181 CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 unknown name 216</td>
<td></td>
<td>παντόμιμος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181 CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 Vincentius of Libya 217</td>
<td></td>
<td>pantomimus</td>
<td>imperial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 Xenophon of Smyrna 218</td>
<td></td>
<td>όρχηστής</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st c. CE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

214 Sordi (1953) 104-121. This pantomime won at the Palatine games in Rome and perhaps at the Sebastea in Naples.
215 P.Flor. I 74. The papyrus is a contract for the pantomimes to perform at a festival in Ibion Sesymbotheos, for 5 days, with musicians, for 36 drachmas/ day + 2 drachmas for a crown. See Webb (2011) 234 for a discussion of the meaning of the crown.
216 Ibid.
217 Bayet (1967) 441 (epitaph from Thamugadi, modern Timгад, Libya).
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